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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

The passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provided opportunities for people with disabilities to become more involved in society (U.S. Department of Justice [USDJ], 1990). “Anyone with a physical or mental impairment substantially limiting one or more major life activities; has a record of such impairment; or is regarded as having such impairment, is considered a person with a disability” (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission [EEOC], 1991, p. 2).

According to 2000 U.S. census data, 17% of the U.S. population has disabilities; about 43 million Americans have one or more physical and/or mental disabilities. Of those who reported having a disability and were between 16 to 64 years of age, 21 million (11.9%) reported a condition that affected their ability to find a job or remain in one; 56% of those with disabilities were employed as compared to 88% of people without disabilities (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007).

Hospitality companies are looking for various ways to create a more diverse workforce. Diversity includes not only different cultures, races, and genders; people with disabilities are part of this diversity concept. The employment of people with disabilities could be a viable alternative for managers to diversify their workforces. The adoption of the ADA in 1990 changed the way people with disabilities could participate in society and the workforce (Price, Gerber, & Mulligan, 2007).

Hospitality organizations often prefer to hire part-time employees, and part-time work schedules facilitate the incorporation of employees with disabilities (Groschl, 2007). A number of employees with disabilities work late or rotation shifts; however, day shift employees and most night shift employees with disabilities receive lower hourly wages than do employees without disabilities (Presser & Altman, 2002). Incorporating people with disabilities into the workplace presents challenges to human resources departments because of the complexities of defining, accommodating, and understanding disabilities (Groschl, 2007).

Employers have the responsibility to make sure employees with disabilities have the same tools and opportunities as other employees have to succeed. Training is an important component of human resources management and has been demonstrated to increase
companies’ performance (Barrett & O’Conell, 2001; Ubeda, 2005). Accommodations may be necessary to help employees with disabilities in their training processes (EEOC, 2004).

The hospitality industry needs qualified and skilled workers in order to compete. Groschl (2004) found that, due to the continuous growth in the hotel industry and the need for qualified employees, people with disabilities represent an important labor source for hotel organizations. Disabled employees can learn the necessary skills to perform their jobs and contribute to the success of organizations.

Statement of the Problem

Human resources managers are challenged when defining and understanding disabilities and practices that have an impact on employing people with disabilities (Groschl, 2007; Hignite, 2000). Besides the complexity of understanding disabilities, qualifying organizations (those with 15 or more employees, state and local governments; employment agencies; and labor unions) encounter potential legal implications associated with hiring disabled employees. The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission provided broader protections for workers with disabilities when amending the ADA by extending the definition of the term “disabled” (EEOC, 2008). As of January 2009, more employees could be defined as having disabilities under the ADA.

In addition to the legal aspect, there is limited awareness, understanding, and communication between people with and those without disabilities (Groschl, 2007; Hignite, 2000). Groschl (2007), in a Canadian study, found that improving communication between workers with disabilities and workers without disabilities and educating people without disabilities might increase hotel managers’ willingness to hire and integrate more of this sector of the population into the work force.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to obtain the perceptions of hospitality industry managers’ and supervisors’ from one Midwestern state and determine their understanding of disability to help create a common definition. Once a definition was established, it served as the basis for an assessment of current training topics and training methods used with employees with disabilities, as well as managers’ and supervisors’ attitudes and knowledge
about people with disabilities, in the hospitality industry (specifically retail foodservices and lodging operations).

The results of this study provide information about managers’ attitudes toward employees with disabilities in the hospitality industry and managers’ knowledge about disability topics. The results also provide information to hospitality industry managers about current human resources practices such as training methods commonly used in the industry. This work presents information about potential professional development needs of current managers to better incorporate people with disabilities into their organizations. It can also help educators identify human resources management curriculum needs for hospitality management students who likely will work, at some point in their careers, with workers with disabilities.

The specific objectives of this study were to:

1. Develop a definition for “disability” based on terminology used in the hospitality industry.
2. Utilize the definition in developing a questionnaire to determine training topics and methods used for people with disabilities.
3. Assess managers’ knowledge and attitudes toward people with disabilities.
4. Assess current training topics and methods used by hospitality employers for employees with disabilities.

Definitions of Terms

Terms used in this study are defined as follows:

*Accommodation:* Any [reasonable] change or adjustment to a job, the work environment, or the way things usually are done that would allow [a disabled worker] to apply for a job, perform job functions, or enjoy equal access to benefits available to other individuals in the workplace” (EEOC, 2002, p. 9).

*Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA):* A federal law designed to eliminate discrimination against individuals with disabilities by mandating equal access to jobs, public accommodations, government services, public transportation, and telecommunications. Private employers who have 15 or more employees; state and
local governments; employment agencies; and labor unions must abide by the ADA (USDJ, 1990).

*Communication skills:* Skills needed to use language (spoken or written) to interact with others (Wrench, McCroskey, & Richmond, 2008).

*Disability:* A physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities, a record of such an impairment, or being regarded as having such an impairment (EEOC, 2008).

*Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC):* A federal agency with the goal of ending discrimination based on an individual’s race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, or disability (EEOC, 2002).

*Major life activities:* Activities that a person can perform with little or no difficulty; some examples are walking, seeing, hearing, speaking, breathing, learning, performing manual tasks, caring for oneself, working, sitting, standing, lifting, or reading (USDJ, 1990).

*Mental impairment:* “Any mental or psychological disorder, such as mental retardation, organic brain syndrome, emotional or mental illness, and specific learning disabilities” (USDJ, 1990, p. 11).

*Methodological skills:* Skills needed to follow procedures in the workplace (Geng-qing & Qu, 2003).

*Physical impairment:* “Any physiological disorder or condition, cosmetic disfigurement, or anatomical loss affecting one or more of the following body systems: neurological, musculoskeletal, special sense organs, respiratory (including speech organs), cardiovascular, reproductive, digestive, genitourinary, hemic and lymphatic, skin, and endocrine” (USDJ, 1990, p.11).

*Social desirability bias:* The tendency of respondents to answer in a way that will be viewed favorably by others (Fischer & Fick, 2003; Thompson & Phua, 2005).

*Social skills:* Skills needed to interact with others; for example, cooperation, sharing, and following directions (Gresham & Elliot, 1984).

*Technical skills:* Skills needed to perform jobs that require following a technique or procedure (Geng-qing & Qu, 2003).
Training: Provision of practical skills and knowledge to increase a person’s capability, capacity, and performance (Harris & Bonn, 2000).

Dissertation Organization

This dissertation comprises five additional chapters. Chapters 2 and 3 present the Literature Review and Methodology of the study, respectively. Chapter 4 is a journal article prepared for submission to the *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*; I was involved in every phase of research from idea conception to data analysis, I took leadership in preparation of the manuscript. Dr. Arendt served as major professor, advised in every phase of research from idea conception to data analysis; advised through the manuscript preparation process. Chapter 5 is a journal article prepared for submission to the *Journal of Child Nutrition Management*; I was involved in every phase of research from idea conception to data analysis, I took leadership in preparation of the manuscript. Dr. Arendt served as major professor, advised in every phase of research from idea conception to data analysis; advised through the manuscript preparation process. Dr. Strohbehn was involved in every phase of research from idea conception to data analysis, contributed to manuscript preparation. The last chapter presents general conclusions for the study. References cited are listed at the end of each chapter.
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CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

People with disabilities continue to be discriminated against, and even with the adoption of the American with Disabilities Act, their employment rate remains low (Bruyere, 2000; U.S. Census Bureau, 2007). Training is an important human resource management function in any organization and could be a good tool to help incorporate people with disabilities into the workforce. Training represents an opportunity for people with disabilities to increase their skills and performance.

The ADA (U.S. Department of Justice [USDJ], 1990) provided opportunities for people with disabilities to become more active in society by trying to diminish discrimination against people with disabilities. People with disabilities face disadvantages in our society from different perspectives, including economic and educational. Price, Gerber, and Mulligan (2007) noted that the ADA could be helpful for people with learning disabilities during job searches, job performance evaluations, and job advancement. The researchers mentioned that people with disabilities who do not use the ADA to their advantage are missing opportunities to become more active in the social environment.

People have tended to isolate individuals with disabilities, and despite some efforts and legislation, discrimination against individuals with disabilities continues to be a serious problem. Areas where discrimination was reported as a problem were: employment, housing, public accommodations, education, transportation, communication, recreation, institutionalization, health services, voting, and access to public services (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission [EEOC], 2004).

Limited understanding of the definition of disabilities has been a barrier to incorporating people with disabilities into the workforce in Canada (Groschl, 2007). Organizations need to consider the possibility of making accommodations to employ people with disabilities. Training is one human resources practice that has been associated with increased productivity and low turnover in organizations (Barrett & O’Connell, 2001; Bartel, 1994). Finding training methods that are effective with the population with disabilities is important in order to increase involvement and development in the organization and to ensure continuity and productivity in the workforce.
In a Canadian study, human resources departments identified challenges associated with the incorporation of those with disabilities into the workplace and found challenges were related to the complexity and limited understanding of the definition of disabilities (Groschl, 2007). Presser and Altman (2002) studied U.S. workers using data obtained from the Medical Expenditure Panel Survey. The authors found a number of employees with disabilities worked late or rotation shifts; day employees with disabilities and most night shift employees received lower hourly wages than did employees without disabilities. The hospitality industry’s flexible work schedules and low-skill entry-level jobs can facilitate the incorporation of disabled employees, making it beneficial for employee and employer. In addition, hospitality organizations often hire part-time employees (Groschl, 2007), which can benefit employees with disabilities (Marcoullier, Smith, & Bordieri, 1987).

For this study, previous research related to training methods for people with disabilities in the hospitality industry was reviewed. Literature was reviewed in the following areas: definition of disability, employment and disability, training and disability, and disability in the hospitality industry.

**Definition of Disability**

The ADA defined an individual with a disability as someone who:

- “has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities;
- has record of such an impairment; or
- is regarded as having such an impairment” (EEOC, 1991, p. 2).

Major life activities include walking, reading, bending, and communicating. In addition, major bodily functions, such as brain, neurological, circulatory, and respiratory functions, are considered vital life activities. This three-part definition reflects general types of limitations experienced by people with disabilities. There is no listing of all conditions or diseases determined to be physical or mental impairments; considering the variety of possible impairments, this would be difficult. In January of 2009, the ADA Amendment Act of 2008 took effect. This amendment to the ADA redefined who is considered disabled by expanding the definition of “major life activities” and “auxiliary aids and service” (EEOC, 2008).
The World Health Organization (WHO; 1980), in the *International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health*, defined “impairments” as abnormalities of body or organ structures and functions; “disabilities” as reductions of a person’s abilities to perform basic tasks; and “handicaps” as a person’s experienced disadvantage to fulfill social roles. Some examples of impairments are: intellectual, language, aural, ocular, or disfiguration. Disabilities include locomotor activities, behavior, and communication aspects. Handicaps are related to orientation, physical independence, mobility, and social integration.

Schur (2002) conducted a national study with a sample of working age people (18–64 years of age), 668 (42%) with disabilities and 924 (58%) without disabilities. Disability screening questions from the 2000 U.S. Census and the Harris Disability Questionnaire were used. In this study, the author presented a disabilities classification scheme based on activity limitation and functional impairments. The categories within the scheme were: sensory impairment, mobility impairment, mental impairment, other type of impairment, difficulty going outside alone, difficulty with activities inside home, and needing help with daily activities. The author found the following results reported by those sampled: sensory impairment, 41.1%; mobility impairment, 36.3%; mental impairment, 33.6%; other type of impairment, 66%; difficulty going outside, 18.5%; difficulty with activities inside home, 23.8%; and needed help with daily activities, 24.3%. Respondents, in some cases, reported more than one disability classification.

**Employment and Disability**

The ADA, enforced by the EEOC, states that no job discrimination should occur by covered organizations. Covered organizations are private employers with 15 or more employees; public employers, such as state and local governments; employment agencies; and labor unions (EEOC, 1991). The ADA states that no covered entity shall discriminate against a qualified individual with a disability because of the disability in regards to job application procedures, the hiring, advancement, or discharge of employees; employee compensation; job training; and other terms, conditions, and privileges of employment. (EEOC, 1996, p. 1). “Qualified individual” refers to someone who can perform the essential functions of the position held or desired with or without reasonable accommodations. In the United States, of
the 43 million people classified as disabled, 56% of those with disabilities are employed as compared to 88% of people without disabilities (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007). In Iowa, of the total civilian noninstitutionalized population ages 16 and older, 15% (415,074) had some kind of disability and 6.3% reported that a disability made it difficult to find a job (State Data Center of Iowa, 2006).

Bruyere (2000) conducted two research initiatives to examine employer practices in response to the employment provisions of Title I of the ADA and related civil rights legislation. A state sample of human resource and equal employment opportunity personnel from public and private sectors were interviewed by phone. Of the seven possible barriers to employment and advancement of people with disabilities, lack of related experience was seen as the biggest barrier by both the public and private sector employers. Other identified barriers were: lack of required skills/training; supervisor knowledge of accommodation; supervisors’ attitudes; and costs of accommodation, supervision, and training. The author concluded that there was still a lot to be done to decrease the unemployment rate for people with disabilities. The recommendations provided by the researcher included that people with disabilities, educators, and employers need to improve education and training for persons with disabilities, provide more outreach from the employment community to recruit persons with disabilities, offer a better understanding of reasonable accommodation, and make an effort to overcome the attitudinal barrier. These needs were seen as fundamental to integrating people with disabilities into the workforce (Bruyere, 2000).

The Urban Institute used information from the Disability Supplement of the National Interview Survey to study barriers adults with disabilities face when finding a job. Sixteen thousand persons with disabilities were asked about their disability, their work, and their need for accommodations (Loprest & Maag, 2001). Of those who reported they could work, the reasons they could not find a job were: no appropriate jobs available, family responsibilities, lack of transportation, no information about jobs, inadequate training, fear of losing health insurance or Medicaid, and discouraged from working by family and friends.

Organizations might limit the hiring of people with disabilities because of several challenges they face in understanding definitions and legal implications of hiring workers with disabilities. Associated with this is the fact that there is limited awareness,
understanding, and communication between people with disabilities and people without disabilities (Bruyere, 2000; Groschl, 2007). Groschl (2007) suggested that an improvement in manager education and enhanced communication between employees with disabilities and employees without disabilities might lead hotel managers to hire and integrate more of this sector of the population.

Price, Gerber, and Mulligan (2007) conducted a review of literature on the use of the ADA by people with learning disabilities. The authors discussed several studies that showed people with learning disabilities were not using provisions of the ADA—specifically the use of self-disclosure (telling others about their disabilities)—because of their limited knowledge of the ADA. Because most (85%) people with learning disabilities go straight to work after school (Price et al.), the authors reviewed materials used for people with disabilities as part of their transition from high school to the workforce. They found limited or no information related to the ADA in these materials. The authors noted the ADA could be a good tool for people with learning disabilities during job searches, job performance evaluations, and job advancements.

Schur (2002) conducted a study using two existing datasets. The researcher’s purpose was to value the effect of employment on people with disabilities by comparing employment variables, such as economic, social, psychological, and political outcomes, between people with and those without disabilities. The sample included people of working age (18–64 years of age), 668 with disabilities and 924 without disabilities; the sample was stratified to oversample people with disabilities. Disability screening questions from the 2000 U.S. Census and the Harris Disability Questionnaire were used. Data were analyzed using comparisons between employment variables for people with and without disabilities. The author found that less than half ($n = 307$) of working-age people with disabilities were employed compared with 82% ($n = 758$) of working age people without disabilities. Employees with disabilities were more likely to work part time, and their hourly and annual incomes were lower than for people without disabilities. The author concluded that employment benefited people with disabilities by helping skill development, increasing income, decreasing social isolation, increasing life satisfaction, and increasing civic skills.
Gilbride, Stensrud, Vandergoot, and Golden (2003) conducted a qualitative research study to identify characteristics of workplaces where employers are open to hiring and integrating people with disabilities into their organizations. To gather data, focus groups and interviews were conducted, tape recorded, and transcribed. Focus groups were used with people with disabilities who were currently employed to help identify employment experiences; employers’ behaviors, policies and procedures; and other characteristics that helped them to be successful. Employers who had hired people with disabilities participated in focus groups and individual interviews to discuss their experiences with employees with disabilities. Employers included human resource directors from hospitals, manufacturing, and service industries; owners of small businesses; and mid-level supervisors of retail stores. Placement employers who had placed employees with disabilities also participated in focus groups and individual interviews to discuss methods used to place employees and perceptions of employers’ characteristics.

The results showed 13 workplace characteristics grouped into three categories: work cultural topics, job matches, and employer experience and support. Work cultural topics included characteristics related to diversity, work performance, and organizational policies; people with disabilities had to feel welcomed and supported in the workplace by management and coworkers. In the category of job match, the most important issue was the applicant’s ability to perform essential job functions. Additional areas were: involving the person in the job, accommodations discussions, focusing on essential functions, and offering internships. The authors found that employers who had worked with people with disabilities in the past were more open to hiring and integrating them into the workforce (Gilbride et al., 2003).

Vilá, Pallisera, and Fullana (2007) conducted a study in Spain to identify and analyze how factors related to family, work, and training influenced work integration of people with disabilities. The sample consisted of 32 professionals from 18 agencies who provided services for people with intellectual, physical, and mental disabilities. Semistructured group interviews were used for data collection. The interviews were structured using five themes: family, prior training of the worker, training by the supported employment service, workplace monitoring, and work setting of the person. The interviews lasted for 2½ hours
and were recorded and transcribed. The data were analyzed using thematic content analysis techniques. The authors found that it was very important to clearly inform the family about the process of work integration and the work options of the person with a disability. Related to the work setting, the authors found that there was a need for more effort from the government to integrate workers with disabilities into the workforce. When monitoring the worker at the workplace, the authors highlighted the importance of the involvement of the job trainer and the supervisor at the work setting prior to training.

Accommodations

The ADA requires an employer to provide reasonable accommodation to qualified individuals with disabilities who are employees or applicants for employment; an exception can be made when such accommodation would cause an undue hardship (EEOC, 2002). The ADA defines three categories for reasonable accommodation:

(i) modifications or adjustments to a job application process that enable a qualified applicant with a disability to be considered for the position such qualified applicant desires; or

(ii) modifications or adjustments to the work environment, or to the manner or circumstances under which the position held or desired is customarily performed, that enable a qualified individual with a disability to perform the essential functions of that position; or

(iii) modifications or adjustments that enable a covered entity's employee with a disability to enjoy equal benefits and privileges of employment as are enjoyed by its other similarly situated employees without disabilities (EEOC, 2002).

The ADA describes a reasonable accommodation as any change or adjustment to a job, the work environment, or the way things usually are done that would allow a person to apply for a job, perform job functions, or enjoy equal access to benefits available to other individuals in the workplace. There are many types of accommodations that may help people with disabilities work successfully (USDJ, 1990). Some examples of reasonable accommodations include:

- physical changes, such as installing a ramp or modifying a workspace or restroom;
• sign language interpreters for people who are deaf or readers for people who are blind;
• providing a quieter workspace or making other changes to reduce noisy distractions for someone with a mental disability;
• training and other written materials in an accessible format, such as in Braille, on audio tape, or on computer disk;
• time off for someone who needs treatment for a disability.

Kreismann and Palmer (2001) provided an overview of court determinations regarding accommodation-related issues. Even though the purpose of the ADA is to protect people with disabilities, it has been used as an instrument of litigation. There are some human resources management issues covered under the ADA, such as hiring, advancement, employee compensation, or training. Job accommodations include the modification of existing facilities to be usable and accessible to employees with disabilities and job restructuring. Disagreement exists on whether it is the employer or the employee who is responsible for initiating the accommodation process. Differences also exist in circuit court rulings regarding reassignment as a reasonable accommodation and telecommuting issues. Some rulings did not favor reassignment to a different position as reasonable accommodation. The authors recommended that employers carefully analyze each situation related to accommodations and follow these steps: (a) talk with the candidate and current employee, who is responsible for identifying the need, about their requirement for accommodation; (b) analyze essential functions of the job; (c) identify whether the person is qualified for the job before hiring; (d) be as clear as possible with the employee; (e) analyze each situation and (f) document all information (Kreismann & Palmer).

**Attitudes Toward People with Disabilities**

Blum (1996) conducted a review of literature and found that legislative changes, such as the ADA, were having an impact on the hospitality industry. He also identified the importance of incorporating cultural changes in hospitality programs.

Marcouiller et al. (1987) studied hiring practices and attitudes toward people with mental disabilities. The sample consisted of 503 (294 commercial and 209 noncommercial) randomly selected food manufacturing employers, institutional foodservice employers, and
commercial foodservice employers in Minneapolis, Minnesota. A response rate of 30.2% \( (n = 152) \) was achieved. A questionnaire, adapted from the Attitudes Toward Disabled Person’s Scale (Yuker, Block, & Young, 1996), was used to assess the hiring practices and attitudes of manufacturers and foodservice employers toward workers with mental disabilities. Past hiring practices related to workers with mental disabilities and performance ratings were requested. The authors found that employers reported good performance by people with mental disabilities.

Unger (2002) conducted a review of literature on employers’ perceptions toward people with disabilities and identified characteristics that might affect those perceptions. A total of 24 studies were retrieved from different electronic databases. Through the review of literature, the author found that no relationship between organization size or sector of the industry and attitudes toward people with disabilities had been identified. Some benefits and concerns of hiring people with disabilities were: work performance, productivity, safety, dependability, attendance, corporate social responsibility, turnover and retention, appearance, coworker acceptance, experience, financial incentives, costs, extra training, and supervision.

Characteristics identified in the literature review by Unger (2002) that may affect attitudes toward people with disabilities were: presence of employer or applicant disability, previous experience with workers with disabilities, size of employer organization, and sector of business or industry. Based on the literature review, the author found that employers were more concerned about employing people with mental or emotional disabilities than people with physical disabilities. Another finding was that having a previous working experience with people with disabilities increased employers’ positive attitudes when hiring people with disabilities. Most of the studies surveyed employer representatives who were responsible for the hiring process.

Geng-qing and Qu (2003) conducted a survey to determine foodservice employers’ attitudes about hiring people with disabilities and how these attitudes impacted hiring practices in the foodservice industry. The authors found that there was a positive attitude toward hiring people with disabilities in commercial foodservice operations. Some of the employers’ concerns about hiring people with disabilities were: amount of supervision, training, and training costs.
Hunt and Hunt (2004) tested the effectiveness of a short educational intervention on students’ knowledge and attitudes toward people with disabilities. The sample consisted of 190 business undergraduate students at a mid-Atlantic university. A Solomon four-group design was used for data collection. Group one \((n = 49)\) completed a pretest, was exposed to the educational intervention, and took a posttest 1 week after the intervention. Group two \((n = 47)\) received the intervention and took the posttest. Group three \((n = 46)\) completed the pretest and posttest, and the fourth group \((n = 48)\) only completed the posttest.

The educational intervention implemented by Hunt and Hunt (2004) included a 1-hour presentation with information regarding the definition of disability, awareness, barriers, myths and misperceptions, the ADA, and guidance for working with people with disabilities. Attitudes toward people with disabilities were assessed using items from the Attitudes Towards Disabled Persons Scale (ATDPS), which used a six-point Likert-type scale. Students’ knowledge about people with disabilities was assessed using a multiple choice test based on the information presented during the intervention. The authors found that women had significantly higher knowledge scores and higher attitude scores than did men. The educational intervention significantly increased the students’ knowledge and attitude scores, and these scores were still higher 1 week after intervention as compared to before the intervention. The authors concluded that it was important to incorporate training about disabilities into existing programs to affect overall knowledge and attitudes.

Daruwalla and Darcy (2005) conducted two studies and examined the differences in personal and societal attitudes toward people with disabilities. The first study included hospitality and tourism students \((N = 175)\) from a university and technical college in the United States. The study’s objective was to measure the most effective way of changing attitudes toward people with disabilities. The second study included 176 respondents from a state-based tourism organization \((n = 137)\) and from the government \((n = 39)\), where disability awareness training was implemented. The aim of this second study was to implement the best practices identified in the first study.

In the first study, a control group and two intervention groups were used. One group received lecture and video, and the other received lecture, video, role play, and contact with people with disabilities. Participants were surveyed prior to the intervention, immediately
after, and 1 month after the intervention. For the second study, two scales were used to collect the attitude information: the Interaction with Disabled Persons Scale (IDP) and the ATDPS. The first scale measures attitudes at a personal level and consists of 20 items rated on a six-point scale. The Scale of Attitudes towards Disabled People (SADP) has 24 items rated on a six-point scale and measures attitudes toward a group at the societal level. Daruwalla and Darcy, 2005 found that the different types of interventions (lecture, video, and role play) were effective for changing scores regarding attitude toward people with disabilities. The authors noted the effectiveness of contact with people with disabilities on attitudinal change and increased knowledge.

Perry, Ivy, Conner, and Shelar (2008) examined attitudes of leisure and recreation undergraduate students toward people with disabilities. Data were drawn from a compilation of two research studies identified as study A and study B. The ATDPS scale was used to establish an attitude mean. In addition, for study B, the frequency data of interactions with people with disabilities were collected. The sample for Study A consisted of 139 undergraduate students from an accredited National Recreation and Parks Association program in a southeast U.S. university. Study B used 266 undergraduate students of accredited and nonaccredited National and Recreation Parks Association programs in the same U.S. region as study A. The sample for both studies A and B consisted of a total of 405 undergraduate students enrolled in recreation and leisure services programs from five universities in the Southeast region of the United States. A questionnaire was administered to all students; a response rate of 74% (n = 298) was achieved, resulting in 269 usable questionnaires. The authors found that gender was the only demographic variable with significant differences on attitudes toward people with disabilities. Age, area of specialization, and program accreditation presented no statistically significant differences. For study B, where the frequency and quality of interaction with people with disabilities was measured, the authors found that the highest mean scores for attitude occurred with participants who interacted with people with disabilities on a weekly basis.
Training

Training is one of the human resources practices that has been associated with increased productivity and low turnover in organizations. In addition, training has been associated with increased employee motivation (Barrett & O’Connell, 2001; Bartel, 1994).

Training Needs Assessment

Training needs assessments are very important to an organization because these assessments provide direction to focus the training efforts of the organization and facilitate identification of training gaps (Bowman & Wilson, 2008). Training needs assessments provide information on activities and resources that are needed to meet the needs of the organization (McClelland, 1995).

Gupta (1999) noted that there are two purposes associated with training needs assessment: (a) to assess skills and knowledge that people must possess to perform their jobs and (b) to select the appropriate intervention to fill the identified gaps. The data gathering process is very important; surveys are one of the most common methods used. McClelland (1994) discussed the process of training needs assessment and described different aspects that must be considered when using training needs surveys.

Harris and Bonn (2000) studied training techniques, tools, and technology in the foodservice industry. A random sample of 300 foodservice operations was used; the companies offered a variety of foodservice options from full-service fine dining to vending service only. Human resources directors, vice presidents of human resources, or directors of training were contacted to complete a questionnaire related to training methods and tools used with employees in their organizations. A response rate of 49.6% was achieved. The authors found the training techniques most commonly used were classroom-style, on-the-job training, and textbooks and manuals. The tools used by the participants’ organizations were textbooks, transparencies, and flip charts. Computers and video tapes were also used; teleconferencing and interactive multimedia were rarely used. Training was offered in multiple languages. Identified areas in which training needed improvement were: service skills, customer relations, management skills, theory, production, sanitation, computer skills, and communication. The respondents indicated that training topics that were needed but not offered were reading, math, writing, and customer relation skills. The authors mentioned the
hospitality industry was facing training challenges associated with the diversity of their workforce.

*Training and Disabilities*

People with disabilities should have the same training opportunities as those without disabilities (EEOC, 2004). The EEOC worked with four states to identify best practices that promote hiring, retention, and advancement of individuals with disabilities in government jobs. In order to promote career development of people with disabilities, one state (Maryland) incorporated several topics into its biannual ADA training. Topic discussion areas were: responsibilities and expectations of each employee, evaluating employee’s skills and abilities, developing appropriate goals, encouraging job rotations and team associations, working with mentors, and emphasizing the employee’s responsibility for self development (EEOC, 2004).

The U.S. Department of Labor makes it clear that training opportunities should be available for people with disabilities. Organizations that recruit and retain qualified employees with disabilities might have a competitive advantage, as low turnover, low absenteeism, and high loyalty have been associated with employees with disabilities (U.S. Department of Labor, 2000). Another consideration is that the provision of reasonable accommodations is needed in order to provide a good training environment for the employees with disabilities and ensure success in the training process.

Some researchers have identified the advantages and disadvantages of hiring people with disabilities and the role that training plays in performance. The purpose of Stokes’ (1990) study was to provide insights about advantages of hiring people with disabilities for restaurant supervisor positions. The author provided information on the challenges people with disabilities face, such as unfair treatment, underpayment, or other workers making fun of them. When referring to supervisory positions, the Stokes noted that “by completing a specialized training program, persons with disabilities can be trained to perform this type of [supervisory] job” (p. 15). People with disabilities were excited about the job and good at transmitting this excitement to their coworkers. The author mentioned that training of people with disabilities should include hands-on training and postemployment support. As described
by the author, hands-on training consists of job-site training and direct assessment; postemployment support refers to periodic follow ups and problem intervention.

Some of the benefits of hiring people with disabilities discussed by the Stokes (1990) were dedication, stability, state and federal assistance to operations, and tax credits and funds for training programs. Some concerns were given, including an increase in insurance benefits and need for accommodations. The author concluded that people with disabilities could be an answer to the foodservice industry turnover problem, but that support for workers with disabilities is needed from all employees of the organization.

Hignite (2000) conducted interviews with disability experts, most of them working for organizations that work with people with disabilities. Several internal factors for creating a workplace that welcomes people with disabilities were discussed. Some of the barriers organizations faced were the difficulty of understanding disabilities and how to treat people with different disabilities, the lack of management training about the ADA, and issues of privacy. The author mentioned the importance of assessing individual training needs of employees in order to help facilitate the work of people with disabilities.

The importance of on-the-job training was highlighted by emphasizing that it is better to place workers first and then train them, making sure the training is specific to the job and workplace where the job will be performed. A universal design of products and technologies is another way of integrating people with disabilities into the workforce. Exposure was another issue discussed by the disability experts as a way of integrating people with disabilities into the workplace; if people with disabilities are incorporated in the workforce those without disabilities will learn to deal with the different situations that may arise when working with people with disabilities (Hignite, 2000).

Brooks, Rose, Attree, and Elliot-Square (2002) compared different training methods used for students with learning disabilities. The authors evaluated catering students’ performance when trained using a real environment, a workbook, untrained tasks, and a virtual environment. The sample consisted of 24 students with learning disabilities from three different colleges in the United States; half of the students were familiar with the kitchen on which the virtual kitchen was modeled. To determine training topics, questionnaires were sent to trainers at different colleges. Four preparation and cooking tasks and a task
recognizing 12 potential hazards were included in the training; a final test was used to measure performance. All students were trained and tested individually, taking into consideration the differences in learning disabilities. First, a pretest of the four tasks and identification of potential hazards was conducted at each student’s real kitchen. Then, participants were trained on three of the four tasks, one task using the real kitchen, one using the virtual kitchen, and one using a workbook; they were also trained on identifying the potential hazards, three using the real kitchen, three using the virtual kitchen, and three using the workbook. There was no training for one of tasks and three of the hazards; this served as a control. A posttest was conducted on the four preparation tasks and all hazards using their own kitchen (Brooks et al.).

Brooks et al. (2002) used ANOVA to analyze the data and found that there was a significant difference on performance scores between virtual and workbook training and between virtual and no training—more improvement was found with virtual training. There was no significant difference on performance scores between virtual and real training. In relation to the hazards, a significant difference on performance scores was found between virtual and no training, but no difference in scores was found between virtual and workbook training and virtual and real training. It was identified that catering was one of the courses that most students took. The authors concluded that virtual training is an effective training method for people with learning disabilities.

Vilá et al. (2007) conducted a study to identify factors related to training that affected the integration of people with disabilities into the workforce. Participants (professionals from agencies who provided services for people with learning, physical, and mental disabilities) agreed that companies value knowledge and social–personal skills more than they do technical skills. Training should be related to the development of those skills as well as to specific job tasks, motivation, and positive attitudes toward their specific tasks. Participants mentioned that academic training could not be ignored; through this training workers become more specialized and qualified, thus increasing their opportunities to progress at work.

Ruggeri-Stevens and Goodwin (2007) conducted a study to evaluate the effectiveness of the “supported employment” model and the “learning to work” project in the United Kingdom to place young people with learning disabilities in small businesses. The focus of
the study was on learning and training challenges. The supported employment model consisted of training people to perform a specific job at the workplace by following specific routines and expectations. The learning to work project helped people with learning disabilities who had difficulty in making the transition from college to work. A questionnaire was sent to 52 organizations where people with learning disabilities worked. A response rate of 36% ($n = 19$) was achieved. Personal interviews were conducted in 12 of the organizations.

Ruggeri-Stevens and Goodwin (2007) found coworkers working with people with learning disabilities had positive experiences, such as loyalty, devotion to duty, and excitement, which were transmitted to other employees. Some concerns were: additional training needed, need for retraining, and inflexibility. The authors concluded that retraining and refreshing of key points are important for all employees. Changes in work routines could affect performance of some people with learning disabilities and having different supervisors could cause trouble for people with learning disabilities; key issues of concern in the hospitality industry.

Bucholz and Brady (2008) studied literacy-based behavioral interventions (LBBIs) and how these interventions could be used as an instructional method for encouraging positive work behaviors in people with disabilities. The authors described the process of creating LBBIs and how important it is to consider the behavior that needs improvement. Two interventions, with two individuals who had mental disabilities, were conducted to test the use of LBBIs (instructional interventions that use print or pictures as an instructional medium). In both cases the authors found that the use of the LBBIs increased work productivity and social praise from coworkers and supervisors. They concluded that this type of intervention is successful when working with people with disabilities because it helps the individual visualize himself/herself engaged in the desired behavior.

*Disability in the Hospitality Industry*

There is limited information on people with disabilities working in the hospitality industry. Blum (1996) noted that the ADA represented one piece of legislation that is impacting the hospitality industry. Groschl (2004) conducted a study in Canada and found that, due to the continuous growth of the hotel industry and the need for qualified employees
in the industry, people with disabilities could represent an important labor source for hotel organizations.

Blum (1996) conducted a review of 135 articles published in the *Journal of Hospitality Research* from 1989 to 1995 to identify emerging themes in the hospitality field. The six themes identified were: (a) people and organizations, (b) service quality and customers, (c) education and training, (d) finance strategies and performance, (e) foodservice sectors, and (f) legal considerations. The author concluded that the most important concept managers should focus on is change. Change was identified as having the following impacts: changing needs of employees and guests caused organizations to re-evaluate their structure; changing customer preferences impacted service quality and how it’s measured; ethical, technical, and cultural changes impacted how hospitality education was taught; and legislative changes (such as the ADA) caused liability concerns for management.

Earlier work by Marcouiller et al. (1987) found that half \( (n = 76) \) of the organizations in their study (food manufacturers and commercial and institutional foodservices) had hired workers with mental disabilities within the 5 years previous to the study year. Commercial operations employers had hired more of these workers than had institutional operations’ employers, and more entry level positions were available in commercial foodservice operations. Correlations were calculated and a positive relationship was found between an establishment’s size and the number of employees with mental disabilities hired within the 5 years prior to the study year. A positive correlation was found between the overall employers’ attitude scores toward hiring people with disabilities and the number of workers with mental disabilities hired. The authors noted that most managers \( (n = 111) \) rated the job performance of their employees with mental disabilities as satisfactory or above average.

In the foodservice industry, Geng-qing and Qu (2003) determined foodservice employers’ attitudes about hiring people with disabilities and how these attitudes might relate to hiring practices and characteristics of the foodservice industry. A four-section questionnaire was developed to identify employers’ attitudes toward employees with disabilities as well as employers’ demographic characteristics. The four sections consisted of information about the business, assessment of employers’ attitudes by using a Likert-type scale, information regarding previous experiences working with people with disabilities and
intention to hire employees with disabilities, and demographic information about the respondents. The questionnaire was sent to 500 randomly selected foodservice employers who were members of the Oklahoma Restaurant Association. A response rate of 14% \((n = 70)\) was achieved. Geng-qing and Qu found that more than 85% of the respondents had hired people with disabilities; 8 of the 10 respondents who had never hired people with disabilities indicated they had never had a person with disabilities apply. Based on the results, the authors found there was a good attitude toward hiring people with disabilities regarding dependability, business cost, cooperation, adaptability, absenteeism, accommodation, turnover, and interaction with coworkers. A positive relationship was found between the probability of hiring people with disabilities and work performance and accommodations, as well as work ethics, employment risks, and general evaluation.

Amount of training needed was identified as one of the biggest concerns for hiring people with disabilities. Other concerns included more supervision and additional costs for accommodations. Some positive factors identified by the respondents were loyalty and punctuality. Employers’ attitude scores were significantly higher for those who had previous experience working with people with disabilities. Geng-qing and Qu (2003) concluded that, as more people with disabilities get incorporated into the workforce, managers and coworkers will develop better attitudes toward people with disabilities.

Groschl (2004) examined current human resources practices in hotels affecting the employment of people with disabilities in Toronto. An exploratory study using a case study approach included four 5-star hotels, part of a large international organization. Data were collected using company documents, nonparticipant observations, semistructured interviews with the human resources directors of each hotel, and discussions and interviews with senior managers and director or hotels working with or for people with disabilities. Between 400 and 1,200 employees (an average of 650 employees) worked in the hotels; none of the hotels could provide information on the number of employees with disabilities. The author found that the companies had policies against discrimination and had training and initiatives to increase diversity in the workforce. Most of the training was related to the reintegration of employees with disabilities as a result of a work accident. Training on how to treat customers with disabilities was more common than training on how to treat employees with disabilities;
accommodations were also focused on customers rather than employees. Some identified challenges of hiring people with disabilities were accommodations, difficulty in understanding the term disability, and perceptions about people with disabilities. The author mentioned that greater awareness, understanding, and education of the topic could be a good way to attract, retain, and integrate people with disabilities into hotel organizations.

Daruwalla and Darcy (2005) explored the role, nature, and impact of disability awareness training in the Australian hospitality industry. In their study, a comparison between tourism personnel’s attitudes and attitudes of personnel working in other industries was conducted. The authors found tourism personnel had less positive attitudes toward people with disabilities than did personnel from other industries. Personal attitude change was influenced by the type of intervention; social attitudes were not influenced by type of intervention. The authors recommended the following to increase the effectiveness of the intervention: contact with people with disabilities with similar backgrounds, focus on the person’s abilities rather than the impairment, and make the contact meaningful and relevant to the situation. The importance of incorporating disability awareness in hospitality college programs was also noted.

Groschl (2007) conducted an exploratory study to examine current practices and policies affecting the hiring process of people with disabilities in the Canadian hotel industry. Semistructured interviews were conducted with directors or managers at 42 hotels. The hotels had 11,161 employees of which 58 (0.005%) had some disability as identified by the director or manager; these organizations did not have a tracking system that identified exactly how many employees with disabilities were employed. All interviews were recorded and transcribed to generate categories, including barriers and challenges faced by managers when hiring people with disabilities. The hotel managers or directors identified challenges of hiring people with disabilities such as the high cost of training, lower productivity, and incorporation of accommodations. The complexity of defining disabilities and legal issues, the importance of employees’ physical appearance, the difficulty of getting to the work place, high training costs, and limited communication between people with and without disabilities were identified as barriers for hiring people with disabilities. For most, the focus was on customers with
disabilities rather than employees with disabilities. Groschl (2007) concluded that changes in education and communication could be a good way to incorporate people with disabilities into the workforce. Based on the information provided by managers, the author found that there were no best human resources practices or specific policies for hiring people with disabilities.

Summary

This review of literature contains information that showed training can benefit an organization by increasing productivity and reducing turnover. Unger (2002) found, in a review of literature, that employers at different types of organizations may be willing to spend more time on training and supervision of people with disabilities because of the perceived benefits of hiring them (such as low turnover, increased diversity, and improved corporate social responsibility image). Limited research has supported these perceptions.

U.S. law supports the idea that people with disabilities should have the same opportunities to get training as people without disabilities. In some particular cases, accommodations must be made to facilitate the training process of people with disabilities. Past research has investigated the integration of people with disabilities in the overall workforce as well as in the hospitality industry, but limited research can be found about training methods used for people with disabilities. Also, the increased use of technology might bring new changes to the way employees are trained. The ADA provides a broad definition of what a disability is, but organizations are still facing the challenge of understanding disabilities.
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CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

Limited information was available about training topics and methods used for employees with disabilities in the hospitality industry. The literature underscored the importance of finding a disability definition in order for people within organizations to understand the topic. The purpose of this study was to obtain hospitality managers’ and supervisors’ (retail foodservice and lodging operations) perceptions about disabilities in order to create a useful definition for the hospitality industry. Current training topics and methods used with employees with disabilities, as well as managers’ and supervisors’ attitudes and knowledge about people with disabilities, were assessed in a limited geographic area. The specific research objectives were to:

1. Develop a definition for “disability” based on terminology used in the hospitality industry.
2. Utilize the definition in developing a questionnaire to determine training topics and methods used for people with disabilities.
3. Assess managers’ knowledge and attitudes toward people with disabilities.
4. Assess current training topics and methods used by hospitality employers for employees with disabilities.

For this study, a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods was used to collect, analyze, and better understand the topic (Creswell & Plano, 2007). Hospitality managers and supervisors were interviewed and completed a questionnaire. First, in-depth, open-ended interviews provided information about managers’ and supervisors’ perceptions of the definition of disabilities and about training topics and methods used in their operations. Next, a questionnaire was developed and used, with a larger sample, to identify knowledge, attitudes, training topics, and training methods used in the hospitality industry for people with disabilities.

Human Subjects

The Iowa State University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviewed and approved the proposal for this study, to guarantee that the health, safety, and rights of the participants were protected (Appendix A). Cover letters to participants clearly explained the purpose of the study and assured confidentiality of responses (Appendix B).
The researchers had completed the Human Subjects Research Assurance Training by Iowa State University.

**Research Design**

The research design followed in this study was an exploratory design; a two-phase design was used in which results of the first more qualitative method generated information for the development of the questionnaire used in the second, more quantitative method (Creswell & Plano, 2007). Through interviews, managers’ and supervisors’ perceptions on the meaning of “disability” in the hospitality industry were explored and themes were generated. A questionnaire for determining knowledge, attitudes, training topics, and training methods was developed using interview results and information from the review of literature. Findings from the interviews provided disability terms used by hospitality managers, and these terms were used when developing the questionnaire.

**Interviews**

In-depth, open-ended interviews with key informants were used to gather information from managers and/or supervisors about disabilities in the workforce. The sample selection, content, procedures, and analysis are presented next.

**Sample Selection**

The population consisted of a purposeful sample of managers and supervisors of lodging and foodservice operations (commercial and noncommercial, small and large) from one Midwestern state in the United States. Equal numbers of participants were selected from each type of organization: three hotels, three restaurants, and three school foodservice operations. Potential key informants at 21 sites were contacted. Ten agreed to participate and nine interviews were conducted. Interviews continued until no new major themes emerged from the data.

Potential participants were initially contacted by phone, e-mail, or on site. A script was developed to explain the purpose of the research and the interview procedures (Appendix C). An e-mail was sent to potential participants and, if no answer was received after 1 week, another e-mail was sent requesting their participation. Due to the limited response from hotel managers, one of the managers voluntarily e-mailed other managers and requested participation.
Content

The goal of the interview was to deeply explore respondents’ perceptions, feelings, and points of view regarding development of a disability definition (i.e., terms used, content of definition, and examples of disabilities) as well as obtain information related to training methods used where the respondent worked (Seidman, 1998). An interview guide was developed considering the information needed to better understand the topic (Appendix D). The guide was reviewed and approved by five experts. The semistructured format was followed such that the researcher asked preplanned questions during the interview and, based on information provided by the informants, also added questions to allow for natural flow.

Ten open-ended questions were worded so that respondents could not simply answer “yes” or “no,” but could expound on the topic. Four questions asked for information about the disability definition and types of disabilities. Two questions were related to the operations’ training topics and methods used for all employees. Two questions asked participants about their willingness to use or current use of different training topics and training methods for employees with disabilities. Participants were asked to add any additional comments they wanted.

Due to the sensitive nature of this topic area and the possibility of receiving socially desirable responses on questionnaire administered during the second phase of this research, the last part of the interview pilot tested social desirability questions (Fischer & Fick, 1993; Thompson & Phua, 2005). The researcher assessed respondents’ reactions to the questions and their thoughts regarding potential use on the questionnaire. Interview participants completed a form about demographic information including age, gender, years working in the industry and for the current organization, and previous experience working with people with disabilities (Appendix E).

Procedures

Before starting the interview, participants were asked to voluntarily complete a consent form (Appendix F). One researcher conducted the interviews at each participant’s workplace; her role was primarily that of a facilitator, listener, and note taker. This researcher had previous experience in qualitative data collection both in group and individual interview situations. Through the interview, the researcher sought to understand and interpret what she
was hearing, as well as to clarify and gain a deeper understanding about responses. Nonverbal behaviors were observed and recorded on field notes. Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed to facilitate data analysis. The interviews lasted approximately 1 hour each. Immediately after the interview, the researcher’s views and feelings were recorded in the form of field notes. The interviewer held debriefing sessions with another researcher, her major professor, following the interviews.

Data Analyses

The interview recordings were transcribed by a hired, experienced transcriptionist and then analyzed manually by two researchers to look for emerging themes. Emerging themes were grouped into categories and labeled consistent with the quotations included in each category. Further analysis and data display were conducted using the qualitative software program, Atlas.ti (Appendix G). Observations and interview data provided cross examination in order to increase trustworthiness of the qualitative results as recommended by Creswell (1998).

Questionnaires

A questionnaire to gather information about knowledge, attitudes, training topics, and training methods used for employees with disabilities was developed. Two formats of the same questionnaire were used. A paper version of the questionnaire was used for hotels and restaurants (Appendix H), and an online version was used for schools (Appendix I). The sample selection, development, content, distribution, and analysis are discussed below.

Sample Selection

The target population of this study was managers of retail foodservice (schools and restaurants only) and lodging (hotels; bed and breakfasts were not included) operations in a Midwestern state of the United States. It has been demonstrated that mail surveys in limited geographical areas have higher response rates than do national surveys (Unger, 2002). There were approximately 6,000 foodservice and lodging operations in Iowa (this approximate number was indicated on the websites for the Iowa Department of Education, 2009; Iowa Lodging Association, 2008; and Iowa Restaurant Association, 2009) at the time of the study. However, a total of 1,199 operations were used for this study as these were the ones with e-mail addresses (schools) and postal mailing addresses (hotels and restaurants) available.
All schools listed in the Iowa Public District Directory of the Department of Education (2009) were used for this study. The directory contained a total of 363 school superintendents’ names and e-mail addresses. A list of school foodservice representatives’ e-mail addresses was developed by visiting each school district’s website to look for the e-mail address of the school foodservice authority. If the school district had a foodservice or nutrition department, the e-mail address of the foodservice director or supervisor was used for mailing purposes; if this information was not available, the e-mail address of the superintendent was used. This process resulted in 243 foodservice representative (director or supervisor) e-mail addresses and 120 superintendent e-mail addresses.

For restaurants, a sample was selected from the Iowa Restaurant Association 2009 membership list. The list contained a total of 598 restaurant names and addresses; 444 establishments were used for the study based on the type of operation; educational institutions and organizations listed as beneficiary institutions were not used.

All hotels from the 2009 AAA TourBook® Guide (AAA, 2009) were selected. The book contained a total of 397 lodging operations; for this study, 392 operations were used. The five bed and breakfast operations listed were not used due to the limited number of employees working at these small operations and therefore limited opportunities for workers with disabilities. A list of hotels was created including hotel name, manager’s name, address, and phone number. Phone calls were made to obtain general managers’ names as these were not available in the AAA TourBook® Guide.

Questionnaire Content

The questionnaire included five sections. At the beginning of the questionnaire, the purpose of the study and definition of terms (e.g., disability and social skills) were provided to ensure that all respondents understood the terms used throughout the questionnaire. Some of the questions included on the school questionnaire were slightly different to make it appropriate for that type of operation. For example, when asking about type of ownership, the hotels and restaurants questionnaire gave the options of “franchised,” “independently owned,” or “chain”; for schools, the options were “contracted” or “self-managed.”

The first section of the questionnaire contained questions related to current training topics, methods, and tools used at the operations and included a list of items where
respondents could choose “yes” or “no” based on the usage of the item. Topics and methods listed on the questionnaire were adapted from the training areas and delivery methods identified by Harris and Bonn (2000) and from information obtained from the managers’ and supervisors’ interviews.

The second section gathered information related to managers and supervisors’ attitudes and beliefs toward people with disabilities in the workplace. This section included 31 items answered on a Likert-type scale with corresponding descriptors (SA = strongly agree, A = agree, N = neutral, D = disagree, SD = strongly disagree). This section was adapted from a tested questionnaire developed by and used with permission of Geng-qing and Qu (2003; Appendix J). The third section contained 10 items to assess managers’/supervisors’ perceived knowledge about different disabilities and organizations and used the same Likert-type scale as used in the second section.

The fourth section included seven questions about the organization where the respondent worked (such as type of operation, the number of total employees, number of employees with disabilities, type of disability, acquisition of disability, and type of positions held by people with disabilities). The fifth section contained seven demographic questions about the respondent including gender, age, position in the organization, years having worked in the foodservice or lodging industry, years having worked at the current organization, and previous experience working with people with disabilities.

**Questionnaire Development**

The questionnaire was developed to determine managers’ and supervisors’ current human resources practices, such as training topics and methods used with employees with disabilities, as well as to determine their perceived knowledge and attitudes toward people with disabilities.

**Paper questionnaire.** The paper questionnaire was developed using Microsoft Office Word. The questionnaire was printed in a booklet format containing six pages. The cover letter was the first page. The second through the fifth pages included all questions related to training topics and training methods, attitudes and knowledge, and demographics. The last page was a self-addressed prepaid business reply label. Respondents were instructed after
completing the last section to fold the questionnaire, tape or staple the bottom, and drop it in the mail.

*Online questionnaire.* The online questionnaire was developed by the Office of Distance Education and Educational Technology at Iowa State University using SurveyGizmo software and saved as a URL. SurveyGizmo allows the questionnaire designer to customize the look of each page. A graphical bar indicated the progress of the respondent as he or she completed the questionnaire; this is recommended to help increase the response rate (Dillman, 2007). At the beginning of the questionnaire, the purpose of the study was explained. The definition of terms (e.g., disability and social skills) was provided at the top of each page to ensure that all respondents understood and remembered the terms used in the questionnaire.

SurveyGizmo also provided options for how respondents could answer each of the questions. For the first three sections of the questionnaire, respondents were restricted to only one answer per statement. For the fourth section of the questionnaire, respondents were allowed to choose only one answer on questions related to the operation’s type of management, total number of employees in the school district, number of employees with disabilities over their entire career, if they were currently working with employees with disabilities, and types of employees’ disabilities. If a respondent was not currently working with employees with disabilities, the questions about number of employees with each or both disability were not shown. Those respondents who reported no experience with employees with disabilities over their entire career were automatically moved to section five. Respondents were allowed to choose more than one answer to questions about acquisition of the disability and job positions employees with disabilities hold or have held. If they currently worked with employees with disabilities, respondents typed the number of employees with whom they worked who had either a physical or mental disability.

In the demographic section, respondents were allowed to choose only one answer on questions related to gender, age, ethnicity, current job position, time working in the foodservice industry, and time working for current organization. Respondents were able to choose more than one answer on the question asking about experience with people with disabilities.
Respondents were not able to go back to previous pages and change answers prior to completing the survey. Based on current recommendations (Dillman, 2007), respondents were not required to answer questions before proceeding to the following section of the questionnaire. To ensure the anonymity of the data collected from respondents, the Internet Protocol (IP) addresses were not linked to the responses.

**Pilot Study**

Five hospitality management and research methods educators reviewed the questionnaire. Revision suggestions were incorporated to improve format and content before conducting the pilot test. Fifteen revised questionnaires were sent to foodservice managers or people with foodservice management experience; their responses were not included in the sample. Ten paper questionnaires and five online questionnaires were distributed. The pilot test’s purpose was to seek comments on clarity of statements in the questionnaire and length of time needed to complete the questionnaire. An evaluation form was completed by the pilot test respondents (Appendix K and L). Changes in format and content were incorporated according to recommendations on the evaluation form. Most of the respondents reported the statements would apply but “depending on the job” or “depending on the disability” needed to be incorporated. The questions were rephrased in a more specific way. For example, one of the questions before the pilot test was: “I train/would train on different topics based on whether an employee has a disability.” After the pilot test, the question was written as: “I train/would train on different topics if a disabled employee has a specific disability,” and “I train/would train on different topics if a disabled employee has a specific job.”

**Questionnaire Distribution**

Two distribution methods were used: a paper questionnaire for restaurant and hotel managers and a web questionnaire for school foodservice authorities. The decision to use the different distribution methods was made considering availability of respondents’ physical and e-mail addresses and respondents’ access to the Internet. The questionnaire distribution protocol followed Dillman’s (2007) suggestions.

**Paper questionnaire.** For the mail questionnaire, a cover letter was sent with the questionnaire explaining the purpose of the study and its length. Business reply mail was used on the questionnaires to facilitate the return process. Consistent with recommendations
by Dillman (2007), after 1 week a follow-up card was sent to thank those who had responded
and to remind those who had not responded to complete the questionnaire (Appendix M).
Because the first questionnaire was sent close to winter holidays and the response rate was
low, a second copy of the questionnaire and a modified cover letter were sent 6 weeks after
the first contact (Appendix N). A total of two questionnaires and one post card reminder was
sent to hotel and restaurant managers. Questionnaires were color coded by industry and
distribution phase.

*Online questionnaire.* For the web questionnaire, an e-mail cover letter (Appendix O)
was sent containing a hyperlink to the web questionnaire. Respondents were directed to the
web questionnaire by clicking on the URL link. One week after initial contact, a follow-up
e-mail was sent to all school foodservice authorities to thank those who had responded and to
remind those who had not responded to complete the questionnaire (Dillman, 2007). A
second follow-up e-mail was sent after 6 weeks (Dillman, 2007). A total of two e-mail follow
ups with a link to the questionnaire were sent to schools.

*Data Analyses*
Questionnaires were coded and the data processed and analyzed using the Statistical Package
for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 18.0. Data coding and entry followed the procedures
recommended by Dillman (2007). Before conducting the analysis, frequencies for all
variables were evaluated to clean the data and correct miscoding. Descriptive statistics,
including frequencies, means, and standard deviations, were computed. Exploratory factor
analysis, principal axis factoring analysis with varimax rotation, was used to group the items
together. Because of the number of respondents, the three groups (hotels, restaurants, and
schools) were combined to run the factor analysis. To validate findings from the factor
analysis, correlations for each one of the factors in each sector, commercial (hotels and
restaurants) and noncommercial (school foodservices), were obtained. Then mean scores for
each of the factors for each sector were calculated by adding the items’ scores together and
dividing by the number of items. T tests and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used for
comparisons. Results provided information about the knowledge, attitudes, training topics,
methods used, training needs of people with disabilities, and types of disabilities found in the
hospitality organizations.
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Abstract

People with disabilities continue to be discriminated against. Training is an important human resource management function that can increase productivity in any organization. This study aimed to assess current training topics and methods used with employees with disabilities, as well as managers’ attitudes about people with disabilities, in hotels and restaurants in the United States. Interviews and questionnaires were used for data collection. This study provides information for hospitality industry managers about training methods and topics currently used. Managers’ age and years worked for the current organization had an effect on attitudes related to the importance of training people with disabilities. Ethnicity had an effect on attitudes related to teamwork.

Introduction

People with disabilities continue to be discriminated against even with the adoption of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA; U.S. Census Bureau, 2007). Training represents an opportunity for people with disabilities to improve their skills and performance. This human resource management function is important in any organization and could be a good tool to help incorporate people with disabilities into the workforce. Through training, employees with disabilities can learn necessary skills to perform their jobs and contribute to the success of organizations.

According to the 2000 U.S. census data, 17% of the U.S. population have disabilities; about 43 million Americans have one or more physical and/or mental disabilities. Of those who reported a disability and were between 16 and 64 years old, 21 million (11.9%) reported a condition that affected their ability to find a job or remain in one. (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007)

Some hospitality companies are looking for various ways to create a more diverse workforce. Diversity includes not only different cultures, races, and genders; people with
disabilities are part of this diversity concept. The employment of people with disabilities could be a viable alternative for managers to diversify their workforces. With the incorporation of the ADA in 1990 came a change in the way people with disabilities could participate in society and the workforce (Price, Gerber, & Mulligan, 2007). An ADA amendment in 2009 expanded the definition of disabilities. The expansion resulted in a definition that included new people who had not been classified before as having disabilities and provided even more opportunities for people with disabilities to get involved in society (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission [EEOC], 2008).

Research has indicated that, because hotels and restaurants often look for part-time employees, hospitality work schedules facilitate the incorporation of employees with disabilities, providing for an arrangement beneficial for employee and employer (Groschl, 2007). A number of employees with disabilities work late or rotating shifts; however day shift employees and most night shift employees with disabilities receive lower hourly wages than do employees without disabilities (Presser & Altman, 2002).

Human resources managers are challenged when defining and understanding disabilities (Groschl, 2007; Hignite, 2000). Besides the complexity of understanding disabilities, leaders of qualifying organizations (those with 15 or more employees, state and local governments, employment agencies, and labor unions) should consider the potential legal implications, potential lack of awareness, and potential limited understanding associated with hiring employees with disabilities as well as the communication challenges between employees with disabilities and employees without disabilities (Groschl; Hignite).

Given the recent changes in the ADA (EEOC, 2008), the purpose of this study was to assess current training methods and topics used in the hospitality industry as well as training methods and topics used with employees with disabilities in the United States. Managers’ and supervisors’ attitudes about people with disabilities in retail foodservices and lodging operations were assessed.

**Literature Review**

**The Americans with Disabilities Act**

Through the incorporation of the ADA (U.S. Department of Justice [USDJ], 1990) opportunities opened for people with disabilities in the United States to become more active
in society and a reduction in the discrimination of people with disabilities was expected. The ADA defines an individual with a disability as someone who:

- “has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities;
- has record of such an impairment; or
- is regarded as having such an impairment” ([USDJ], 1990, p.7)

Consistent with the recent ADA amendment, major life activities include walking, reading, bending, learning, thinking, and communicating (EEOC, 2008). Also, disabilities involving major bodily functions, such as brain, bladder, neurological, circulatory, and respiratory, are recognized in this definition. This three-part definition reflects general types of limitations experienced by people with disabilities. There is no known list of all conditions or diseases that are considered physical or mental impairments; given the variety of possible impairments, this would be difficult. The ADA, enforced by the U.S. EEOC, states that there should be no job discrimination by covered organizations (EEOC, 1991).

The ADA requires employers to provide reasonable accommodations to qualified individuals with disabilities, yet an exception is made when an accommodation would cause an employer undue hardship (EEOC, 2002). The ADA describes a reasonable accommodation as any change or adjustment to a job, the work environment, or the way things usually are done that would allow a person with disabilities to apply for a job, perform job functions, or enjoy equal access to benefits available to other individuals in the workplace. The United Kingdom also has disability laws. In the United Kingdom, the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 was promoted to reduce discrimination of people with disabilities and was extended in 2005 (Office of Public Sector Information, 1995, 2005).

Employment of People with Disabilities

The employment rate of people with disabilities remains low despite the adoption of the ADA (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003). In the United States, of the 43 million people classified as having disabilities, 56% are employed compared to 88% of people without disabilities (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007) The United Kingdom faces a similar situation: 1.3 million people with disabilities in the United Kingdom want to work. Of those who are of working age, only 50% are employed compared to 80% of those without disabilities (Office
of National Statistics, 2009). Schur (2002) found that less than 50% of working age people with disabilities in the United States were employed compared with 82% of working age people without disabilities. Employees with disabilities were more likely to work part time, and their hourly and annual incomes were less than that for people without disabilities. Employment was beneficial for people with disabilities by helping skill development, increasing income, decreasing social isolation, increasing life satisfaction, and increasing civic skills (Schur).

There is still a lot to be done to decrease the unemployment rate for persons with disabilities. Barriers to employment and advancement of people with disabilities have been identified; lack of related work experience was seen as the biggest barrier by both public and private sector employers (Bruyere, 2000). Other identified barriers were: lack of required skills/training; supervisor knowledge of accommodation; attitudes; and costs of accommodation, supervision, and training (Bruyere).

Organizations might unknowingly limit the hiring of people with disabilities because of several challenges they face in understanding definitions and legal implications of hiring them. An improvement in manager education and involvement in training processes, as well as enhanced communication between employees with and those without disabilities, might lead to hiring and better integration of this sector of the population (Groschl, 2007; Vilá, Pallisera, & Fullana, 2007). Additional training, need for retraining, more supervision, and additional costs for accommodations are concerns managers have when working with employees with disabilities. Researchers have also found that changes in work routines can affect performance of people with learning disabilities and having different supervisors can cause problems for people with learning disabilities, key issues in the hospitality industry (Geng-qing & Qu, 2003; Groschl, 2004; Ruggeri-Stevens & Goodwin, 2007; Stokes, 1990; Unger, 2002).

Despite the many challenges noted, researchers have identified benefits of hiring and working with people with disabilities, such as contagious excitement about the job (Ruggeri-Stevens & Goodwin, 2007). Some of the other reported benefits of hiring people with disabilities were: dedication, stability, loyalty, duty devotion, state and federal assistance, tax
Training and Disabilities

Training is a human resources practice that has been associated with increased productivity, employee motivation, and low turnover in organizations (Barrett & O’Connell, 2001; Bartel, 1994). Harris and Bonn (2000) identified hospitality industry training challenges associated with workforce diversity; therefore, different training methods and tools are needed in the hospitality industry. Researchers found that classroom style, on-the-job training, and manuals were commonly used. Textbooks, transparencies, and flip charts were most commonly used. Computers and video tapes were also used; teleconferencing and interactive multimedia were not used as often. Areas where inadequate employee training was provided were: service skills, customer relations, management skills, production, sanitation, computer skills, and communication (Harris & Bonn).

Employees with disabilities should have the same opportunities as those without disabilities. The U.S. Department of Labor (2000) makes it clear that training opportunities should be available for people with disabilities. These employees are similar to other employees and like supervision, enjoy challenges, and want to grow within the organization. Finding training methods that are effective with employees with disabilities is important to increase involvement and development in the organization and to ensure continuity and a productive workforce. Effective training for people with disabilities might include hands-on training, periodic follow ups, specific training for the job and workplace, and virtual training (Brooks, Rose, Attree, & Elliot-Square, 2002; Hignite, 2000; Stokes, 1990; Vilá et al., 2007).

Attitudes Toward People with Disabilities

People have isolated individuals with disabilities and, as mentioned before, despite efforts and legislation, forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious problem. Areas where discrimination is still a problem are: employment, housing, public accommodations, education, transportation, communication, recreation, institutionalization, health services, voting, and access to public services (EEOC, 2004). Characteristics identified in the literature that may affect individuals’ attitudes toward people
with disabilities were: previous experience with workers with disabilities, employer or applicant having a disability, interaction frequency, and gender (Perry, Ivy, Conner, & Shelar, 2008; Unger, 2002). Employers who had worked in the past with people with disabilities had positive attitudes and were more willing to hire and integrate them into the workforce (Daruwalla & Darcy, 2005; Geng-qing & Qu, 2003; Gilbride, Stensrud, Vandergoot, & Golden, 2003; Unger). Some researchers found that, in addition to previous experience with people with disabilities, interaction frequency was also an influential attitudinal factor (Perry et al.). Some researchers found significant differences between attitude scores by gender; females scored higher as compared to males (Hunt & Hunt, 2004; Perry et al.).

Research suggested managers and employees would benefit from incorporating disability training into existing programs. Through educational intervention, knowledge, and attitudes toward people with disabilities might significantly improve (Daruwalla & Darcy, 2005; Hunt & Hunt, 2004). Therefore, the objectives of this study were to: (a) determine training topics and methods used in U. S. restaurants and hotels, (b) assess managers’ attitudes toward people with disabilities, and (c) assess current training topics and methods used by U.S. hospitality employers for employees with disabilities.

**Methodology**

A combination of qualitative and quantitative methods was used to collect data, analyze data, and better understand the topic (Creswell & Plano, 2007). First, a select group of hospitality managers and supervisors were interviewed; then a larger sample completed a questionnaire. The appropriate University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved the research proposal.

**Interviews**

Sample. A purposeful sample of restaurant and lodging managers and supervisors from small and large operations in one U.S. Midwestern state was used. Equal numbers of participants were selected from each type of operation: three from restaurants and three from hotels. Participants were contacted by phone, e-mail, and/or on site. Ten managers were contacted and six interviews were conducted.
**Instrument.** An interview guide with 10 open-ended questions was developed and reviewed by five experts. A semistructured format was followed such that the interviewer asked preplanned questions and added follow-up questions to allow for a natural flow. Questions were related to the operations’ training topics and methods used for all employees and participants’ current use of or willingness to use different training topics and training methods for employees with disabilities. Participants were encouraged to supplement responses and add additional comments. Demographics of participants, including age, gender, years working in the industry and for the current organization, and previous experience working with people with disabilities, were obtained. The interviewer had previous experience in qualitative data collection both in group and individual interview situations. The goal of the interview part was to deeply explore the respondents’ perceptions related to training methods in their organizations (Seidman, 1998).

**Data analysis.** Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed to facilitate data analysis. Transcripts were analyzed manually by two researchers to look for emerging themes. Emerging themes were grouped into categories and labeled consistent with the quotations included in each category; additional analysis and data display were done using Atlas ti. (a qualitative software program). Observations and interview data provided for cross examination and thus increased trustworthiness of the qualitative results (Creswell, 1998).

**Questionnaires**

**Sample.** The target population for this part of the study was managers of restaurants or hotels in a U.S. Midwestern state. A total of 836 operations (444 restaurants and 392 hotels) were sampled out of a total possible number of 5,500 as indicated by the Iowa Lodging Association (2009) website and the Iowa Restaurant Association website (2009). Restaurants were selected from the State Restaurant Association 2009 membership list. All hotels from the 2009 AAA TourBook® Guide (AAA, 2009) were selected. The tourbook listed a total of 397 lodging operations located in this Midwestern state; for this study, 392 operations were used. The five bed and breakfast operations listed were not included due to the limited number of employees working at these small operations and therefore limited opportunities for workers with disabilities.
**Instrument.** A paper questionnaire was developed and pilot tested with educators and foodservice managers ($N = 15$) for content and format. After the pilot test, the revised questionnaire was mailed with a self-addressed prepaid business reply label to the operations departments of the 836 hotels and restaurants. Following Dillman’s (2007) recommendations, after 1 week a follow-up card was sent. A second questionnaire was sent 6 weeks after the first contact.

The questionnaire included five sections. The first section contained questions related to current training topics, methods, and tools used by the operations. Topics and methods listed on the questionnaire were adapted from the training areas and delivery methods identified by Harris and Bonn (2000) and information obtained from the managers/supervisors’ interviews. The second and third sections gathered information related to managers/supervisors’ attitudes and beliefs toward people with disabilities in the workplace. Questions in these sections included a Likert-type scale and corresponding descriptors for respondents to use for their answers ($SA = strongly agree$, $A = agree$, $N = neutral$, $D = disagree$, $SD = strongly disagree$). The attitudes section was adapted, with permission, from the questionnaire developed by Geng-qing & Qu (2003). The fourth section included questions about the organization such as type of operation, the number of total employees, number of employees with disabilities, type of disability, acquisition of disability, and type of positions held by people with disabilities. The fifth section contained demographic questions about the respondent.

**Analysis.** Questionnaires were coded and the data processed and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 18.0. Data coding and entry followed the procedures recommended by Dillman (2007). Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, means, and standard deviations, were computed. Exploratory factor analysis, principal axis factoring analysis with varimax rotation, was used to group the items. Because of the limited number of respondents, three groups who had completed the questionnaire (managers/supervisors at hotels, restaurants, and school foodservice) were combined to run the factor analysis; for this manuscript, results from school managers/supervisors will not be included. To validate findings from the factor analysis, correlations for each one of the factors in each group (hotels and restaurants) were obtained; significant correlations were an
indicator that data from both sectors could be combined. Then, mean scores for each of the factors were calculated by summing the items’ means within each factor. Independent sample $t$ test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used for comparisons.

Results and Discussion

Respondents’ Profile

For the six interviews, equal numbers of participants were male and female; half of them were under the age of 35 years and all reported having some type of experience with people with disabilities (Table 1). For the questionnaire, a majority of the respondents was female (60%) and most were Caucasian (90%). The majority of respondents (56%) had worked over 15 years for the hospitality industry, and 41% ($n = 51$) had worked 5 or fewer years for the current organization. Respondents’ answers showed most of them (87%) had some type of experience with people with disabilities. Almost half of respondents (48%) were currently working with employees with disabilities. The positions most commonly reported to be held by employees with disabilities were housekeeping (44%), dishwasher (33%), and kitchen helper (26%); Geng-qing and Qu (2003) reported that 60% of their respondents had hired persons with disabilities as kitchen helpers.

Of the 836 questionnaires sent to hotel and restaurant managers in a Midwestern state of the United States, 124 were returned for a response rate of 15%. A similar response rate (14%) was achieved by Geng-qing and Qu (2003) in their study of foodservice operations; Ravichandran and Arendt (2008) reported response rates in hospitality lodging research ranged from 11% to 93%. Of the 124 returned and analyzed questionnaires, 63 (51%) were from restaurant managers and 61 (49%) from hotel managers. Respondents identified ownership type: 70% ($n = 87$) of operations were independently owned, 32% ($n = 40$) were part of a franchise, and 16% ($n = 20$) part of a chain; some respondents selected more than one option.

Training Methods and Topics

Interview participants and questionnaire respondents were asked about the training methods and topics most commonly used in their operations for all employees. Training methods, topics, and tools reported to be used by hotel and restaurant managers are presented in Table 2. The three training methods most commonly reported by the managers were on-
the-job training (97%), demonstrations (76%), and self-guided (56%). Similarly, Harris and Bonn (2000) found on-the-job training to be one of the training methods most commonly used in the foodservice industry. It has also been reported in the literature that hands-on is an effective method for training people with disabilities (Brooks et al., 2002; Hignite, 2000; Vilá et al., 2007). During the interview portion of this study, congruent data emerged about on-the-job or hands-on as a useful training method, as illustrated by the following comments (names have been changed throughout to protect the identity of respondents):

That’s pretty common in all the departments—the one-on-one training, where they’re teamed up with another individual to be able to explain to them how to do the job, whether it’s housekeeping, or maintenance, or in the kitchen, serving (hotel manager, Kathy);

Hands-on training. I think hands-on training is the best. I want to show them personally how it’s done, how I would do it. . . . You know, the right way to do things. I think it’s easier for people to learn sometimes when they see it, hands-on, than to read it and then go do it (restaurant manager, Ana); and

So “hands-on” training in both of those areas might be the operator connected to listening in on the headset while another operator is actually doing the call and doing the talking (hotel manager, Mel).

In contrast to what has been found in past research (Harris & Bonn, 2000), questionnaire respondents indicated most identified training topics were covered. The training topics that were reported to be used by most of the respondents were: customer service (93%), cleaning procedures (93%), equipment usage/cleaning (88%), knowledge of product (87%), communication skills (85%), employee relations (80%), and chemical use (80%). The information obtained from the questionnaire participants was supported by interview data. Participants voiced customer service, chemical use, and product knowledge as training topics used at their operations: “Same thing in housekeeping, there’s a few more proper procedural training for safety-wise—chemicals—you see that more in the kitchen and housekeeping and banquets where there’s probably more heavy lifting” (hotel manager, Mel); “They’re trained on fries, they could be trained on working with customers, how to have good customer service, trained on the lobby, trained on our ice cream machine—how to
assemble sandwiches‖ (restaurant manager, Mike); “There’s your basic front desk training, and then there’s customer relationship management, which is about our Hotel Honors program, you have to train on that. There is reservation training” (hotel supervisor, Rob); “Obviously, the menu, safety and sanitation (also), dining room employees are responsible for service of alcohol” (restaurant manager, Joe).

The training tools used most commonly and reported by hotel and restaurant managers were text and manuals (64%), followed by programs/simulations, audio-video tapes, DVDs, and CDs (46%). Podcasts/vodcasts were used rarely (7%). Considering the age range of the interview participants, different results regarding the use of technology might be found with younger managers. Harris and Bonn (2000) found similar results related to the limited use of technology. Some interview participants reported using the computer for training, as illustrated by the following comments: “[The hotel] has their own training software, so we get them signed onto the system, get them a log-in and a password, and then we start them in on the training. Basically you start out with the training software on the computer” (hotel manager, Rob); “So we have computer training, we have paper training, we have job shadowing” (restaurant manager, Ana); “The only one that would use the computer extensively (as part of training) is the front desk, because they have to use the computer extensively to check someone in” (hotel manager, Kathy); “We have electronic media, now, our training program, as far as our tests and quizzes and videos are all done on the laptop” (restaurant manager, Joe).

Attitudes Toward People with Disabilities

In general, managers had neutral perceptions of employees with disabilities with an overall mean rating of 3.26 (scale 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree) on 22 attitudinal statements. For most of the individual statements, managers reported a neutral perception toward employees with disabilities (mean ratings between 3.10 and 3.50; Table 3). Providing training on communication, technical, and social skills to employees with disabilities was perceived as important (M = 4.17, M = 3.85, and M = 3.80; respectively). Managers perceived it was costly to give additional training to employees with disabilities and slightly agreed that different training methods would need to be used to train employees with disabilities (M = 3.67 and M = 3.53, respectively).
attention needed from supervisor was one of the statements with the lowest mean \((M = 2.85)\), suggesting managers were in slight disagreement that workers with disabilities needed more attention, contrary to Geng-qing and Qu’s (2003) findings in which restaurant managers reported employees with disabilities needed closer supervision and special attention from coworkers.

Factor analysis was conducted; Bartlett’s test of sphericity was used to test for intercorrelation and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was used to make sure the factor analysis was appropriate for the data analysis. The chi square was significant at .000, indicating that the empirical correlation matrix was statistically different from the identity matrix. The KMO value was 0.765; being greater than 0.5 indicated factor analysis was suitable for the data (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991).

Four factors with loadings higher than 0.400, representing 44.5% of the explained variance, were extracted (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). Eight statements were discarded due to low loadings or high loadings on more than one factor. Correlations were calculated to ensure there was a significant correlation between the statements within each factor (Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7). Correlations between all statements for Factor 1, 2, and 4 were significant \((p \leq .001)\). One statement was discarded from Factor 3 because there was no significant correlation with one or more of the other variables within that factor. The factors were named based on the statements included in each of them.

Factor 1, “Teamwork and Costs,” is constituted of 11 statements related to employees with disability working as part of a team. Two of the statements were related to special attention required by employees with disabilities from their coworkers or supervisors, three were related to the way employees with disabilities relate to other employees, two were associated with difficulty of training employees with disabilities depending on the job or disability, and four were related to the increased cost of training employees with disabilities. An example of an illustrative comment made during the interviews associated with Factor 1 is: “It’s all about helping each other—that’s what we focus on, teamwork” (restaurant manager, Mike).

Factor 2, “Training,” included four statements associated with training employees with disabilities. Three items asked about whether the managers used/would use different
training methods, topics, or tools for employees with disabilities as compared to those used for employees without disabilities. One statement was related to whether the manager believed that employees with disabilities should be trained differently than employees without disabilities. Some illustrative comments managers made during the interviews were related to training employees with disabilities in their organizations: “You have to be very specific about what you want them to do. So, we do change our training methods for someone with disabilities, but I think we adjust all of our training to an individual” (hotel manager, Kathy); “In that case, you are tailoring it towards that employee. Be a lot more one-on-one” (restaurant manager, Joe); “I don’t think we’re going to leave out any topics, because they still have to be able to do all the functions of the job, like anybody else” (hotel manager, Mel).

Factor 3, named “Characteristics,” included four statements. Statements in this factor reflected some of the positives and negative characteristics of people with disabilities, for example, dependency, loyalty to organization, tardiness for work, and better cooperation from employees with disabilities. Interview participants commented on some of the positive characteristics of employees with disabilities: “Probably care more than most people do to get the job done correctly” (hotel manager, Mel); “I think they’re great workers, and I think more employers should give them opportunities” (restaurant manager, Ana); “They usually show up for work every day . . . attendance is very good” (hotel manager, Rob).

Factor 4, labeled “Skills,” consists of three statements. This factor reflects managers’ perceptions of the importance of providing training on communication, technical, and social skills for employees with disabilities. Relating to skills of employees with disabilities, one interview participant commented on the importance of knowing the required skills: “They’ve got to be able to have all the same customer service skills and all the same technical skills for what we hired them, like their cohorts” (hotel manager, Mel).

**Attitudes Mean Scores and Demographic Characteristics**

Mean scores were computed for each of the four attitudinal factors (Table 3). Reliability estimates for the mean scores ranged from .72 to .92. The mean score for Factor 4, Skills, was the highest of the four factors. Harris and Bonn (2000), in their study with foodservice operations, found that training for communication, technical, and social skills
was something in which organizations needed to improve. Bruyere (2000) reported that one of the barriers for employment and advancement of people with disabilities was the lack of skills. No statistically significant difference was found for mean scores of the four factors and experience with people with disabilities. Past research has found significant relationships between prior experiences with people with disabilities and respondents’ attitudes (Daruwalla & Darcy, 2005; Geng-qing & Qu, 2003; Gilbride et al., 2003; Unger, 2002).

No statistically significant differences were found for the mean scores of the four factors based on gender, years working in the hospitality industry, current position, sector of the industry, or current experience with employees with disabilities. Geng-qing and Qu (2003) did not find significant differences between attitudes and gender; however they did find significant differences between attitudes and current job position (owner, manager, and supervisor). In their studies, Hunt and Hunt (2004) and Perry et al. (2008) found significant differences between gender and attitudes.

Statistically significant differences (p ≤ .001) were found between mean scores for Factor 1, Teamwork and Costs, and ethnicity of participants (Caucasian or other ethnicity groups); Caucasians had a mean score of 3.23 (scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree), and the non-Caucasion group had a mean score of 2.58. A statistically significance difference (p ≤ .05) was found between mean scores for Factor 4, Skills, and participant’s age and number of years working for the current organization. Qeng-qing and Qu (2003) and Perry et al. (2008) found no significant differences between overall attitudes toward people with disabilities and age in their studies.

**Accommodations**

Hotel and restaurant managers agreed that they made or would make accommodations in their operations for people with disabilities. The reported mean was 3.93 (scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree). During the interviews participants agreed that their operations provided accommodations for employees with disabilities, as illustrated by the following quotes:

We have a very short person who works in the kitchen, and so we provide a stool so that she can reach the counters. Sometimes it can be something as simple as that,
and sometimes it would need to be a little more extensive to provide the accommodations for that particular individual (hotel manager, Kathy);

We usually accommodate them. . . . We like to work with people, and that’s the majority of our business; we’re a “people” business and not a burger business. And we’re here to help people, as well as serve people (restaurant manager, Mike); and There’s always a job. You can always put somebody to work in a certain situation. No matter what their handicap, you can easily find something for them to work. Find some type of work for them to do. You have to cater to their needs, is the way I see it. Depending on what they’re able to do and their motivation (hotel manager, Rob)

Conclusions

Preparing people with disabilities for continued employment is an important task. This study examined training methods and topics used in restaurants and hotels for all employees and for employees with disabilities. It also provided information about managers’ and supervisors’ attitudes toward people with disabilities. This work presented information about potential professional development needs of current managers and supervisors, such as increasing their knowledge about disabilities, to better incorporate people with disabilities into their organizations. Responses to the questionnaire were confirmed by interview participants’ points of view related to employees with disabilities. Results indicated that many training methods, topics, and tools were used by foodservice and lodging operations. The most used training methods reported by respondents were on-the-job training, demonstrations, and self-guided training. Past research (Harris & Bonn, 2000) reported a need to improve training in areas such as customer service, cleaning, employee relations, communication skills, and chemical use. Managers in this study reported most of their operations were training their employees on those topics, using tools such as text and manuals and programs, simulations, audio and/or video tapes, DVDs, and CDs. Newer technologies are starting to be used for training, however some operations might not have the necessary equipment to take advantage of this technology.

Individuals with disabilities may have difficulty learning and performing employment skills without support or guidance from their supervisors, coworkers, or coaches. Employers
want people who have communication, social, and technical skills. Respondents agreed that providing training for those skills for employees with disabilities was important for their operations; the factor with the highest mean score was the one that included items related to the importance of communication, social, and technical skills. This is something to consider as past research (Bruyere, 2000) reported these might represent barriers for employing people with disabilities. Training people with disabilities on communication, social, and technical skills might be an important consideration for managers.

The study supported previous research (Geng-qing & Qu, 2003) regarding the relationship between employers’ attitudes and demographic characteristics. Age and years working for the current organization had a positive effect on attitudes about the importance of providing skills for employees with disabilities. Also, a relationship was found between being Caucasian and attitudes toward people with disabilities working as part of a team. However, no effect on employers’ attitudes was found for gender, years working in the hospitality industry, job position, sector of the industry, or current experience with employees with disabilities. Other studies have shown relationships between gender and attitudes toward people with disabilities (Hunt & Hunt, 2004; Perry et al., 2008). Previous research has highlighted the positive effect of past experience on attitudes toward people with disabilities and how this affected employers’ willingness to hire people with disabilities; in contrast this study did not find that experience with employees with disabilities had an effect on employers’ attitudes.

Accommodations should be considered when hiring people with disabilities. The ADA states that an employer should provide reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities. Respondents to the questionnaire and those interviewed agreed that they had provided or would provide reasonable accommodations for employees with disabilities if it were necessary. Managers are sometimes concerned about the cost associated with accommodations (Geng-qing & Qu, 2003) and might look for a new way of organizing the duties or the space to accommodate an employee with disabilities.

There are training and working challenges associated with employing people with disabilities. This study found hotel and restaurant managers in this one state had a neutral to positive attitude toward training and working with people with disabilities. It is important to
consider not only challenges but associated benefits (for example, loyalty) of working with people with disabilities. Employees with disabilities might need closer supervision but possibly would do a good job because they really want to do the job; as one of the interview participants concluded, “You can have all the functionality to do a job and be just darn lazy. You can get a person that’s maybe a little functional and they could be your best worker because they have a better drive and desire to do it.”

**Limitations and Future Research**

There are several limitations that should be recognized in this study. The study had a low response rate; reasons for this low response rate are unknown but not uncommon and it has been reported that nonresponse may not always generate bias (Groves, 2006). The first questionnaire was sent during the second week of November which may have impacted the response rate because of the holidays during the end of the year. Another potential limitation is that socially desirable responses might have been reported due to the sensitive nature of this topic. Questions to measure socially desirable responses were pilot tested during interviews and respondents voiced concerns about including those on the questionnaire.

This research provided baseline information about training methods, topics, and tools used with employees with disabilities in the hospitality industry after the adoption of the amendment to the ADA in 2009. Managers’ attitudes toward employees with disabilities were also measured and assessed. Future researchers should study training methods and topics needs for specific types of disabilities in the industry in order to customize training for those with disabilities. This information could expand the knowledge about what is needed based on the specific disability, which might allow development of training methods oriented toward people with disabilities. Future research should be conducted with hospitality lodging and foodservice operations from other states. In addition, future research should identify managers’ perceived benefits and challenges of hiring people with disabilities in the hospitality industry.
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Table 4.1. Demographic Characteristics of Hotel and Restaurant Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Questionnaire (N=124)</th>
<th>Interviews (N=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency (n)</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-35 years old</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45 years old</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55 years old</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55 years old</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager or Supervisor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Working for Hospitality Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤1-5 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 15 years</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Working with Current Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤1-5 years</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 15 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with Disabled People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Ethnicity was not obtained for interview participants*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Methods, Topics, and Tools</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-the-job Training</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrations</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-guided</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Plays</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Style/Lecture</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning Procedures</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Usage/Cleaning</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Product</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Relations</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Use</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Safety</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling of Food</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Preparation</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Service</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text and Manuals</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-video Tapes, DVDs, CDs</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Programs and Simulations</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparencies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podcasts/Vodcasts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aPercent is more than 100 as respondents chose all answers that applied.*
Table 4.3: Hotel and Restaurant Managers Mean Ratings for Factors and Attitudinal Statements about People with Disabilities (N=123)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Attitudinal Statements</th>
<th>Mean (^a)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Alpha(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teamwork and costs</strong></td>
<td>I feel it is too costly to give additional training to EWD. (^c,d)</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EWD make other employees uncomfortable. (^c,d)</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EWD increase operational costs. (^c,d)</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisors find/would find it hard to get disabled employees to adopt new ways of doing the job. (^c)</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EWD need special attention from coworkers. (^c,d)</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depending on the job, it costs/would cost me more to train EWD. (^c,d)</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depending on the job, EWD are harder to train than EWOD. (^c,d)</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EWD work slower than EWOD. (^b,c)</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depending on the disability, it costs/would cost me more to train EWD. (^c,d)</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depending on the disability, EWD are harder to train than EWOD. (^c,d)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Even after training, EWD need special attention from supervisors. (^c,d)</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td>I use/would use different training methods for EWD. (^d)</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I do not believe disabled employees need to be trained differently than EWOD. (^c,d)</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I train/would train all employees using the same methods whether they are disabled or not. (^c)</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I use/would use the same training tools for EWD as those without disabilities. (^c,d)</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics</strong></td>
<td>I feel EWD are more dependable than EWOD. (^d)</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EWD are absent less often than EWOD. (^d)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I believe that generally, EWD cooperate better than EWOD. (^d)</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EWD are more loyal to the organization than EWOD. (^d)</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills</strong></td>
<td>Providing training on communication skills for EWD is important. (^d)</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing training on technical skills for EWD is important. (^d)</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing training on social skills for EWD is important. (^d)</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Mean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Scale for statements: 1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neutral; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree.
\(^b\) Coefficient alpha reliability estimates
\(^c\) These statements were reversely coded: 1=strongly agree; 2=agree; 3=neutral; 4=disagree; 5=strongly disagree
\(^d\) EWD=employees with disabilities and EWOD=employees without disabilities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. EWD work slower than EWOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Even after training, EWD need special attention from supervisors. a</td>
<td>.473**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel it is too costly to give additional training to EWD. a</td>
<td>.408** .363**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Depending on the job, EWD harder to train than EWOD a</td>
<td>.471** .559** .424**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Depending on the disability, EWD harder to train than EWOD a</td>
<td>.464** .465** .417** .743**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EWD need special attention from coworkers a</td>
<td>.555** .519** .412** .527** .519**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supervisors find/would find it hard to get EWD to adopt new ways of doing the job a</td>
<td>.473** .545** .373** .536** .438** .666**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. EWD make other employees uncomfortable a</td>
<td>.299** .307** .374** .411** .350** .483** .439**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. EWD increase operational costs a</td>
<td>.547** .385** .606** .500** .493** .588** .461** .607**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Depending on the job, it costs/would cost me more to train EWD a</td>
<td>.441** .400** .466** .629** .546** .538** .459** .498** .498** .670**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Depending on the disability, it costs/would cost me more to train EWD a</td>
<td>.442** .399** .484** .550** .582** .463** .373** .438** .643** .891**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aEWD=employees with disabilities and EWOD=employees without disabilities

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level
### Table 4.5. Correlations between Statements for Factor 2: Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I train/would train all employees using the same methods whether they are disabled or not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I use/would use the same training tools for EWD as those without disabilities&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.498**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I do not believe disabled employees need to be trained differently than EWOD&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.476**</td>
<td>.263**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I use/would use different training methods for EWD&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.454**</td>
<td>.364**</td>
<td>.333**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>EWD=employees with disabilities and EWOD=employees without disabilities

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

### Table 4.6. Correlations between Statements for Factor 3: Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel EWD are more dependable than EWOD&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. EWD are absent less often than EWOD&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.632**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I believe that generally, EWD cooperate better than EWOD&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.428**</td>
<td>.463**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. EWD are more loyal to the organization than EWOD&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>.235**</td>
<td>.302**</td>
<td>.432**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. EWD produce higher quality work than EWOD&lt;sup&gt;a,b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.391**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>EWD=employees with disabilities and EWOD=employees without disabilities

<sup>b</sup>The shaded statement was deleted because of no significant correlation with one or more other statements

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

### Table 4.7. Correlations between Statements for Factor 4: Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Providing training on technical skills for EWD is important&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Providing training on social skills for EWD is important&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>.383**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Providing training on communication skills for EWD is important&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>.353**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>EWD=employees with disabilities and EWOD=employees without disabilities

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level
CHAPTER 5. TRAINING: AN OPPORTUNITY FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES IN SCHOOL FOODSERVICE OPERATIONS
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Abstract

Purpose/Objective: This study assessed current training methods and topics used at public school foodservice operations as well as school foodservice representatives’ attitudes toward training employees with disabilities.

Methods: Three experienced school foodservice directors were interviewed and then an online questionnaire was developed using SurveyGizmo. The questionnaire was sent to all school foodservice representatives in Iowa. Interview transcripts were analyzed manually and with Atlas ti. Questionnaire responses were analyzed using the SPSS. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, means, and standard deviations, were computed.

Results: A total of 363 questionnaires were mailed to school foodservice representatives, and 77 completed questionnaires were received, resulting in a response rate of 22%. The most common employee training methods used were on-the-job, demonstrations, classroom style/lecture, and self-guided. Training tools commonly used were text and manuals and audio/video tapes, DVDs, and CDs. Training topics most commonly reported were food safety, cleaning procedures, equipment usage/cleaning, handling of food, and food preparation. Respondents agreed that different training methods needed to be used for employees with disabilities. Providing training for employees with disabilities on technical, communication, and social skills was reported to be important ($M = 4.00, M = 3.89, M = 3.79$, respectively) on a Likert-type scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Applications to child nutrition professionals: To assure compliance with the updates to the ADA that went into effect January 8, 2009, it is imperative that child nutrition professionals look for appropriate ways to integrate people with disabilities in their operations. This study provided information about school foodservice representatives’ attitudes about training methods used with and overall attitudes toward employees with disabilities. Foodservice directors may need to use different training methods with employees with disabilities in order to provide more opportunities for them to succeed at their jobs. School foodservice
School foodservice authorities are responsible for meeting nutritional standards of those school-aged children who participate in child nutrition programs. With changes that are occurring, school foodservices are experiencing new trends and need to be prepared to satisfy customers’ desires. Influential factors for those changes are the economy, technology, workers demographics, and nutrition awareness (DeMicco, Cetron, & Williams, 2000). The adoption of the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the 2008 amendment provided new opportunities for people with disabilities to get involved in society (Price, Gerber, & Mulligan, 2007; U.S. Department of Justice [USDJ], 1990; U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission [EEOC], 2008).

According to 2000 U.S. census data, about 43 million Americans have one or more physical and/or mental disabilities, which represent 17% of the U.S. population. Of those who reported having a disability and being 16 years or older, 21 million (11.9%) reported a condition that affected their ability to find a job or remain in one (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007). In Iowa, of the total civilian noninstitutionalized population 16 years of age and older, 15% (415,074) had some kind of disability and 6.3% reported that a disability made it difficult to find a job (State Data Center of Iowa, 2006). As this sector of the population keeps expanding, organizations may need to make accommodations to employ and train people with disabilities (EEOC, 2004).

The EEOC refers to someone with a disability as “anyone with a physical or mental impairment substantially limiting one or more major life activities; has a record of such impairment; or is regarded as having such impairment” (EEOC, 1991, p. 2). The ADA, enforced by the EEOC, states that no job discrimination should occur by covered organizations (private employers with 15 or more employees, state and local governments, employment agencies, and labor unions; EEOC, 1991). Public schools are included under the ADA and, therefore, must comply.

The foodservice industry represents a good employment opportunity for people with disabilities because it offers entry level jobs where unskilled workers can be employed.
(Mulvihill, Repetto, Andrews, & Gritz, 2008). Training is an important component of any operation because it helps employees learn the necessary skills to perform the job. School foodservice directors identified staff development and training as one of their principal job duties (DeMicco, Palakurthi, Sammons, & Williams, 1994). Several researchers have identified the training needs and preferred delivery methods of school foodservice directors, managers, and/or supervisors, but no research was found about training methods and topics used with school foodservice employees (DeMicco et al., 1994; Kendrick, & Gangadharan, 2001; Sneed, 1992; Sullivan, Harper, & West, 2001, 2002).

Training of school foodservice directors or managers is focused around competencies in 10 functional areas and knowledge and skills identified by Carter and Carr (2007): facilities and equipment management; financial management; food production and operation management; food security, sanitation, and safety; human resource management; marketing and communication; menu and nutrition management; procurement and inventory management; program management; and technology and information systems. Demonstrations, on-the-job, and conferences have been identified as preferred training methods (Kendrick & Gangadharan, 2001; Sullivan et al., 2001, 2002). Harris and Bonn (2000) found similar results in their study with foodservice operations. Researchers found hands-on, periodic follow-up, and specific training to the job and workplace could be used when training people with disabilities (Brooks, Rose, Attree, & Elliot-Square, 2002; Hignite, 2000; Stokes, 1990; Vilá, Pallisera, & Fullana, 2007).

Challenges with incorporating people with disabilities into the workplace were identified as: difficulty in defining and understanding disabilities, costs, extra training, amount of supervision, changes in work routine, lack of necessary skills, and need for accommodation (Bruyere, 2000; Geng-qing & Qu, 2003; Ruggeri-Stevens & Goodwin, 2007; Stokes, 1990; Unger, 2002). Researchers have also recognized advantages or benefits of working with employees with disabilities, which included good performance, more corporate social responsibility, low turnover and better retention, better attendance, more loyalty, and stronger dedication (Geng-qing & Qu; Marcouiller, Smith, & Bordieri, 1987; Ruggeri-Stevens & Goodwin,; Stokes; Unger). The purpose of this study was to assess current
training methods and topics used in school foodservice operations as well as school foodservice authorities’ attitudes toward training employees with disabilities.

Methodology

For this study, a mixed method approach was used to collect and analyze the data, allowing for a deeper understanding of the topic (Creswell & Plano, 2007). School foodservice directors were interviewed, and an online questionnaire was sent to school foodservice representatives. A Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved the research study prior to data collection.

Interviews

Sample. A purposeful sample of public school foodservice directors from one Midwestern state in the United States was used. Eight school foodservice directors were contacted; three interviews were conducted.

Questions. A semistructured interview format was followed and at least 10 open-ended questions were asked during the interviews. Questions related to the definition of disability, types of disabilities, training methods and topics used for all employees, and current use of or willingness to use different training methods and topics for employees with disabilities. Demographic information was also collected.

Analysis. Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed. The interviews lasted approximately 30 minutes each. Transcripts were analyzed manually by two researchers to look for emerging themes; themes were then grouped into categories. Additional analysis was done using Atlas ti, a qualitative software package. Observations and interview data provided for cross examination and increased trustworthiness of results (Creswell, 1998).

Questionnaires

Sample. All schools districts listed on the State Public District Directory of the Department of Education (2009) were used for this study. The directory contained a total of 363 school superintendents’ names and e-mail addresses. Each school’s website was then visited to obtain the e-mail address of the school foodservice representative. If this information was available, the e-mail address of the foodservice director or supervisor was used for mailing purposes; if not, the superintendent’s e-mail address was used. Superintendents were asked to complete the questionnaire if they were responsible for
training foodservice employees or to forward the questionnaire to the person responsible for training foodservice employees. Foodservice directors who participated in the interviews received a questionnaire.

**Instrument.** An online questionnaire was developed and pilot tested for content and format with educators and foodservice managers (N = 15). The questionnaire was developed using SurveyGizmo. An e-mail cover letter was sent to the potential respondents with a hyperlink directing him/her to the questionnaire. Follow-up procedures were consistent with those recommended by Dillman (2007).

The questionnaire had 31 statements, 16 of which were reversed coded as recommended by Dillman (2007). The questionnaire comprised five sections. The first section contained questions related to current operation training topics, methods, and tools. Questions were adapted from Harris and Bonn (2000) and also developed based on interview data. The second and third sections asked about foodservice directors’ attitudes and beliefs toward people with disabilities. Questions were adapted from Geng-qing and Qu (2003) and based on interview data. A Likert-type scale and corresponding descriptors (SA = strongly agree, A = agree, N = neutral, D = disagree, SD = strongly disagree) were used. The last sections included demographic questions about the organization and respondent.

**Analysis.** Questionnaires were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 18.0. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, means, and standard deviations, were computed.

**Results and Discussion**

**Respondents’ Profile**

A total of 363 e-mails with a link to the web-based questionnaire were sent to all public school foodservice representatives in a Midwestern state of the United States. A response rate of 22% was achieved with 77 questionnaires completed; other studies with foodservice directors have reported response rates of 30% and 34% (Sullivan et al., 2001, 2002, respectively). Even though the response rate was lower, it has been reported that nonresponse may not always generate bias (Groves, 2006). This response rate might have been affected by the lack of equipment in some school districts and/or foodservice representatives’ ages, their computer skills, and their comfort level with technology. Twenty-
two of the 363 questionnaires were undeliverable because of the Internet security systems in schools; paper questionnaires were mailed to these foodservice representatives.

The majority of respondents were foodservice directors/managers (89%), female (77%), Caucasian (55%), and over 46 years old (71%). More than one third (38%) of the respondents had worked more than 25 years for the foodservice industry (Table 1). Similar demographic characteristics have been reported in studies with school foodservice directors as the sample (Hanna, 2008; Kendrick & Gangadharan, 2001; Sullivan et al., 2001). Almost all of the questionnaire respondents (89%) reported some type of experience with people having disabilities. Over one third of the respondents (38%) were currently working with employees with disabilities. Positions commonly held by employees with disabilities were dishwasher (46%), kitchen helper (40%), and server (22%); Geng-qing and Qu (2003) reported that 60% of their respondents (restaurant managers) had hired people with disabilities as kitchen helpers.

**Training Methods and Topics**

Table 2 details training methods, topics, and tools reportedly used in school foodservice operations. The most common training methods reported to be used were on-the-job training (99%), demonstrations (89%), classroom style/lecture (64%), self-guided (57%), and computers (39%). Computers might not be used as often because some small districts might not have this type of equipment. During the interviews similar information was obtained, as noted with these illustrative comments: “The manager, first of all, does an overview-kind of training, small, informal, and then she will ‘buddy’ them up with another employee that they’ll work side-by-side with” and “We have written directions for a lot of our jobs that we do, then I have an employee that has done it before work with them for at least a week or two depending on how they are picking up on what they are suppose to be doing”.

Training tools most commonly reported were text and manuals (74%) and audio/video tapes, DVDs, CDs (68%). Almost all of the respondents (more than 96%) reported training their employees on food safety (which might include HACCP), cleaning procedures, equipment usage/cleaning, handling of food, and food preparation. Other covered topics were customer service, chemical use, communication skills, and knowledge of
products. During the interviews, foodservice directors emphasized some of the same topics, for example: “We talk about nutrition, with the meal requirements, we talk about safety and sanitation; we do use of equipment; we do right-to-know, that’s the HAZMAT one; we do Civil Rights; we do customer service.”

Past research has identified on-the-job and demonstrations as training methods preferred by school foodservice directors or managers (Kendrick, & Gangadharan, 2001; Sullivan et al., 2001, 2002). On-the-job training was reported as one of the training methods most commonly used in the foodservice industry and an effective method for training people with disabilities (Brooks et al., 2002; Harris & Bonn, 2000; Hignite, 2000; Vilá et al., 2007).

**Training Attitudes Toward People with Disabilities**

School foodservice authorities had a relatively positive attitude toward training people with disabilities. The overall mean for the 17 attitude statements was 3.42 (scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree). Table 3 details means and standard deviations for the statements. The majority of respondents (75%) agreed that giving additional training to employees with disabilities did not increase training costs. Foodservice authorities were asked to give their perceptions on whether it was harder to train employees with disabilities than those without disabilities; 18% agreed or strongly agreed that it is harder, 46% answered with neutral responses, and 46% disagreed or strongly disagreed. One interviewee’s comments reflected her attitude toward people with disabilities as being no different from people without disabilities: “I think they’re like our normal employees; I guess I don’t see working with people with a disability any different than I see working with what we would consider our ‘normal’ employees.”

Foodservice representatives agreed that it is important to provide training on communication, technical, and social skills for employees with disabilities, which is similar to what was reported in past research (Bruyere, 2000). Statements related to the importance of providing training on technical, communication, and social skills had the highest mean ratings ($M = 4.00$, $M = 3.89$, $M = 3.79$; respectively). One of the interviewees commented about the challenges of communicating with an employee with disabilities: “The communication is a challenge; the communication was a big issue.”
Most of the respondents agreed they would use different training topics for employees with disabilities depending on the disability (63%) and the job (61%), and less than half of them (47%) agreed they would use different training methods for employees with disabilities. This was made evident during the interviews as well. One foodservice director commented:

We had our two hearing disabled people out there and we didn’t think much about it before we set up the meeting and they were unable to, everything was reverberating around and they couldn’t hear so if I would do it again for them I would set it up that we would have someone, a sign language person for them.

**Attitudes Toward General Characteristics of People with Disabilities**

Respondents had a neutral attitude toward general characteristics of employees with disabilities with an overall mean rating of 3.27 (Table 4). Characteristics were related to loyalty, dependability, cooperation, absenteeism, and higher work quality. A slight majority of the respondents agreed that employees with disabilities are not late for work (56%), usually stay longer at a job (53%), do not increase operational costs (54%), will adapt to new ways of doing things (59%), and do not need special attention from coworkers (54%). Interview participants expressed positive attitudes toward the general characteristics of people with disabilities:

The benefit that I see that comes with hiring some people with disabilities, most of them seem to be pretty happy with their job, and so they come to work every day, as opposed to other people who may not come to work every day;

You know what to expect out of them. They perform consistently, whether that’s good or bad. They perform consistently;

Smile, happy people, less worries; I really like to see people with disabilities working because most of the time you would see them with a smile in their face and you think, “I think that’s a happy person”; and I would like to say that for people, that should definitely take time to at least, if they have the patience to do it, work with someone that has disabilities because you certainly learn from them and they can learn from you.
Accommodations

Given the importance of providing accommodations for employees with disabilities, a supplemental question was asked to gather information on whether the respondents had provided or would provide reasonable accommodations for employees with disabilities. Over three quarters of the respondents (78%) reported they have made or would make reasonable accommodations for employees with disabilities. Interview participants were also open to making accommodations; one of the interview participants commented about employees with lifting restrictions:

We try to find jobs for them as much as possible if they’re—if they have a limit with their weight, but we’ve got some other job that they can do, like cashiering or something that doesn’t have the weight with it.

Conclusions and Applications

Results provided information about training topics and methods used with school foodservice employees. School foodservice representatives’ attitudes toward people with disabilities were assessed. Foodservice operations may employ diverse personnel and may use a variety of training methods and tools to meet their needs. This study demonstrated that traditional training methods and tools continue to be used in school foodservice operations. The most commonly used training methods identified in this study were on-the-job training, demonstrations, and classroom style/lecture. The use of computers as a training method was reported, and computers are used more frequently as new technological changes take place. The most common tools were text and manual, audio/video tapes, DVDs, and CDs. The incorporation of different training methods by school foodservice operations may be necessary as the effectiveness of traditional methods (such as lectures) has been questioned (Harris & Bonn, 2000). As the use of technology increases and young people are incorporated into the workforce, other training tools such as computer programs and podcasts/vodcasts may be used.

People with disabilities should have the same opportunities to get training as do people without disabilities; this might provide development opportunities for people with disabilities, as most of the time they are hired for entry-level jobs (Mulvihill et al., 2008). Preparing people with disabilities for employment is an important task. Respondents agreed
that different training methods need to be used to train employees with disabilities; depending on the job and/or the disability, training methods and topics might vary. Foodservice directors need to consider these training differences in order to provide the best training methods and opportunities for their employees with disabilities and assure they succeed at their jobs.

Bruyere (2000) reported skill deficiency as one of the barriers to employing people with disabilities. Individuals with disabilities may have difficulty learning and performing skills needed for employment. Employers want employees who have the technical, communication, and social skills needed to perform the job. Respondents agreed that providing training for those skills for employees with disabilities is important for their operations. School foodservice operations should consider including a training component that covers the basics of technical, communication, and social skills for their employees to perform their jobs better.

Communication skills refer to the skills needed to use language (spoken or written) to interact with others (Wrench, McCroskey, & Richmond, 2008). Communication is essential when working in foodservice operations; one of the interview participants referred to a employee whose disability was a hearing problem:

Quite honestly communication is a key part to working with other employees so that, there are some drawbacks to [having an employee with a hearing problem] because the communication was a really [hard] thing to get them to work with other people. Training for communication skills might also have an impact on the way employees with disabilities interact with coworkers and customers (students and teachers).

Technical skills are those skills needed to perform jobs that require following a technique or procedure. Training for technical skills is critical for employees to learn the appropriate way to do the job and, thus, impact job performance and productivity. Skills needed to interact with others, for example cooperation, sharing, and following directions (Gresham & Elliot, 1984) are social skills. Having good social skills also would enhance the overall work environment of the school foodservice operation.

Foodservice operations offer a wide range and variety of employment opportunities for people with disabilities because they provide the flexibility to accommodate them and
their specific needs. Accommodation is one of the reported challenges when hiring people with disabilities (Geng-qing & Qu, 2003; Groschl, 2007). School foodservice representatives who responded to the questionnaire and those interviewed agreed they had provided or would provide reasonable accommodations to employees with disabilities if it were necessary, opening up opportunities for people with disabilities. Considering that only public school foodservices were included in this study, this might have influenced the awareness of school foodservice representatives about disability-related topics, as these operations must comply with the ADA. Each employee situation should be analyzed to determine what effects the accommodation will have on the employee and others within the organization.

There certainly are challenges associated with training and working with people with disabilities. This study found school foodservice authorities had a positive attitude toward training and working with people with disabilities. It is important to consider not only the challenges but also the benefits of working with employees certainly (for example, increased diversity of the workforce). Employees with disabilities might need closer supervision but possibly would do a good job because they really want to be an active member of society. As one of the interview participants concluded:

It would be an educational experience. . . . It would be a teaching lesson for all of us involved to train the person, to work with that person, and for all of our customers to see that we are open to work with people that have disabilities.

Looking forward, researchers need to assess training methods and topics needed for specific types of employees with disabilities. This information could expand the knowledge about what is needed based on the specific disability and might allow for the development of training methods oriented toward specific disabilities. In addition, future research could identify school foodservice directors’ perceived benefits and challenges of hiring people with disabilities.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Questionnaire&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency (n)</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-35 years old</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45 years old</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55 years old</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55 years old</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foodservice Director/Manager</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Working for Hospitality Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Working with Current Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤1-5 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with Disabled People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> n=65-66
Table 5.2. Training Methods, Topics, and Tools Reported to be Used by School Foodservice Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Methods, Topics, and Tools</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-the-job Training</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrations</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Style/Lecture</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-guided</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Plays</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Safety</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning Procedures</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Usage/Cleaning</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling of Food</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Preparation</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Use</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Product</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Relations</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text and Manuals</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-video Tapes, DVDs, CDs</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Programs/Simulations</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparencies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podcasts/Vodcasts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a n = 61-74 \)

\( ^b \) Percent is more than 100 for each category as respondents chose all answers that applied.
# Table 5.3. School Foodservice Participants Attitudes Towards Training People with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>M ± SD</th>
<th>Frequency of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing training on technical skills important for EWD</td>
<td>4.00 ± .67</td>
<td>0(0%) 2(3%) 9(13%) 44(65%) 13(19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing training on communication skills important for EWD</td>
<td>3.89 ± .53</td>
<td>0(0%) 0(0%) 13(20%) 47(71%) 6(9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing training on social skills important for EWD</td>
<td>3.79 ± .71</td>
<td>0(0%) 3(4%) 16(24%) 40(60%) 8(12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is too costly to give additional training to EWD</td>
<td>3.79 ± .66</td>
<td>6(9%) 44(66%) 14(21%) 3(4%) 0(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I train/would train on different topics if an employee has a specific disability</td>
<td>3.65 ± .82</td>
<td>0(0%) 9(14%) 10(15%) 41(63%) 5(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I train/would train on different topics if an EWD has a certain job</td>
<td>3.64 ± .79</td>
<td>0(0%) 8(12%) 13(19%) 41(61%) 5(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use/would use different training methods for EWD</td>
<td>3.41 ± .86</td>
<td>0(0%) 12(18%) 19(29%) 31(47%) 4(6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depending on job, it costs/would cost me more to train EWD</td>
<td>3.36 ± .69</td>
<td>0(0%) 32(48%) 27(40%) 8(12%) 0(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depending on job, EWD are harder to train than EWOD</td>
<td>3.33 ± .66</td>
<td>1(1%) 26(39%) 34(51%) 6(9%) 0(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depending on the disability, I spend/would spend more time training EWD than EWOD</td>
<td>3.28 ± .81</td>
<td>0(0%) 13(19%) 24(36%) 28(42%) 2(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depending on disability, it costs/would cost more to train EWD</td>
<td>3.24 ± .74</td>
<td>0(0%) 12(18%) 26(39%) 28(42%) 0(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depending on the job, I spend/would spend more time training EWD than EWOD</td>
<td>3.23 ± .82</td>
<td>0(0%) 14(21%) 25(38%) 25(38%) 2(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depending on disability, EWD are harder to train than EWOD</td>
<td>3.19 ± .74</td>
<td>1(1%) 23(35%) 31(46%) 12(18%) 0(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not believe EWD need to be trained different than EWOD</td>
<td>3.18 ± .91</td>
<td>2(3%) 25(38%) 28(42%) 9(13%) 3(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even after training EWD need special attention from supervisors</td>
<td>3.11 ± .79</td>
<td>1(1%) 20(30%) 34(51%) 10(15%) 2(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I train/would train all employees using the same methods whether they are disabled or not</td>
<td>3.09 ± 1.20</td>
<td>4(6%) 31(46%) 7(11%) 17(25%) 8(12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use/would use the same training tools for EWD as EWOD</td>
<td>2.91 ± .97</td>
<td>1(1%) 21(32%) 19(29%) 21(32%) 4(6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.42 ± .34</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*a* n=65-67  
*b* Mean ± Standard Deviation.  
*c* Scale for statements: 1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree.  
*d* EWD=employees with disabilities and EWOD=employees without disabilities
Table 5.4. School Foodservice Participants Attitudes Towards People with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>M ± SD</th>
<th>Frequency of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EWD are often late for work</td>
<td>3.81 ± .68</td>
<td>9(14%) 37(56%) 19(28%) 1(2%) 0(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWD usually stay shorter at a job than EWOD</td>
<td>3.61 ± .58</td>
<td>3(4%) 35(53%) 29(43%) 0(0%) 0(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWD increase operational costs</td>
<td>3.52 ± .61</td>
<td>1(1%) 36(54%) 27(41%) 3(4%) 0(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors find/would find hard to get EWD to adopt new ways of doing the job</td>
<td>3.48 ± .80</td>
<td>1(1%) 39(59%) 21(32%) 3(4%) 3(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWD make other employees uncomfortable</td>
<td>3.41 ± .78</td>
<td>3(4%) 30(45%) 27(41%) 6(9%) 1(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWD need special attention from coworkers</td>
<td>3.41 ± .68</td>
<td>1(1%) 36(54%) 27(41%) 3(4%) 0(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWD work slower than EWOD</td>
<td>3.37 ± .71</td>
<td>2(3%) 28(42%) 30(45%) 7(10%) 0(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWD need closer supervision than EWOD</td>
<td>3.21 ± .88</td>
<td>2(3%) 25(37%) 28(42%) 9(14%) 3(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWD are more loyal than EWOD</td>
<td>3.11 ± .64</td>
<td>0(0%) 9(14%) 42(64%) 14(22%) 1(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWD cooperate better than EWOD</td>
<td>3.03 ± .61</td>
<td>0(0%) 11(16%) 42(64%) 13(20%) 0(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWD are more dependable than EWOD</td>
<td>2.93 ± .68</td>
<td>1(1%) 13(19%) 45(67%) 6(9%) 2(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWD are absent less often than EWOD</td>
<td>2.90 ± .74</td>
<td>3(4%) 12(18%) 42(63%) 9(14%) 1(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWD produce higher quality work than EWOD</td>
<td>2.76 ± .65</td>
<td>1(1%) 20(30%) 41(61%) 4(7%) 1(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.27 ± .30</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to obtain hospitality industry managers’ and supervisors’ perceptions of the definition of disability and types of disabilities. Once a definition was established, current training methods and topics used with disabled employees, as well as managers’ and supervisors’ attitudes and knowledge about people with disabilities, in the hospitality industry (retail foodservices and lodging operations) were assessed. This chapter includes a summary of the results and conclusions. Limitations of the study and recommendations for future research are also described.

Summary of Results

For the questionnaire, a total of 1,199 managers and foodservice authorities were contacted, and 201 questionnaires were received (17% response). Of the 201 returned and analyzed questionnaires, 61 were from hotel managers, 63 from restaurant managers, and 77 from school foodservice authorities. More than half of the respondents were female (63%) and Caucasian (52.6%). More than half of the participants had been working for the hospitality industry for more than 15 years (56%) and reported having some experience with people with disabilities (83%). Similar results were obtained from the interviews where the majority of participants were female (60%), half of them had been working for the hospitality industry more than 15 years, and all reported having experience with people with disabilities.

During the interviews, participants were asked to define disabilities. Participants voiced their perceptions of the definition of disabilities as a personal view or, in some cases as, defined by their organizations (Appendix P). Based on their comments disability in the workplace was defined as: “a physical or mental challenge that the individual may be born with or it may be caused by an accident. The disabled employee needs special accommodation to perform one or all of the job duties required by the operation.” This definition reflects the hospitality industry managers’ perceptions of the term “disability.” Most participants agreed there is no common definition of disability, and some of them even mentioned that was something they needed to think about and it was really hard to define. Groschl (2007) found that the complexity of defining disability was one of the challenges hotel managers faced when hiring people with disabilities. One of the participants in this study commented: “In the school, we define a disability based on the legal aspect . . . and
nobody really has a definition at this point.” Participants referred to disability as a challenge to perform the job or the need to have an accommodation to do the job. Some illustrative quotes include: “Physical or mental ‘challenge’ that needs special accommodation in order to do the same kind of a job that someone without the disability would need” (hotel manager, Kathy); “Somebody that is incapable of doing what a normal person would do” (restaurant manager, Ana); and “Disabled. I would say, that’s an employee that can no longer perform the services that we need to get our jobs done, here at the school” (school foodservice director, Sara)

Questionnaire respondents reported a neutral opinion on knowledge about disability-related topics such as specific types of disabilities, training for specific types of disabilities, ADA, federal and state benefits of hiring people with disabilities, reasonable accommodations, legal issues, hiring process for disabled people, and the EEOC’s role with an overall mean rating of 3.30 (SD = 0.61) on a scale of 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree (Appendix R). Topics with the highest mean ratings were: knowledgeable about ADA (3.68), physical disabilities (3.66), mental disabilities (3.52), and reasonable accommodation (3.46).

The training methods most commonly used as reported by questionnaire respondents, school foodservice representatives, and hotel and restaurant managers were on-the-job training (96%), demonstrations (78%), and self-guided (53%). The training tools most commonly used were text and manuals (68%); audio/video tapes, DVDs, and CDs (53%); and computer programs (40%). The most common training topics for hotel and restaurant employees were cleaning procedure (93%), customer service (93%), equipment usage/cleaning (88%), knowledge of product (87%), and communication skills (85%). School foodservice employees were mostly trained on food safety (99%), cleaning procedures (99%), equipment usage/cleaning (97%), handling of food (97%), and food preparation (96%).

Attitudinal questions were analyzed for the two sectors: commercial (hotels and restaurants) and noncommercial (school foodservices). In general, hotel and restaurant managers and school foodservice authorities had a neutral attitude toward employees with disabilities with means of 3.26 and 3.31, respectively.
Factor analysis was conducted and correlations were calculated to ensure there was a significant correlation between the statements within each factor. For both groups, four factors with loadings higher than 0.400 were extracted. Factors were named based on the items included in each one of them. Factor 1 was named “Teamwork and Costs,” factor 2 “Training,” factor 3 was labeled “Characteristics,” and factor 4 “Skills.” Mean scores were computed for each of the four attitudinal factors. The mean score for Factor 4 (Skills) was the highest of the four factors for both groups. For hotel and restaurants statistically significant differences ($p \leq .001$) were found between mean scores for factor 1 (Teamwork and Costs) and ethnicity of participants (Caucasian or other ethnicity); Caucasians had a higher mean (3.23). Mean scores for Factor 4 (Skills) were statistically significant ($p \leq .05$) based on age and number of years working for the current organization. Hotel and restaurant managers’ age and number of years working for their current organization has an effect on their attitudes toward employees with disabilities in relation to the importance of providing training on specific skills. For schools, statistically significant differences ($p \leq .05$) were found between mean scores for Factor 4 (Skills) and ethnicity of participants (Caucasian or other ethnicity); respondents from the non-Caucasian group had the higher mean (4.18).

Conclusions

This study examined current training methods, topics, and tools used with employees in the hospitality industry and assessed employers’ knowledge and attitudes toward people with disability. Defining disability is difficult because of all the aspects that need to be considered and the legal considerations this might have. Most of interview participants did not even mention the ADA when defining disability. Based on interview participants’ responses, disability would be defined as “a physical or mental challenge that the individual may be born with or it may be caused by an accident. The disabled employee needs special accommodation to perform one or all of the job duties required by the operation.” This definition should be used in conjunction with the ADA definition.

Results indicate that hotel and restaurant managers and school foodservice authorities have a neutral attitude toward people with disabilities. Respondents had a neutral opinion on how knowledgeable they were about disability topics such as ADA, types of disabilities, and reasonable accommodations. The questionnaire respondents and the interview participants
agreed that they had provided or would provide reasonable accommodations to disabled employees if it were necessary. People with disabilities may have difficulty learning and performing employment skills; training on those skills for employees with disabilities is important for hotels, restaurants, and school foodservice operations.

Results indicate that hotels, restaurants, and school foodservice operations are using a variety of training methods and tools for all employees. The most-used training methods reported by respondents were on-the-job training, demonstrations, classroom style, self-guided training, and computers. Training topics covered by the operations were different for commercial (hotels and restaurants) and noncommercial (school foodservices) entities; which makes sense considering the different sectors. Hotels and restaurants trained their employees mostly on cleaning procedure, customer service, equipment usage/cleaning, knowledge of product, and communication skills. School foodservice authorities reported employees were mostly trained on: food safety, cleaning procedures, equipment usage/cleaning, handling of food, and food preparation.

**Limitations**

There are some limitations that should be recognized in this study. The results of this study are based on self-reported attitudes and knowledge; thus, socially desirable responses might have been reported due to the sensitive nature of this topic area. Consideration was given to including questions from the Social Desirability Scale, however, interview respondents cautioned against this. The study had a low response rate; reasons for this low response rate are unknown but not uncommon. The first questionnaire was sent during the second week of November which may have impacted the response rate because of the holidays during the end of the year. Another potential limitation was that some of the online questionnaires were undeliverable because of the security systems of schools. Some of the schools might not have had computers available, and that could have affected their participation.

**Future Research**

This work presented information about potential professional development needs of current managers to better incorporate people with disabilities into their organizations. This research provided baseline information about training methods, topics, and tools used with
employees with disabilities in the foodservice and lodging operations since the amendment of the ADA effective 2009. Future researchers should study training methods and topics needs for specific types of disabilities (physical and mental) in the industry in order to customize training for the disabled. This information could expand the knowledge of what is needed based on the specific disability and the job.

Future research should be conducted with lodging and foodservice operations from other states. In addition, future research should identify employers’ perceived benefits from and challenges of hiring people with disabilities in the hospitality industry. Employees both with and without disabilities training needs could also be investigated in considering the best methods, topics, and tools to be used. In order to identify potential educational interventions, hospitality management students’ knowledge and attitudes toward people with disabilities could be assessed.

Implications

Foodservice and lodging operations might be affected by the updates to the ADA that went into effect January 8, 2009. To assure that the provisions of the amendment will be incorporated it is important that professionals in this industry look for appropriate ways to integrate people with disabilities into their operations. This study provided information about training methods used with people having disabilities. Foodservice and lodging managers may need to use different training methods with employees with disabilities in order to provide more opportunities for them to succeed at their jobs.

This study provided information about the knowledge hospitality industry managers have about disability-related topics. Even though there were topics about which participants reported to be knowledgeable, foodservice and lodging operation managers should be exposed more to information regarding disabilities and this might help changing their attitudes toward employees with disabilities. Also, hospitality programs might use the information to incorporate disability topics into their curriculums and better prepare future managers.
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APPENDIX A: HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL

DATE: July 7, 2009
TO: Paola Paez
    11 MacKay Hall
CC: Dr. Susan Arendt
    9E MacKay Hall
FROM: Jan Canny, IRB Administrator
      Office of Research Assurances
TITLE: Attitudes, Knowledge, Training Methods, and Tools for Employees with Disabilities in the Hospitality Industry
IRB ID: 09-292
Study Review Date: 7 July 2009

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) Chair has reviewed this project and has declared the study exempt from the requirements of the human subject protections regulations as described in 45 CFR 46.101(b). The IRB determination of exemption means that:

- You do not need to submit an application for annual continuing review.

- You must carry out the research as proposed in the IRB application, including obtaining and documenting (signed) informed consent if you have stated in your application that you will do so or if required by the IRB.

- Any modification of this research should be submitted to the IRB on a Continuing Review and/or Modification form, prior to making any changes, to determine if the project still meets the Federal criteria for exemption. If it is determined that exemption is no longer warranted, then an IRB proposal will need to be submitted and approved before proceeding with data collection.

Please be sure to use the documents with the IRB approval stamp in your research.

Please note that you must submit all research involving human participants for review by the IRB. Only the IRB may make the determination of exemption, even if you conduct a study in the future that is exactly like this study.
Dear General Manager:

People with disabilities represent an important labor source for the hospitality industry. Disabled employees can learn necessary skills to perform their jobs and contribute to the success of an organization. In order to better prepare employees with disabilities it is important to identify current training topics and needs for this sector of the population.

As researchers at Iowa State University’s Hotel, Restaurant, and Institution Management Program, we are conducting a questionnaire to gain your viewpoints about current training topics, methods used for employees with disabilities in the hospitality industry, as well as training attitudes and knowledge related with employees with disabilities. Results of the project will provide information for the hospitality industry about incorporating disabled workers and training methods used with disabled employees.

We need your input! Whether you currently employed disabled workers, formerly employed disabled workers, or have never employed disabled workers, your input is valuable. This is an opportunity for you to provide information on the training methods for people with disabilities and help identify potential training needs for disabled employees. The questionnaire will take less than 15 minutes to complete. Your participation in this project is voluntary and you may refuse to participate. Return of a completed questionnaire indicates your willingness to participate in this project. To ensure confidentiality to the extent permitted by law, the following measures will be taken: 1) questionnaire responses will remain completely anonymous and no identifiers will be used; 2) only the identified researchers will have access to the research records; and 3) research records will be kept in a locked office.

If you have any questions, please contact one of us at the e-mails or phone numbers listed below. Thank you in advance for helping us with this research.

Paola Paez, MS
PhD Candidate
Iowa State University
pabolap@iastate.edu
515-294-4494

Susan Arendt, PhD, RD
Assistant and Major Professor
Iowa State University
sarendt@iastate.edu
515-294-7575
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW CONTACT SCRIPT

Hello, my name is Paola Paez (No name on e-mail), I am a PhD student in the Hotel, Restaurant and Institution Management Program at Iowa State University. I’m doing my research project here at the university.

The purpose of this study is to obtain managers’, supervisors’, and directors’ perceptions of the definition of disability in the hospitality industry, in order to create a definition of disability. We also want to assess training methods and topics used with employees in your operation. You are being invited to participate in this study because you are a manager or supervisor of a lodging or foodservice operation.

If you agree to participate in this study, your participation will last for approximately one hour while we conduct the interview. Participation is strictly voluntary and all data collected will be kept confidential. Only summary data will be used in publications or presentations about this research.

We believe that this research project will provide very useful information for foodservice and lodging operations. It is hoped that the information gained in this study will benefit society by establishing a definition of disabilities in the hospitality industry and provide information that might assist hospitality managers with integration of disabled workers into their workforce.

Would you be willing to participate? (Phone contact)

If you are willing to participate please reply back to this e-mail along with potential interview days/times. I will be happy to accommodate your schedule. I look forward to hearing from you soon. (E-mail)
APPENDIX D: MANAGERS/SUPERVISORS INTERVIEW GUIDE

Name: ___________________________ Interview Date: _________

Title: ___________________________ Interview Time: _________

Employer: _________________________ Interviewer: _________

Thank you for participating in this interview. My name is Paola Paez and I will be asking you some questions related to definition of disability and training employees with disabilities. Before we start do you have any questions regarding the questionnaire or consent form?

The information we share here is confidential, I please ask you not to use your real name. There is no right or wrong answers, I want your input. Any question?

1) How would you define disability?
2) How would you define a disabled employee?
3) According to the definition provided, how would you categorize a disabled employee?
4) Which disabilities are you aware of? Describe them.
5) What type of training methods are used in your operation?
6) What topics are employees trained on in your operation?
7) Do you use or would you use different training methods topics for employees with disabilities? Expand on this.
8) Do you include or would you include different training topics for employees with disabilities? Expand on this.
9) What additional comments would you like to make regarding employees with disabilities?
10) You do not need to answer these questions, I just want to know how would you feel if you were asked the following questions on a questionnaire:
   a. You have never been annoyed when people expressed ideas very different from your own
   b. You have never deliberately said something that hurt someone’s feelings
   c. There have been occasions when you took advantage of someone
   d. You sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget
   e. At times you have really insisted on having things your own way
   f. There have been occasions when you felt like smashing things
APPENDIX E: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION OF INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. Your input is very important.

1) What type of operation do you work for?
   ____ Lodging
   ____ Foodservice:  ____ Commercial  ____ Non-commercial

2) What is your gender?
   ____ Female
   ____ Male

3) What is your age?
   ____ 18 years or less
   ____ 19-25 years
   ____ 26-35 years
   ____ 36-45 years
   ____ 46-55 years
   ____ over 55 years

4) What is your current job position?
   ____ Owner
   ____ Manager
   ____ Supervisor
   ____ Director
   ____ other, specify _______________

5) How long have you worked in the hospitality industry?
   ____ Less than 1 year
   ____ 1-5 years
   ____ 6-10 years
   ____ 11-15 years
   ____ over 15 years

6) How long have you worked for your current organization?
   ____ Less than 1 year
   ____ 1-5 years
   ____ 6-10 years
   ____ 11-15 years
   ____ over 15 years
7) What experiences have you had with people with disabilities?
   ___ None
   ___ Myself
   ___ Family
   ___ Friend
   ___ Coworker
   ___ Employee
   ___ Other, please specify __________

8) If you were to receive a questionnaire, which delivery method do you prefer?
   ___ Hard copy by mail
   ___ E-mail
   ___ Other

9) What would prevent you from completing the questionnaire?

10) What would make you want to complete the questionnaire?
APPENDIX F. INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

Interviews

Title of Study: Attitudes, Knowledge, Training Methods, and Tools for Employees with Disabilities in the Hospitality Industry

Investigators: Paola Paez, PhD. Candidate; Susan Arendt, PhD.

This is a research study. Please take your time in deciding if you would like to participate. Please feel free to ask questions at any time.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to obtain managers’ and supervisors’ perceptions of the definition of disability in the hospitality industry, in order to create a definition of disability in this sector of the hospitality industry. You are being invited to participate in this study because you are a manager or supervisor of a lodging or foodservice operation.

DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURES

If you agree to participate in this study, your participation will last for approximately one hour while we conduct the interview. During the study you may expect the following study procedures to be followed: you will be asked questions and while you are talking, notes will be taken by the interviewer.

Digital recorders will be used to audio record the interview. After analysis is done, the recordings will be destroyed.

RISKS

There are no foreseeable risks at this time from participating in this study.

BENEFITS

If you decide to participate in this study there will be no direct benefit to you. It is hoped that the information gained in this study will benefit society by establishing a definition of disabilities in the hospitality industry and provide information that might assist hospitality managers with integration of disabled workers into their workforce.

COSTS AND COMPENSATION
You will not have any costs from participating in this. You will not be compensated for participating in this study.

**PARTICIPANT RIGHTS**

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may refuse to participate or leave the study at any time. If you decide to not participate in the study or leave the study early, it will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

**CONFIDENTIALITY**

Records identifying participants will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by applicable laws and regulations and will not be made publicly available. However, federal government regulatory agencies, auditing departments of Iowa State University, and the Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews and approves human subject research studies) may inspect and/or copy your records for quality assurance and data analysis. These records may contain private information.

To ensure confidentiality to the extent permitted by law, the following measures will be taken: 1) interview responses will remain completely anonymous and no identifiers will be used; 2) only the identified researchers will have access to the research records; and 3) research records will be kept in a locked office. If the results are published, your identity will remain confidential.

**QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS**

You are encouraged to ask questions at any time during this study.

For further information about the study contact:
Paola Paez, 515-294-4494
Susan Arendt, 515-294-7575

If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact the IRB Administrator, (515) 294-4566, IRB@iastate.edu, or Director, (515) 294-3115, Office of Research Assurances, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011.

***************************************************************************

***

**PARTICIPANT SIGNATURE**

Your signature indicates that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study, that the study has been explained to you, that you have been given the time to read the document and that your questions have been satisfactorily answered. You will receive a copy of the written informed consent prior to your participation in the study.
Participant’s Name (printed) ________________________________________________

(Participant’s Signature) ________________________________  (Date) __________

INVESTIGATOR STATEMENT

I certify that the participant has been given adequate time to read and learn about the study and all of their questions have been answered. It is my opinion that the participant understands the purpose, risks, benefits and the procedures that will be followed in this study and has voluntarily agreed to participate.

______________________________  ________________________________
(Signature of Person Obtaining Informed Consent)  (Date) __________
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We are investigating current training topics and methods used for employees with disabilities in the hospitality industry, as well as attitudes and knowledge about training employees with disabilities. Because you make decisions in a foodservice or lodging operation, your opinions are valuable. Please complete the following questionnaire based on your experiences. As you answer the questions use the following definitions.

**Disability**: A physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities, a record of such an impairment, or being regarded as having such an impairment (USEEOC, 2009). An employee could already have a disability when hired for a job or become disabled because of an accident while employed at the workplace.

**Physical Disability**: Any physiological condition, cosmetic disfigurement, or anatomical loss affecting the body systems. Examples include: neurological, musculoskeletal (wheel chair), special sense organs (hearing), respiratory (including speech organs), cardiovascular (high blood pressure), reproductive, or digestive (diabetes).

**Mental Disability**: Any mental or psychological disorder, such as mental retardation, organic brain syndrome, emotional or mental illness, and learning disabilities (dyslexia).

**Social Skills**: Skills needed to interact with others.

**Technical Skills**: Skills needed to perform jobs that require following a technique.

### Part I: Current Training Topics and Methods in Foodservice and Lodging Operations.

1) From the following list, indicate which training topics are covered with all your employees (disabled and not disabled).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Topic</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Usage/Cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling of Food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) From the following list, indicate which training methods are used with all your employees (disabled and not disabled) to communicate the topics identified above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Methods</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Style/Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-guided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-the-job Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Plays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) From the following list indicate which training tools are used with all your employees (disabled and not disabled).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Tools</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text and Manuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Programs/Simulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-video Tapes, DVDs, CDs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podcasts/Vodcasts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part II: Personal attitudes and beliefs about people with disabilities.** If you currently work with disabled employees, please answer the following questions based on what you are doing; if you have worked with disabled employees in the past, please answer the questions based on what you have done; if you have no experience with disabled employees please answer based on what you think you would do.

Please circle your response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I feel employees with disabilities are more dependable than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Providing training on technical skills for employees with disabilities is important.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I use/would use different training methods for employees with disabilities.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Employees with disabilities are absent less often than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Providing training on social skills for employees with disabilities is important.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) I train/would train on different topics if a disabled employee has a specific disability.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) I train/would train on different topics if a disabled employee has a certain job.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) I believe that generally, employees with disabilities cooperate better than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Providing training on communication skills for employees with disabilities is important.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) I train/would train all employees using the same methods whether they are disabled or not.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Employees with disabilities are often late for work.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Depending on the job, I spend/would spend more time training employees with disabilities than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Depending on the disability, I spend/would spend more time training employees with disabilities than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Employees with disabilities work slower than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) I use/would use the same training tools for employees with disabilities as those without disabilities.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Employees with disabilities need closer supervision than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees with disabilities produce higher quality work than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I do not believe disabled employees need to be trained differently than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Even after training, employees with disabilities need special attention from supervisors.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I feel it is too costly to give additional training to employees with disabilities.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Employees with disabilities are more loyal to the organization than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Employees with disabilities usually stay at a job a shorter time period than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Depending on the job, employees with disabilities are harder to train than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Depending on the disability, employees with disabilities are harder to train than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Employees with disabilities need special attention from coworkers.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Supervisors find/would find it hard to get disabled employees to adopt new ways of doing the job.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Employees with disabilities make other employees uncomfortable.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Employees with disabilities increase operational costs.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Depending on the job, it costs/would cost me more to train employees with disabilities.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Depending on the disability, it costs/would cost me more to train employees with disabilities.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I make/would make reasonable accommodations for employees with disabilities.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part III: Knowledge about disabilities

Please circle your response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am knowledgeable about these disabilities:</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Disabilities</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Disabilities</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have adequate knowledge to train employees with the following disabilities:</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Disabilities</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Disabilities</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am knowledgeable about:</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal benefits of hiring people with disabilities</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State benefits of hiring people with disabilities</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part IV: Tell us about your organization

1. What is your operation’s type of ownership? (Check all that apply)
   ___ Independently owned
   ___ Franchised
   ___ Chain

2. Which is the total number of employees that work at your organization?
   ___ Less than 15
   ___ 15-30
   ___ 31-50
   ___ 51-100
   ___ over 100

3. Do you currently work with disabled employees?
   ___ Yes, If yes indicate how many have a physical or mental disability, or both disabilities.
     ___ Physical
     ___ Mental Disability
     ___ Both disabilities
   ___ No

4. How many disabled employees have you worked with over your entire career?
   ___ None (Skip to part V if no experience with disabled employees).
   ___ 1-3
   ___ 4-6
   ___ 7-10
   ___ Over 10

5. What type or types of disabilities do your employees present or have presented? (Check all that apply)
   ___ Physical Disability
   ___ Mental Disability

6. When was/were the disability/disabilities acquired? (Check all that apply)
   ___ Employee(s) was/were hired already having a disability
   ___ Employee(s) acquired the disability on the job, after hire
   ___ Employee(s) acquired the disability after hire but not “on the job”

7. What positions do employees with disabilities hold or have held in your current operation? (Check all that apply)
   ___ Supervisor
   ___ Server
   ___ Kitchen Helper
   ___ Dishwasher
   ___ Housekeeping
   ___ Maintenance
   ___ Front Desk
   ___ Cashier
   ___ Custodian
   ___ Other, please specify___________________
Part V: What about you?

1. What is your gender?
   ___ Female
   ___ Male

2. What is your age?
   ___ 18 years old
   ___ 19-25 years old
   ___ 26-35 years old
   ___ 36-45 years old
   ___ 46-55 years old
   ___ over 55 years old

3. What is your ethnicity?
   ___ American-Indian or Alaskan Native
   ___ African-American or Black (Non-Hispanic origin)
   ___ Asian or Pacific Islander
   ___ Caucasian
   ___ Hispanic
   ___ Multiracial
   ___ Ethnicity unknown
   ___ Other, please specify ____________________

4. What is your current job position?
   ___ Owner
   ___ Manager
   ___ Supervisor
   ___ Other, please specify____________________

5. How long have you worked in the foodservice/hospitality industry?
   ___ Less than 1 year
   ___ 1-5 years
   ___ 6-10 years
   ___ 11-15 years
   ___ 16-25 years
   ___ Over 25 years

6. How long have you worked at your current organization?
   ___ Less than 1 year
   ___ 1-5 years
   ___ 6-10 years
   ___ 11-15 years
   ___ 16-25 years
   ___ Over 25 years

7. What experiences do you have or have you had with people with disabilities?
   ___ No experience
   ___ Myself, I am disabled
   ___ Family, I have/had a disabled family member
   ___ Friend, I have/had a disabled friend
   ___ Coworker, I have/had a disabled coworker
   ___ Other, please specify____________________

Please fold the questionnaire and make sure that the self-addressed, prepaid business reply page is visible; tape or staple at the bottom and drop in the mail.

Thank you for your time and input!
APPENDIX I: ONLINE VERSION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Survey: Hospitality Industry Employees with Disabilities - ver. 2
Status: Launched

1. Page One

Hospitality Industry Employees with Disabilities:
Training Methods, Topics, Attitudes, and Knowledge

We are investigating current training topics and methods used for employees with disabilities in the hospitality industry, as well as attitudes and knowledge about training employees with disabilities. Because you work in a foodservice or lodging operation, your opinions are valuable. Please complete the following questionnaire based on your experiences.

As you answer the questions use the following definitions:

Disability: A physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities, a record of such an impairment, or being regarded as having such an impairment (USEEOC, 2009). An employee could already have a disability when hired for a job or become disabled because of an accident while employed at the workplace.

Physical Disability: Any physiological condition, cosmetic disfigurement, or anatomical loss affecting the body systems. Examples include: neurological, musculoskeletal (wheel chair), special sense organs (hearing), respiratory (including speech organs), cardiovascular (high blood pressure), reproductive, or digestive (diabetes).

Mental Disability: Any mental or psychological disorder, such as mental retardation, organic brain syndrome, emotional or mental illness, and learning disabilities (dyslexia).

Social Skills: Skills needed to interact with others.

Technical Skills: Skills needed to perform jobs that require following a technique.

2. Part I: Current Training
Topics and Methods in Foodservice O...
1. From the following list, indicate which topics are covered in training all your employees (disabled and not disabled).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Usage/Cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling of Food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. List any other topics covered when training all your employees (disabled and not disabled):

3. From the following list, indicate which training methods are used with all your employees (disabled and not disabled) to communicate the topics identified above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Style/Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-guided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-the-job Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Plays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. List any other training methods used with all your employees:


5. From the following list indicate which training tools are used with all your employees (disabled and not disabled).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text and Manuals</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparencies</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Programs/Simulations</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-video Tapes, DVDs, CDs</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podcasts/Vodcasts</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. List any other training tools used with all your employees:


3. Part II: Personal attitudes and beliefs about people with di...

If you currently work with disabled employees, please answer the following questions based on what you are doing; if you have worked with disabled employees in the past, please answer the questions based on what you have done; if you have no experience with disabled employees please answer based on what you think you would do.

Disability: A physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities, a record of such an impairment, or being regarded as having such an impairment (USEEOC, 2009). An employee could become disabled because of an accident while employed on the workplace or could already have that condition when applying for a job.

Social Skills: Skills needed to interact with others.

Technical Skills: Skills needed to perform jobs that require following a technique.
7. Personal attitudes and beliefs about people with disabilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel employees with disabilities are more dependable than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing training on technical skills for employees with disabilities is important.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use/would use different training methods for employees with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees with disabilities are absent less often than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing training on social skills for employees with disabilities is important.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I train/would train on different topics if a disabled employee has a specific disability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I train/would train on different topics if a disabled employee has a certain job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that generally, employees with disabilities cooperate better than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing training on communication skills for employees with disabilities is important.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I train/would train all employees using the same methods whether they are disabled or not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees with disabilities are often late for work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depending on the job, I spend/would spend more time training employees with disabilities than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depending on the disability, I spend/would spend more time training employees with disabilities than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees with disabilities work slower than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use/would use the same training tools for employees with disabilities as those without disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees with disabilities need closer supervision than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees with disabilities produce higher quality work than employees without disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not believe disabled employees need to be trained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Part III: Knowledge about disabilities

8. Knowledge about disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am knowledgeable about physical disabilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am knowledgeable about mental disabilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have adequate knowledge to train employees with physical disabilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have adequate knowledge to train employees with mental disabilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am knowledgeable about the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am knowledgeable about Federal benefits of hiring people with disabilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am knowledgeable about State benefits of hiring people with disabilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am knowledgeable about reasonable accommodations for disabled employees</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am knowledgeable about legal issues related to employees with disabilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am knowledgeable about hiring process for people with disabilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am knowledgeable about the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)'s role</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Part IV: Tell us about your organization
9. 1. What is your operation's type of management?
   ○ a) Contract
   ○ b) Self Managed

10. 2. Which is the total number of employees in your school district?
   ○ a) Less than 15
   ○ b) 15-30
   ○ c) 31-50
   ○ d) 51-100
   ○ e) over 100

11. 3. Do you currently work with disabled employees?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

12. 3a. How many have a physical disability?

13. 3b. How many have a mental disability?

14. 3c. How many have both a physical and mental disability?
16. 4. How many disabled employees have you worked with over your entire career?
   ○ a) None
   ○ b) 1-3
   ○ c) 4-6
   ○ d) 7-10
   ○ e) Over 10

16. 5. What type or types of disabilities do your employees present or have presented?
   ○ a) Physical Disability
   ○ b) Mental Disability
   ○ c) Both Physical Disability and Mental Disability

17. 6. When was the employee(s) disability acquired? (Check all that apply.)
   ■ a) Employee(s) was/were hired already having a disability
   ■ b) Employee(s) acquired the disability on the job, after hire
   ■ c) Employee(s) acquired the disability after hire but not "on the job"

18. 7. What positions do employees with disabilities hold or have held in your current operation? (Check all that apply.)
   ■ a) Supervisor
   ■ b) Server
   ■ c) Kitchen Helper
   ■ d) Cook
   ■ e) Dishwasher
   ■ f) Cashier
   ■ g) Maintenance
   ■ h) Laundry
   ■ i) Custodian
   ■ j) Other, please
       specify: ____________________________

   6. Part V: What about you?
19. 1. What is your gender?
   ○ a) Female
   ○ b) Male

20. 2. What is your age?
   ○ a) 18 years old
   ○ b) 19-25 years old
   ○ c) 26-35 years old
   ○ d) 36-45 years old
   ○ e) 46-55 years old
   ○ f) over 55 years old

21. 3. What is your ethnicity?
   ○ a) American-Indian or Alaskan Native
   ○ b) African-American or Black (Non-Hispanic)
   ○ c) Hispanic
   ○ d) Asian or Pacific Islander
   ○ e) Caucasian
   ○ f) Hispanic
   ○ g) Multiracial
   ○ h) Ethnicity unknown
      ○ i) Other, please
          ○ specify: ________________________

22. 4. What is your current job position?
   ○ a) Superintendent
   ○ b) Foodservice Director
   ○ c) Foodservice Manager
   ○ d) Foodservice Supervisor
   ○ e) Head Cook
   ○ f) Other, please
      ○ specify: ________________________
23. 5. How long have you worked in the foodservice industry?
   ○ a) Less than 1 year
   ○ b) 1-5 years
   ○ c) 6-10 years
   ○ d) 11-15 years
   ○ e) 16-25 years
   ○ f) Over 25 years

24. 6. How long have you worked at your current organization?
   ○ a) Less than 1 year
   ○ b) 1-5 years
   ○ c) 6-10 years
   ○ d) 11-15 years
   ○ e) 16-25 years
   ○ f) Over 25 years

25. 7. What experiences do you have or have you had with people with disabilities? (Check all that apply.)
   ○ a) No experience
   ○ b) Myself, I am disabled
   ○ c) Family, I have/had a disabled family member
   ○ d) Friend, I have/had a disabled friend
   ○ e) Coworker, I have/had a disabled coworker
   ○ f) Other, please
      specify: 

'Thank You'/Redirect
Page

Thank you for taking our survey. Your response is very important to us.
APPENDIX J: PERMISSION TO USE BASE QUESTIONNAIRE

From Chi, Geng-Qing <cgengqi@wsu.edu>
To Paola Páez <pabolap@iastate.edu>
Date Thu, Feb 12, 2009 at 3:58 PM
Subject RE: Questionnaire
Mailed-by wsu.edu

Dear Paola,

Thanks for your interests in my disability-related study. Attached please find the survey questionnaire that I developed for the study. If you decide to adopt my scale, please make appropriate acknowledgement. If you have further questions, please let me know. Good luck with your dissertation.

p.s. The instrument was separated into two documents. Thus there are two files attached.

Sincerely,

Christina G. Chi, PhD
Assistant Professor
Washington State University
College of Business
School of Hospitality Business Management
481 Todd Hall
PO Box 644742
Pullman, WA 99164-4742
Phone: (509) 335-7661
Fax: (509) 335-3857
Email: cgengqi@wsu.edu
- Show quoted text -
APPENDIX K: PILOT TEST EVALUATION PAPER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How long did it take you to complete the questionnaire?
   _____ minutes

2. Where the questions clear and understandable?

   [ ] Yes  [ ] No

   If no please indicate question number and what needs to be clarified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Was the scale clear and understandable?

   [ ] Yes  [ ] No

   If no, please indicate what could be done to make it more understandable.

   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

4. What suggestions do you have to make this questionnaire better?

   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

   Thank you for your assistance.
APPENDIX L: PILOT TEST EVALUATION ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How long did it take you to complete the questionnaire?
   _____ minutes

2. Where the questions clear and understandable?
   □ Yes          □ No

   If no please indicate question number and what needs to be clarified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Was the scale clear and understandable?
   □ Yes          □ No

   If no, please indicate what could be done to make it more understandable.

   ______________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________

4. What suggestions do you have to make this questionnaire better?

   ______________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________

5. Did you experience any technical problems with the online questionnaire?
   □ Yes          □ No

   If yes, please indicate the problems you encountered

   ______________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________

Thank you for your assistance.
APPENDIX M: QUESTIONNAIRE FOLLOW-UP CARD

Dear General Manager:

About one week ago, you received a questionnaire regarding current training topics and methods used for employees with disabilities in the hospitality industry, as well as attitudes and knowledge about training employees with disabilities. If you have already completed and mailed the questionnaire, please accept our sincere gratitude. If you have not had the time to complete the questionnaire, we would appreciate you taking the time to do so as soon as possible, your input is really important. We would like to receive these back by the end of December.

If you have any questions, please contact one of us at the emails or phone numbers listed below. Thank you in advance for helping us with this research.

Paola Paez, MS
PhD Candidate
pabolap@iastate.edu
515-294-4494

Susan W. Arendt, PhD, RD
Assistant Professor
sarendt@iastate.edu
515-294-7575
APPENDIX N. MODIFIED COVER LETTER

Dear Hotel/Restaurant Manager:

At the beginning of December, you received a questionnaire regarding current training topics and methods used for employees with disabilities in the hospitality industry, as well as attitudes and knowledge about training employees with disabilities. If you have already completed and mailed the questionnaire, please accept our sincere gratitude. If you have not had the time to complete the questionnaire, I am sending another copy of the questionnaire for you to complete. We would appreciate you taking the time to do so as soon as possible, your input is really important.

As researchers at Iowa State University’s Hotel, Restaurant and Institution Management Program, we are conducting a questionnaire to gain your viewpoints about current training topics, methods used to train employees with disabilities in the hospitality industry, as well as attitudes and knowledge related to working with employees with disabilities. Results of the project will provide information for the hospitality industry about incorporating disabled workers and training methods used with disabled employees.

We need your input! Whether you currently employ disabled workers, formerly employed disabled workers, or have never employed disabled workers, your input is valuable. This is an opportunity for you to provide information on how to train people with disabilities and help identify potential training needs for disabled employees. The questionnaire will take less than 15 minutes to complete. It will be helpful if you can complete and return the questionnaire by _____. To return the completed questionnaire for free, please follow directions at the end of the questionnaire. If you are not the person in-charge of employee training, please give this questionnaire to that person to complete.

Your participation in this project is voluntary and you may refuse to participate. Returning a completed questionnaire indicates your willingness to participate in this project. To ensure confidentiality to the extent permitted by law, the following measures will be taken: 1) questionnaire responses will remain completely anonymous and no identifiers will be used; 2) only the identified researchers will have access to the research records; and 3) research records will be kept in a locked office.

If you have any questions, please contact one of us at the e-mails or phone numbers listed below. Thank you in advance for helping us with this research.

Paola Paez, MS  
PhD Candidate  
Iowa State University  
pabolap@iastate.edu  
515-294-4494

Susan Arendt, PhD, RD  
Assistant and Major Professor  
Iowa State University  
sarendt@iastate.edu  
515-294-7575
Dear Superintendent/Foodservice Director:

People with disabilities represent an important labor source for the hospitality industry. Disabled employees can learn necessary skills to perform their jobs and contribute to the success of an organization. In order to better prepare employees with disabilities it is important to identify current training topics and needs for this sector of the population.

As researchers at Iowa State University’s Hotel, Restaurant, and Institution Management Program, we are conducting a questionnaire to gain your viewpoints about current training topics, methods used for employees with disabilities in the hospitality industry, as well as training attitudes and knowledge related with employees with disabilities. Results of the project will provide information for the hospitality industry about incorporating disabled workers and training methods used with disabled employees.

**If you are not the person in-charge of training foodservice employees, please forward this email to that person.**

We need your input! Whether you currently employed disabled workers, formerly employed disabled workers, or have never employed disabled workers, your input is valuable. This is an opportunity for you to provide information on the training methods for people with disabilities and help identify potential training needs for disabled employees. The questionnaire will take **less than 15 minutes** to complete. It will be helpful if you can complete and return the questionnaire by ____.

Your participation in this project is voluntary and you may refuse to participate. Return of a completed questionnaire indicates your willingness to participate in this project. To ensure confidentiality to the extent permitted by law, the following measures will be taken: 1) questionnaire responses will remain completely anonymous and no identifiers will be used; 2) only the identified researchers will have access to the research records; and 3) research records will be kept in a locked office.

To complete the questionnaire please follow the link:

If you have any questions, please contact one of us at the e-mails or phone numbers listed below. Thank you in advance for helping us with this research.

Paola Paez, MS
PhD Candidate
pabolap@iastate.edu
515-294-4494

Susan W. Arendt, PhD, RD
Assistant Professor
sarendt@iastate.edu
515-294-7575
## APPENDIX P. INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS QUOTES: DEFINITION OF DISABILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Definition</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Restaurant</th>
<th>School Foodservice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical or mental “challenge” that needs special accommodation in order to do the same kind of a job that someone without the disability would need (Kathy)</td>
<td>Somebody that is uncapable of doing what a normal person would do (Ana)</td>
<td>So, we don’t have an official definition, at this point in time (Jane)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think I would define it … someone who usually would need to be hired to perform the same task over and over (Kathy)</td>
<td>Just like regular employees. They just need a little extra training, usually (Ana)</td>
<td>Based on my experiences… I would say disabilities are two different ways (Jane)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think of disabilities as a limitation of some sort, and being able to use a certain function – whether it’s eyes, hands, any sort of function that a person might have, it might be that they have limited use of that function (Mel)</td>
<td>Multitude of different things (similar theme with many – lots of different types). Vast array of people (Joe)</td>
<td>The response I received from our HR people is we define disability as the Disabilities Act, as amended last spring defines it and they (HR) haven’t defined it yet (Jane)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through limited capabilities to do something that somebody else without that disability might have (Mel)</td>
<td>Some of them, they don’t comprehend what we tell them, so we have to show them (Mike)</td>
<td>I would say disabilities are people need accommodations to do their normal work (Jane)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably where somebody that we may have to make some modifications in the job in order to get the job done (Mel)</td>
<td>Disability” in a workplace, I don’t think there is such a thing, because I think people can do anything as long as they’re coached and taught how to do it (Mike)</td>
<td>I would say a disabled employee is an employee that cannot do the standard job without making accommodations (Jane)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited functionality – not being able to possible use it to a capacity that they might have had before or maybe they</td>
<td>In general, people that are slower in picking up things, maybe (Mike)</td>
<td>In the school, we define a disability based on the legal aspect… and nobody really has a definition at this point (Jane)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somebody that needs more assistance than other people (Mike)</td>
<td>for me is a challenge of some nature for someone (Sue)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like helping them, and coaching them. Just really assisting them a lot more than you would “normal” people. And we’re not saying they’re not</td>
<td>what I am trying to say or sometimes they are not capable of doing something because um, of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mel</td>
<td>Can’t tell corporate definition of disability (Mel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mel</td>
<td>I would put it as any person with any type of handicap would be my definition. Whether it be wheelchair-bound, or blind or – any type of disability (Rob)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Any kind of handicap that would prevent a person from living a normal life (Rob)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Anything that prevents you from living a normal life like any other normal person would live without a handicap (Rob)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Not that there would be any less worthy of an employee, just that the disability usually is going to limit them to certain functions (Rob)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>“normal”, it’s just… Some people learn differently, some people can grasp the concept and others can’t, which is okay (Mike)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>“normal”, it’s just… Some people learn differently, some people can grasp the concept and others can’t, which is okay (Mike)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>“normal”, it’s just… Some people learn differently, some people can grasp the concept and others can’t, which is okay (Mike)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>their thinking um, is maybe not quite up to um the same level as, as what you or I may have the same level of thinking (Sue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>their thinking um, is maybe not quite up to um the same level as, as what you or I may have the same level of thinking (Sue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>So sometimes you can’t do a full, um, range of motions or jobs that someone else might be able to do but you can still do, um, some other things, if you, simpler things or something, other tasks that are not quite as complicated (Sue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>So sometimes you can’t do a full, um, range of motions or jobs that someone else might be able to do but you can still do, um, some other things, if you, simpler things or something, other tasks that are not quite as complicated (Sue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Whether it be because of an accident or just because of how they were born (Sue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Whether it be because of an accident or just because of how they were born (Sue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Disabled. I would say, that’s an employee that can no longer perform the services that we need get our jobs done, here at the school (Sara)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Disabled. I would say, that’s an employee that can no longer perform the services that we need get our jobs done, here at the school (Sara)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Disabled. I would say, that’s an employee that can no longer perform the services that we need get our jobs done, here at the school (Sara)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Disabled. I would say, that’s an employee that can no longer perform the services that we need get our jobs done, here at the school (Sara)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>That person is disabled, and they are no longer able to perform one or all of their duties, making it so that it would be a hardship to the other employees they work with (Sara)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>That person is disabled, and they are no longer able to perform one or all of their duties, making it so that it would be a hardship to the other employees they work with (Sara)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>No longer capable of doing their share, I guess (Sara)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>No longer capable of doing their share, I guess (Sara)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Meaning that sh/he no longer works for me, or they worked for me and have become disabled (Sara)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Meaning that sh/he no longer works for me, or they worked for me and have become disabled (Sara)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX Q: KNOWLEDGE QUESTIONS MEANS

Table 6.1: Mean Ratings for Knowledge Questions: responses from School Foodservice, Hotel, and Restaurant Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable about ADA(^b)</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable about physical disabilities</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable about mental disabilities</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable about reasonable accommodations</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable about EEOC's role(^b)</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate knowledge to train employee with PD(^b)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable about legal issues</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable about hiring process</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate knowledge to train employees with MD(^b)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable about federal benefits</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable about state benefits</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Mean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>.61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a\) Scale for statements: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree.

\( ^b\) ADA= American with Disabilities Act, EEOC=Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, PD=Physical Disability, MD=Mental Disability.
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