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ABSTRACT

Employee hiring is a crucial function in any organization. Adherence to hiring practices that are fair, ethical, and non-discriminatory are vital to both organizations and job applicants. This three-phase study examined hiring practices in the restaurant industry with a focus on the interview step from the perspectives of human resource (HR) managers, unit-level managers, and job applicants. Significant differences were found between the Council of Hotel and Restaurant Trainers HR managers’ attitudes toward ethical hiring and ethnicity, while significant differences were observed between organizational size and perceptions of ethical hiring within organizations. Unit-level restaurant managers from California restaurants used a variety of methods when recruiting and hiring employees and believed they had adequate policies and procedures in place to ensure ethical hiring. While, verbal and non-verbal cues of the interviewer were perceived as indicators of ethical or unethical hiring practices by job applicants who interviewed for employment in California restaurants. Given the diversity in today’s labor market, findings from this study offer a promising view that conveys potential for impacting operations and thus affecting the hiring of millions of foodservice workers.

Key words: Diversity, employment, ethical hiring, hiring practices, human resources, interviews, job applicants, restaurants.
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The restaurant industry is one of the most dynamic industries in the United States (U.S) (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). According to the National Restaurant Association (NRA) (2013) the restaurant industry employs around 13 million workers, making it one of the largest employers in the U.S. and accounts for nearly 10% of the total U.S. workforce. The restaurant industry is expected to add an additional 1.4 million jobs over the next decade, with employment reaching 14.4 million by 2023. Positions that combine both food preparation and service are expected to increase by 403,000 by 2021, while wait staff jobs are expected to grow by 240,000 during the same period. During the same 10-year period, the number of first-line supervisors and managers of food-preparation and-serving workers is expected to increase by more than 12 percent.

In order for restaurants to compete in today’s competitive environment, restaurant management personnel must work towards attracting, recruiting, developing, and retaining an efficient and capable workforce. Aghazadeh (2004) emphasized that a diverse workforce provides unparalleled opportunities for companies and individuals to tap the ideas, creativity, and potential contributions inherent in a diverse workforce. Organizational culture, according to Dibble (2001), entails the shared values, beliefs, behavior, and background of the organization's members. Culture is made up of the values, beliefs, underlying assumptions, attitudes, and behaviors shared by a group of people (Klein, Knight, Ziegert, Lim, & Saltz, 2011). Understanding this requirement enables managers to provide a workplace where people from different backgrounds are easily assimilated into the organization.

The term diversity was originally used to refer to groups that were underrepresented in the workplace, “… individuals’ social identities including age, sexual orientation, physical disability, socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity, workplace role/position, religious and spiritual orientation, and work/family concerns……” (American Psychological Association, 2002, p. 10). Worell and Remer (2003) proposed a definition including —all aspects of a person’s social realities: gender, culture, ethnicity and national origin, immigration and
acculturation status, sexual and affectional orientation, age, education, socioeconomic status (SES), physical characteristics and abilities, intellectual abilities, and religious affiliation.

Organizations today increasingly recognize that their human resources are their most important resource (Love, Singh & Singh, 2011). To achieve this advantage, businesses require effective recruiting and selection procedures. Effective selection is based on maximizing person-job fit. The knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics of the job candidate (KSAOs) should closely match the core tasks, duties, and responsibilities of the job (Chatman, 1989). Thus, effective staffing requires that decision-makers involved in the selection process possess two sets of information: a) detailed information about the KSAOs of the applicant and b) the job description. In order to assess the candidates’ KSAOs and determine if they are best able to perform the job, the employer may use a variety of selection techniques such as the job application, resumes, references, interviews, an assortment of tests, and assessment centers (Gateway & Field, 1990).

To survive, a company must manage and utilize its diverse workplace effectively (Chen & Huang, 2010). Managing diversity in the workplace should be a part of an organization’s culture. A restaurant that is prepared for a change in worker demographics will be prepared for the future as the customer base changes, as well as the applicant pool. The restaurant will experience many of the advantages that a diverse workplace brings such as attracting and retaining the well qualified candidates and employees, and welcoming diners who prefer to patronizing establishments that employ a diverse workforce (Byrd-Giles, 2003). Hiring new workers, however, is a time-consuming and expensive process (Fernandez-Araoz, 1999). An effective hiring process can help individual restaurant teams navigate through the recruitment process and select the right person for the job who will become a member of their diverse team.

**Objectives of the Study**

The specific objectives of this study were:

1. Assess human resources managers’ attitudes towards workplace diversity and ethical hiring.
2. Assess human resources managers’ and unit-level managers’ knowledge of ethical hiring practices.
3. Assess current hiring practices and procedures used by unit-level managers in California restaurants.

4. Define the hiring processes based on terminology used in the restaurant industry.

5. Utilize the definition to develop a questionnaire to explore interview experiences of job applicants in the California restaurant industry.

**Significance of the Study**

There is a dearth of literature related to hiring practices in the restaurant industry. However, some of the available literature underscores the need to study hiring practices as it accents the inherent value for organizations. Besides improving worker productivity, effective hiring practices may also help mitigate claims of discrimination. The purpose of this study was to obtain experiences of job applicants coupled with attitude and knowledge of human resources professionals and combine the two parts in a holistic manner so as to promote fair and ethical hiring practices in the foodservice industry.

Qualitative and quantitative methods were used to collect, analyze, and gain a better understanding of the hiring practices in the California restaurant industry. In the first phase, using an online questionnaire, human resources managers provided information about their knowledge and attitudes in relation to hiring procedures and practices within their organization, how they understand ethical hiring, and the procedures used in their organization. In the second phase, managers from California restaurants were surveyed about the knowledge, attitudes, and procedures in place for hiring. In the third phase, open-ended interviews with job applicants were conducted to reveal information about the experiences of job applicants during the hiring process.

**Definitions of Terms**

Listed below are the definitions of the key terms used in the study.

**Hiring Process:** involves recruiting, processing, eliminating, and selecting candidates for employment. (Fernandez-Araoz, 1999).

**Diversity:** (1) “Variety, or the opposite of homogeneity. In social organizations the term usually refers to the range of personnel who more accurately represent minority populations and people from varied backgrounds, cultures, ethnicities, and viewpoints…” (Barker, 2003, p. 126).
“A broad definition of diversity ranges from personality and work style to all of the visible dimensions of diversity such as race, age, ethnicity or gender, to secondary influences such as religion, socioeconomics and education, to work diversities such as management and union, functional level and classification or proximity/distance to headquarters.” (Society for Human Resource Management, 2005).

**Recruitment:** is the set of activities and processes used to legally obtain a sufficient number of qualified people at the right place and time so that the people and the organization can select each other in their own best short and long term interests (Schuler, 1987, p. 112).

**Equal Opportunity:** A right (supposedly guaranteed by both federal and state laws) to be free of any discrimination in employment, education, housing or credit rights because of a person’s race, marital status, color, sex, sexual orientation, religion, national origin, age (over 40), pregnancy, citizenship, veteran status, physical and mental disability or medical condition. A person who believes he/she has not been granted equal opportunity or has been outright sexually harassed or discriminated against may bring a lawsuit under federal and most state laws, or file a complaint with the federal Equal Opportunity Employment Commission (EEOC) or with a state equal opportunity agency (Hill & Hill, 2002, p. 194).

**Social Desirability Response Bias:** The social desirability response bias refers to the tendency of individuals to over-report socially desirable characteristics and behaviors and under-report undesirable characteristics and behaviors (Dalton & Ortegren, 2011). For example, in this study, a socially desirable response would be if human resource managers rate importance of workplace diversity and ethical hiring as highly desirable but disagree with the statement “I never litter”.

**Dissertation Organization**

This dissertation comprises of five additional chapters and uses the alternate format. Chapters 1, 2 and 3 will present the Introduction, Literature Review, and Methodology, respectively. Chapter 4 will be a journal article representing Phase 1. Chapter 5 will be another journal article representing Phase 2 and 3. The final chapter, Chapter 6, presents
general conclusions from the study. Appendices and a reference list are provided following Chapter 6.
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Restaurant Industry

The restaurant industry is one of the most dynamic industries in the U.S. (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). According to the National Restaurant Association (NRA) (2012), the restaurant industry employs around 13 million workers, making it one of the largest employers in the U.S. and accounts for nearly 10% of the total U.S. workforce. The restaurant industry is expected to add an additional 1.3 million jobs over the next decade, with employment reaching 14.1 million by 2021. Positions that combine both food preparation and service are expected to increase by 403,000 by 2021, while wait staff jobs are expected to grow by 240,000 during the same period. During the same 10-year period, the number of first-line supervisors and managers of food-preparation and-serving workers is expected to increase by 102,000, or more than 12 percent. As a major employer in the U.S., the restaurant industry is vital to the success of many other industries in the economy. Every $1 million spent in restaurants generates an additional 34 jobs in the national economy. In addition, every restaurant job supports a full-time job elsewhere in the economy; essentially any industry that is associated with the operation of a restaurant experiences an increase in employment when the restaurant industry grows (NRA, 2011).

Today, the restaurant industry is defined in its broadest sense to all types of establishments where food is regularly served outside the home. Such establishments include formal restaurants, hotel dining rooms, coffee shops, family restaurants, specialty and ethnic restaurants and fast-food outlets (Payne-Palacio & Theis, 2010).

Formal restaurants: The full-service sector is characterized by full table service and by menus and food preparation processes that require developed and versatile cooking skills. Examples of full-service restaurants include Maggiano’s, Chili’s, Outback and the Olive Garden. Full-service restaurants start with raw food, which is initially processed by unskilled or semiskilled workers, cooked or prepared by skilled workers, and served by wait staff.

Hotel dining rooms: There is a long tradition of hotels providing both food and accommodation for travelers as part of an integrated hospitality product (Hemmington & King, 2000). Many hotel and restaurant companies work together to enhance hotel dining...
and they include: Hilton with Benihana; Holiday Inn with TGI Friday’s and Denny’s; and Marriott with Pizza Hut, TGI Friday’s and Ruth’s Chris Steakhouse.

Coffee shops, family restaurants, specialty and ethnic restaurants: This sector is characterized by price, skill, and employment stability levels that lie between the fast-food and the formal restaurants. Typical restaurants include Denny’s, Sizzler, and Perkin’s. Two characteristics distinguish this sector. Unlike the fast-food sector, intermediate sector restaurants have table or counter service, though it is less formal than the full-service sector and the menu is more extensive than the fast-food sector but it usually consists of a limited number of easily prepared items. The limited menus, the extensive use of pre-prepared foods, and the informal atmosphere obviate the need for the well-developed cooking and serving skills that are required in the full-service sector.

Fast-food Outlets: Fast-food establishments owe their success to low prices, fast service, and advertising. Typical fast food restaurants include McDonald’s, Chipotle and Burger King. Since none of the jobs are specialized, hiring can be easily done at short notice among the other employees. As a result, the majority of the employees in the sector are part-time, short-term workers.

Demographics of the Restaurant Industry

The restaurant industry is rich in terms of the diversity of its workforce (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). The restaurant industry employs more minority managers than any other industry, and has a broader representation of minorities and women in management positions than the overall economy. Forty-seven percent of foodservice managers in the U.S. are women, compared to only 38 percent among all other management occupations in the economy. Ethnic minorities comprise a higher percentage of workers amongst management positions in the restaurant industry (9% Black/African-American, 15% Hispanic origin, and 11% Asians compared to other management oriented occupations in the U.S. (6% Black or African-American, 8% Hispanic origin, and 4% Asian) (National Restaurant Association, 2012). With the increasing diversity of the U.S. population it is expected this diversity will continue to be reflected in its workforce.
Significance of Workforce Diversity

The term *diversity* was originally used to refer to groups that were underrepresented in the workplace, “… individuals’ social identities including age, sexual orientation, physical disability, socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity, workplace role/position, religious and spiritual orientation, and work/family concerns….” (American Psychological Association, 2002, p. 10). In order for restaurants to compete in today’s competitive environment, restaurants must work towards attracting, recruiting, developing, and retaining an efficient and capable workforce. Aghazadeh (2004) emphasizes that a diverse workforce provides tremendous opportunities for companies and individuals to tap the ideas, creativity, and potential contributions inherent in a diverse workforce. Organizational culture, according to Dibble (2001), entails the shared values, beliefs, behavior, and background of the organization's members. Culture is made up of the values, beliefs, underlying assumptions, attitudes, and behaviors shared by a group of people (Klein et al, 2011). Understanding this requirement enables managers to provide a workplace where people from different backgrounds are easily assimilated into the organization.

In order to survive, a company must manage and utilize its diverse workplace effectively. Managing diversity in the workplace should be a part of the culture of the entire organization. Moreover, restaurant personnel that are prepared for a change in demographics will be prepared for the future as the customer base changes as well as the applicant pool. The restaurant will also be able to experience many of the advantages that a diverse workplace can bring, such as attracting and retaining the most qualified candidates and welcoming diners who prefer to patronize establishments that employ a diverse workforce (Byrd-Giles, 2003).

With all the positive aspects that diversity brings to a company, some would see a few disadvantages. Some employees may feel threatened or uncomfortable by working with individuals of a different age, sexual orientation, or culture. There is an increase in training costs associated with seminars, programs and lectures needed to promote and support diversity initiatives within the company. These types of training are given to all levels of staff within the organization with the objective to teach employees how to accept the personalities,
ideas, or cultures of other groups. These programs are designed to teach people how to deal with conflicts and prejudice in a professional and civil manner (White, 1999, p. 478).

One major disadvantage of increasing the diversity in a company is reverse discrimination, a topic that has generated public debate over the past decades (Fullinwider, 1980). At the heart of the “reverse discrimination” debate are reports of successful plaintiffs who have won multi-million dollar settlements while claiming to be victims of overzealous, preferential hiring practices (e.g., McAree, 2005). The most common cited example of “reverse discrimination” involves a White male who is not chosen for a job (promotion, contract, or college admission) that he ordinarily would have received if affirmative action programs did not facilitate the hire choice of a less qualified person of color or woman (Pincus, 2000). Reverse discrimination is associated with affirmative action policies where the victim’s claim that they are equally or more qualified for the position, yet a minority applicant was hired (Brunner, 2003). In some cases this can lead to legal actions, but it can cause rejection of the minority worker by other workers in the company who feel the hiring was unfair.

According to Perkins (1993), people will prefer teamwork when they view relationships in terms of groups, while others will feel most comfortable in informal team settings because of their familiarity with individuals. Perkins (1993), however, cautions against combining two variant cultural groups without providing diversity training as it can adversely impact an organization. Culture is “broadly defined as characteristic ways of thinking, feeling and behaving shared among members of an identifiable group” (Gibson & Gibbs, 2006, p. 460). In today’s cultures, various groups possess distinct identities. These include physical or observable features known as phenotypes. Cox (1993) asserts that “people with phenotypes that are different from those of the majority tend to have less favorable work experiences and career outcomes such as satisfaction, compensation, and promotion.”

Research has revealed that strong identification with the majority culture enhances one’s career outcomes (Carnevale & Stone, 1994). An organization’s culture determines the ability of members from other groups to perform within the organization. An appropriate culture promotes harmony and reduces negative perceptions and claims of discrimination. An
excellent example of promoting culture to employees is found at Starbucks. At its website, the company describes its culture in six “Guiding Principles”. The first is “Provide a great work environment and treat each other with respect and dignity”; and the second states: “Embrace diversity as an essential component in the way we do business.” Coffee, the company’s signature product, is not mentioned until principle number three.

Every day, individuals from minority groups face challenges of prejudice, discrimination, and stereotyping (Graziano, Bruce, Sheese, & Tobin, 2007). Diverse teams can cause communication problems among supervisors, co-workers and customers (Cox, 1993) due to inherent differences between groups. The lack of understanding of different cultures and values can cause misunderstandings, conflict, dissatisfied customers and eventually loss of business (Cushner & Brislin, 1996). Other problems associated with diverse teams were decreased cohesion and trust (Härtel & Fujimoto, 1999; O’Reilly III, Caldwell & Barnett, 1989); increased absenteeism (Härtel & Fujimoto, 1999; Tsui, Egan & O’Reilly III, 1992); increased dissatisfaction and turnover (Härtel & Fujimoto, 1999; O’Reilly III et al., 1989; Shaw & Barrett-Power, 1998).

Stereotyping is another challenge faced by all individuals in the workplace and can have negative impacts on employee morale and performance (Steele, Spencer, & Aronson, 2002). Stereotyping is defined as “one, as a person, group, event, or issue is thought to typify or conform to an unvarying pattern or manner, lacking any individuality” (Webber, 1984). In other words, individuals are viewed as members of groups and associate preconceived notions or opinions stored in our minds about that particular group to the individual. An example of stereotyping would be when an individual reviews a resume with a Hispanic sounding surname and automatically assume that the applicant’s first language is not English or the applicant is not fluent. Stereotyping is a factor in lower acceptance of minority group members as leaders, job segregation based on identity, and differences in hiring and performance ratings between majority and minority group members (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Hence, diversity should be incorporated into organizations with care and an organization’s commitment towards accepting and valuing diversity should be demonstrated at all stages beginning with the hiring process.
Hiring in Restaurants

Hiring of new workers is a time-consuming and expensive process and includes a number of steps (Fernandez-Araoz, 1999; Gregoire, 2010). It can involve:

- Posting a job advertisement in appropriate places;
- Evaluating the information provided on each job application;
- Screening candidates to determine which ones to interview;
- Verifying references and information;
- Conducting personal interviews; and
- Deciding who will be offered the job.

An effective hiring process helps individual restaurant teams navigate through the recruitment process and select the right candidates for the job. Hiring is a component of the selection process and consists of the multiple steps starting with recruitment of applicants and ending with employee orientation after the applicant is selected (Gregoire, 2010, p. 425).

While the selection process should be conducted according to federal and state guidelines (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2011), the selection process is susceptible to bias that might impact the hiring process. Employment hiring decisions have been found to be influenced by factors such as race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, age, disability, gender orientation, and other personal characteristics limiting employment opportunities for historically excluded groups (such as African-Americans, Asians, Hispanics, homosexuals, persons with disabilities, women) (Bendick & Nunes, 2012).

According to Alder and Gilbert (2006) it may occasionally happen that ‘the greatest happiness for the greatest number’ requires considering how a particular hiring decision fits in with the overall pattern of hiring of the company, or even overall patterns of hiring in society. Employers can get first impressions about candidates (such as their appearance when arriving to the interview or the level of friendliness if they have had a casual phone conversation prior to the physical interview) and decide upon the selection prior to investing in more expensive selection measures such as interviews. Reviewing applicant resumes is a common practice when filling entry-level positions (Hutchinson, 1984), especially for those
organizations that consider large numbers of applicants for a limited number of job openings. Some hiring managers knowingly fill positions using invalid selection methods (Sims, 2007). As noted by Sessa and Taylor (2000):

“Top level executives rely primarily on interviews, resumes and references when collecting information about candidates in the pool. They do not often use the more sophisticated selection tools available, such as individual assessment centers, or tests” (p. 38).

From a selection perspective, the goal of any selection process is to select the most qualified applicants for the job. Some employers use resumes as an initial applicant screening tool because they provide an opportunity to appraise the applicants’ qualifications such as education, work experience, and skills (Knouse, 1989). Using a combination of tools versus using just one selection process will lead to a more thorough assessment of the candidate and reduce the chance of adverse impact on minority candidates, thereby indemnifying the organization’s hiring practice (Goffin, Rothstein & Johnston, 1996). Adverse impact can be treated fundamentally as discrimination, and organizations have a financial interest in avoiding any claims of discrimination amongst their workforce. With the advent of resume submission via the internet (Lievens, van Dam, & Anderson, 2002; Mohamed, Orife, & Wibowo, 2002), evaluation of applicants’ resumes is likely to remain as an important pre-employment screening device.

Research supporting the validity and utility of robust selection methods continues to remain a driving force for proper hiring and selection. For example, in a meta-analysis covering 85 years of research, Schmidt and Hunter (1998) concluded that assessment methods are consistently better predictors of future job performance than interviews. Prior to hiring new employees, a restaurant manager who moves carefully and deliberately through the screening and selection process can better ensure that the employees selected for hire are the most qualified for the job.

In today’s economy where competition is intense and technological change occurs constantly, organizations increasingly recognize that their human resources personnel are their most valuable resource, and their primary source of sustainable, competitive advantage (Pfeffer, 1998). To achieve this, the success of a business requires effective recruiting and selection procedures. Effective selection is based on maximizing the person-job fit. The
knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics of the job candidate (KSAOs) should match closely with the core tasks, duties, and responsibilities of the job (Chatman, 1989). Thus, effective staffing demands that decision-makers who are involved in the selection process possess two sets of information: 1) they must obtain detailed information about the KSAOs of the applicant and 2) they must know the job description thoroughly. In order to assess the KSAOs of applicants and determine if who is best able to perform the job, the employer may use a variety of selection techniques such as application responses, resumes, references, interviews, an assortment of tests, and assessment centers (Gateway & Field, 1990).

Once applicants have undergone preliminary screening, employment interviews follow, which are the most common selection tool used by many organizations (Bell, 1992) as they are inexpensive, less time consuming and easy to conduct (Martin & Nag, 1989) and allow the applicants to learn more about the job, provide interviewers with an opportunity to answer applicants’ questions, and produce information about an applicant’s skill level, personality, and company fit (Martin & Nag, 1989; Alfus, 1999). Employment interviews can be either unstructured or structured (Gregoire, 2010, p 425). At first glance the unstructured interview appears attractive because of its loose framework, discretionary content, and conversational flow. However, the validity of unstructured interviews is questionable (Reilly & Chao, 1982).

Besides adversely affecting the reliability and validity of the unstructured interview, the lack of standardization in the interview procedure and questions makes the unstructured interview susceptible to legal challenges (Terpstra, Mohamed, & Kethley, 1999). In a typical unstructured interview, the interviewer asks questions based on the applicant’s resume. There may be several questions that are asked in the interview process that may not be acceptable. For example, questions that are geared to obtain information about race, gender, religion, marital status, pregnancy, age, physical or mental disability, ethnic background, country of origin, sexual orientation, or medical condition are illegal and making employment decisions based on them opens the door to litigation (EEOC, 2012). Most unstructured interviews are random events. For example, if selection decisions were purely random and half of all applicants were hired, the odds of hiring an above-average performer
would be 50/50 (half or 50 percent of those hired should perform above average and half should be below average). The odds of hiring an above-average performer using an unstructured interview as opposed to relying totally on chance would improve to only 56 percent (Huffcutt & Arthur, 1994).

On the other hand, structured interviews ensure candidates have equal opportunities to provide information and are assessed accurately and consistently. Huffcutt and Arthur (1994) have shown that structuring the interview can pay handsome dividends. The average structured interview will increase the odds of hiring an above-average performer by 70%. While recognizing that no selection method is perfect, this still represents a dramatic improvement. Unstructured interviews are among the least reliable and least valid methods of assessing job candidates while properly structured interviews are among the most reliable (Conway, Jako & Goodman, 1995) and valid methods (Campion, Palmer & Campion, 1997).

Best practices are defined as “practices which are most appropriate under the circumstances, esp. as considered acceptable or regulated in business; techniques or methodologies that, through experience and research, have reliably led to desired or optimum results” (Webster’s, 2011). Looi, Marusarz, & (2004) emphasized the following best practices in human resources: provide an organization maximum opportunity to remain an employer of choice, common focus on the sustainability of employee practices, emphasis on doing a few core things very well, and an organizational culture that reinforces adaptability and diversity.

Woods (1997); Groves, Martin and Beck (2000) found a direct effect of inadequate hiring processes on employee turnover and cited the employment interviews as the main culprit. Past research also highlights that interviews allow the applicants to learn more about the job, answer the applicant’s questions and maintain good public relations between the interviewer and applicant as well as produce information about an applicant’s skill level, personality, and company fit (Martin & Nag, 1989; Alfus, 1999).

Another widely used selection technique is pre-employment testing of applicants (Goffin, Jang, & Skinner, 2011; Kantrowitz, Dawson, & Fetzer, 2011). While this may appear costly and time consuming, particularly for managers in smaller companies, careful valid pre-employment testing can offer legal protection and also minimize poor hires.
Additionally, pre-employment testing is grounded in a 1971 Supreme Court decision (Thompson & Thompson, 1982) which provided a major precedent in pre-employment testing. In this case, an applicant for a janitorial job was required to take an intelligence test and show a high school diploma. When the company did not hire him, the applicant filed a lawsuit against the company in the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court ruled that the company's employment requirements did not pertain to applicants' ability to perform the job, and so was discriminating against African-American employees, even though the company had not intended it to do so.

The practice of organizations encouraging their employees to refer friends and relatives to apply for open positions and who ultimately are hired has become common, most likely because employee referrals are cost-effective (Morehart, 2001) and provide significant positive outcomes for the recruited individual and the organization. Employee referrals are a form of word-of-mouth communication, which is defined as "informal, person-to-person communication between a perceived non-commercial communicator and a receiver regarding a brand, a product, an organization, or a service" (Harrison-Walker, 2001, p. 63). Upon completion of the interview process, the employer will select that applicant who best meets the needs and qualifications of the position and extend the job offer. While federal, state, and organizational regulations are in place to prevent inadequacies in the hiring process, discrimination of applicants in the hiring process can still occur.

**Discrimination in Restaurants**

“Discrimination” occurs when employees suffer unfavorable or unfair treatment because of their race, religion, national origin, disability or veteran status, or other legally protected characteristics (Gold, 1985). In 2010, claims of discrimination rose by 24% from 2005 to the highest level in 13 years (EEOC, 2011). The EEOC protects workers from workplace discrimination. Under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA). It is illegal to discriminate against workers based on any of the following criteria: age, disability (mental or physical), pregnancy, sex, national origin, race, color, or religion. Additionally, workers cannot be discriminated against in the following facets of employment: hiring, firing,
compensating, assigning, classifying, recruiting, job advertisements, testing, using company facilities, training programs, getting or keeping benefits programs.

Discrimination is a social problem that can prevent individuals from obtaining employment. The restaurant industry may not be at the origin of this social problem, however, as one of the biggest employers in the economy, restaurants can make a difference. Federal law prohibits workplace discrimination in the following situations: recruiting and hiring, conducting job evaluations, developing promotion policies, conducting training, developing compensation and disciplinary action plans (United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), 2011). The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) (United States Department of Labor, 2009) governs minimum wage, overtime pay and recordkeeping, and employment of minors (under 18 years of age) for Federal, State and local governments, as well as the private sector. The FLSA specifically prescribes regulations that protect workers’ rights, specifically those who are minors (under age 18) or groups who may become victims of discrimination.

However, discrimination is difficult to document. Information that may be accessible to those outside an organization is about who the organization has hired, but not about the entire applicant pool. While disclosure of applicant information may be protected by federal laws, such information is likely ambiguous and open to many interpretations. Those individuals that are not hired will seldom know the reasons for not receiving a job offer, and even when the reasons are known, it may be impossible to gather relevant evidence to document that discrimination was at play. It is also possible that those applicants who are turned down may have received other job offers, and hence do not explore the reasons for not receiving a job offer and do not pursue legal action if discrimination is suspected. Employees already working for an organization are far more likely than applicants to file discrimination lawsuits, and damages awarded to them tend to be greater than those received by applicants (Bloch, 1994). Thus, the hiring process provides opportunities for discrimination because the discrimination is hard to document, documentation is often ambiguous, and a plaintiff is often lacking (Petersen & Saporta 2004).

To provide evidence for discrimination at play in the hiring process, Bertrand and Mullainathan (2002) sent out 5000 résumés in response to help wanted advertisements for
jobs such as cashiers at retail establishments, clerical jobs in a mail room, and office/sales management positions in Boston and Chicago. The researchers randomly assigned stereotypically White-sounding names, such as Emily, or stereotypically African American names, such as Lakisha, to otherwise identical resumés. Applicants with White-sounding names received 50% more calls for interviews than those with African American-sounding names. In a similar study, Bendick, Rodriguez & Jayaraman (2010) recruited a total of 37 White, African American, Asian-American and Latino individuals to participate in a study by posing as job applicants at restaurants seeking employment. The job-seekers were sent to 181 NYC restaurants between January 2006 and June 2007. Grouped in pairs with different races (but matched for age, appearance and gender), participants approached restaurants within 30 minutes of each other to apply for the job. The study found evidence of discrimination at play 31% of the time. The authors asserted that while all job applicants were treated with courtesy, minorities were only 54% as likely as Whites to receive a job offer. Of those minorities that were hired, differences remained between them and their White counterparts. Higher income-earning sections of the restaurant’s dining room were given to Whites, while the minority servers were assigned lower earning sections resulting in average of 12% lower earnings.

Past research has recommended that employers review their recruitment practices and selection criteria and promote diversity by removing any potential for discrimination (Carnevale & Stone, 1994; Graziano, et al, 2007; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Social and economic conditions are changing in much of the industrialized world. The decline of the manufacturing base and growth of the service sector has fundamentally altered the business and employment context, with different skill sets required compared to those required a generation ago. As a consequence of the emergence of this ‘new economy’, it is argued that employers are now competing with each other for the ‘best’ (meaning most talented, skilled and qualified) workers (Kandola & Fullerton 1994, p. 121).

Effective hiring is a fundamental human resources activity, one that if managed well can have a significant impact on organizational performance as well as lead to a more positive organizational image (Royce, 2007). Ineffective hiring has a number of cost implications for organizations: low morale which can affect employee performance; lost
business opportunities, as well as higher levels of employee turnover. Given the relationship between effective hiring practices and organizational performance, organizations need to ensure a more strategic approach to human resources planning before moving on to the actual recruitment and selection process (Garavan, Costine, & Heraty, 1995).

Job applicants who have a negative experience at the job interview might warn other potential applicants or may bring legal action against the restaurant. The purpose of this study was to assess human resources managers’ knowledge and attitudes, unit level restaurant managers’ perspectives and job applicants’ experiences with interviewing for jobs in the California restaurant industry. By assessing differences that might exist between these groups, human resource professionals can attempt to bridge the gaps in the hiring process by providing improved training, development of standard policies for the practice and enforcement of ethical hiring practices.
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

Introduction

There is a dearth of literature that has examined hiring practices in the foodservice industry. However, researchers have underscored the need to study hiring practices as it accents the inherent value of organizations. Besides improving productivity, effective hiring practices may also help mitigate claims of discrimination. The restaurant industry in California is a driving force in the state’s economy. Over 1.4 million workers are employed in over 62,000 eating and drinking places in California accounting for 10% of the total employment in the state (NRA, 2012). The California restaurant industry expects to add an additional 140,500 jobs over the next decade, with employment reaching 1.6 million by 2023. The purpose of this study was to investigate the experiences of job applicants coupled with the attitudes and knowledge of human resources professionals to gain a better understanding of the hiring practices currently being employed in the foodservice industry. The specific objectives of this study were:

1. Assess human resources managers’ attitudes towards workplace diversity and ethical hiring.
2. Assess human resources managers’ and unit-level managers’ knowledge of ethical hiring practices.
3. Assess current hiring practices and procedures used by unit-level managers in California restaurants.
4. Define the hiring processes based on terminology used in the restaurant industry.
5. Utilize the definition to develop a questionnaire to explore interview experiences of job applicants in the California restaurant industry.

Qualitative and quantitative methods were used to collect and analyze data to gain a better understanding of the hiring practices in the California restaurant industry. In the first phase, using an online questionnaire, human resources managers provided information about hiring procedures and practices within their organization that ensure ethical hiring and their definition of the ethical hiring process. In the second phase, unit level managers from California restaurants were surveyed about the knowledge, attitudes, and procedures in place.
for hiring. In the third phase, open-ended, interviews with job applicants were conducted to reveal information about the experiences of job applicants during the hiring process.

**Human Subjects**

The Iowa State University’s Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (IRB) (Appendix A) reviewed and approved the protocol prior to data collection. Participant health, rights and safety were protected by this process. Cover letters provided to all participants thoroughly explained the purpose of the study, assured confidentiality of responses, and ensured that participants were free of discomfort or risks. The researchers conducting this study completed the Human Subjects Research Assurance Training by Iowa State University.

**Research Design**

This study consisted of three phases. In phase 1, a web-based was used to assess attitudes towards workplace diversity, perceptions of ethical hiring within their organization, and their definitions of ethical hiring of human resources managers belonging to the Council of Hotel and Restaurant Trainers (CHART). In phase 2, web-based and paper-based questionnaires assessed California Restaurant Association (CRA) unit-level managers’ attitudes, knowledge, procedures, and training methods in place with relation to hiring. An interview guide was developed in Phase 3 to explore the experiences of applicants when interviewing for jobs in California restaurants and applicants’ views on what ethical hiring entails.

![Figure 1: Phases in this Study](image-url)
Phase 1: Questionnaires

Purpose

A questionnaire gathered information from human resource managers about attitudes towards workplace diversity and ethical hiring. The sample selection, content, procedures, and analysis are discussed below.

Sample

The target population for this study was human resource managers in the United States who belonged to the Council of Hotel and Restaurant Trainers (CHART). CHART (2012) is a professional organization made up of 330 members from more than 300 multi-unit restaurant and hotel companies in the United States. CHART represents a workforce of nearly 5 million workers. CHART membership includes all facets of hospitality training, learning and performance professionals; from entry level to senior executive belonging to companies operating restaurants. An email was sent to all CHART members requesting participation in this study. A screening question was included at the beginning of the questionnaire to allow only those participants who belonged to restaurant companies to participate in this study.

Questionnaire Content and Development

A web-based questionnaire was developed to explore human resources managers’ attitudes towards workplace diversity, perceptions towards ethical hiring within their organization, and their definition of ethical hiring. The questionnaire consisted of four sections. The first section consisted of questions related to respondent demographics. The second section assessed respondents’ attitudes towards diversity and workplace diversity. The third section assessed respondents’ perceptions of ethical hiring within their organization. A 5-point Likert-type scale and corresponding descriptors (SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, N = Neutral, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree) were used in the second and third section.

The fourth section consisted of the Social Desirability Scale (SDS-17), developed by Stober (1999, 2001), to identify respondents’ propensity to provide socially desirable responses. The Social Desirability Scale (SDS-17) is composed of 16 true or false items, e.g., “I will never live off other people,” “I sometimes litter.” It is a balanced index in that
one’s score increases by a true response on nine items, and by a false response on seven items. Fisher (2000) considered the SDS-17 “advantageous” over “troublesome” Crowne-Marlowe (CM) Social Desirability (Crowne and Marlowe, 1960) scale’s length of 33 items mainly taking issue with the latter’s length. The reliability and validity of the SDS-17 is well-established (Ellingson, Sackett, & Hough, 1999; Hancock, & Flowers, 2001; Musch, Brockhaus, & Broeder, 2002) and was found to be valid in studies in the United States (Blake, Valdiserri, Neuenford, and Nemeth, 2006). Additionally, an open-ended question “Please define what ethical hiring means to you?” was included to determine what respondents considered as “ethical hiring” and if the definition varied among human resource managers.

Three hospitality management educators with expertise in human resource management and foodservice operations evaluated the questionnaire for content and clarity. Suggestions for revisions were incorporated into the questionnaire before proceeding with the pilot study. The questionnaire was pilot-tested with ten human resource managers belonging to CHART with expertise in human resource management and restaurant operations. Human resource managers included in the pilot study were not included in the final sample. The purpose of the pilot test was to seek feedback on clarity and content of the questionnaire, response choices, time needed to complete the questionnaire, provide additional comments and suggestions for improvement. Some respondents suggested adding “training” as a distinct specific job function in the “human resources” response choice for clarity. Additional suggestions regarding the expansion of languages fluently spoken response choices were also incorporated to improve the questionnaire. Suggestions provided were incorporated into the questionnaire prior to distribution to the sample.

**Data collection**

An email containing the cover letter (Appendix B) and a hyperlink directing participants to the consent form (Appendix C) and questionnaire (Appendix D) was sent. The questionnaire was distributed electronically using SurveyGizmo™, a web-based survey tool for users to conduct survey research. The purpose of the study was explained at the beginning of the questionnaire and a screening question was included to only allow respondents who were working in the restaurant industry to participate in this study.
Respondents were not allowed to go back to previous pages or change answers as they moved along the questionnaire. To ensure the anonymity of respondents, Internal Protocol (IP) addresses were not collected. The College of Human Sciences Office of Distance Education and Educational Technology (ODEET) collected the email addresses of participants who submitted the questionnaire (complete or incomplete) and included them in the drawing to receive one of eight $25 gift cards. The gift cards were specifically chosen from a company that CHART members prefer. Following Dillman’s recommendation (Dillman, 2008), reminders containing the link (Appendix E) to the questionnaire were sent via email at week 1, 2, and 3 to encourage participation.

**Data analysis**

Data analysis was conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 19.0. Data coding and entry followed the procedures recommended by Dillman (2008). The data were summarized using descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequencies, and percentage). The Cronbach’s coefficient of reliability (α) was computed to determine the reliability of the scales. Cronbach's alpha determines the internal consistency or average correlation of items in a survey instrument to gauge its reliability (Cronbach, 1951). Finally, t tests and one-way ANOVA were conducted to explore how the human resources managers’ attitudes differed based on their demographic characteristics such as gender, income, education, and age.

**Phase 2: Questionnaire**

**Purpose**

A questionnaire gathered information from restaurant managers in California about their attitudes, knowledge, procedures and training methods in place with relation to hiring. The sample selection, content, procedures, and analysis are discussed below.

**Sample**

A random sample of unit-level managers from multi-unit restaurant chains (three or more units) belonging to the California Restaurant Association (CRA) was used in this study. The CRA directory contains a total of 53 multi-unit companies who operate 667 restaurants, which contain a mix of companies with central hiring departments and some independent
units with significant presence in the state of California. All directory contacts were sent an email inviting them to participate in the survey.

**Questionnaire Content and Development**

The goal of the questionnaire was to comprehensively explore unit-level managers’ attitudes, knowledge, current procedures, and training methods in place for hiring workers in their organization (front of house or back of house). The questionnaire consisting of five sections was developed after an extensive review of literature on employee hiring. The first section consisted of 30 multiple-choice questions related to organizational practices and procedures used in the hiring process. The second section of five questions assessed respondents’ knowledge about interview questions considered acceptable when conducting a job interview with three response options (Yes, No, Unsure). In addition, six items that assessed respondents’ perceptions of their knowledge about ethical hiring practices and federal regulations, as it applies to hiring, were developed using a 5-point Likert-type scale and corresponding descriptors (SA = *Strongly Agree*, A = *Agree*, N = *Neutral*, D = *Disagree*, SD = *Strongly Disagree*).

The third section consisting of seven items assessed respondents’ attitudes towards interviewing and ethical hiring using a 5-point Likert-type scale and corresponding descriptors (SA = *Strongly Agree*, A = *Agree*, N = *Neutral*, D = *Disagree*, SD = *Strongly Disagree*). The fourth section measured social desirability bias using the 16-item Social Desirability Scale (SDS-17). The SDS-17 is easier to use than the 33-item Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale (Fisher, 2000). Researchers have found SDS-17 to be a reliable and valid measure of social desirability bias (Ellingson et al., 1999; Hancock, & Flowers, 2001; Musch et al., 2002). The fifth section consisted of demographic questions.

**Pilot Test**

Five individuals with expertise in human resource management and restaurant operations reviewed and approved the questionnaire prior to use. Ten individuals from CRA, who were not included in the final sample, with expertise in human resource management and restaurant operations reviewed and approved the questionnaire for clarity and appropriateness. Any relevant suggestions or inputs were incorporated to improve the questionnaire. Respondents suggested adding “human resource consultant” as a category
under current job function and clarity on knowledge and attitudes statements. The final revised questionnaire was sent to all CRA members.

**Questionnaire Distribution**

The questionnaire was distributed electronically using SurveyGizmo™, a web-based survey program, and when requested, paper-questionnaires were sent. An e-mail was sent to potential respondents with a hyperlink directing him/her to the questionnaire which also contained the informed consent form (Appendix F). At the beginning of the questionnaire (Appendix G) the purpose of the study was be explained. To ensure the anonymity of the data collected, Internal Protocol (IP) addresses were not linked to the responses. Respondents who submitted the questionnaire (complete or incomplete) and provided their email address were included in a drawing to receive one of eight $25 gift cards. Following Dillman’s recommendation (Dillman, 2008), reminders containing the link to the questionnaire were sent via email at week 2, 3, and 4 to encourage participation. Managers of organizations that received paper-based copies were sent email reminders at week 2 to remind their unit-level managers to complete and return the questionnaires.

**Data analysis**

Questionnaires were coded and the data processed and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 19.0. Data coding and entry followed the procedures recommended by Dillman (2008). Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequencies, and percentage) were computed. Cronbach’s coefficients of reliability (α) were computed.

**Phase 3: Unstructured Interviews**

**Purpose**

The purpose of the interviews was to explore participants’ experiences when interviewing for a job in the California restaurant industry and their views on ethical hiring. The sample selection, content, procedures, and analysis are discussed below.

**Sample**

Participants were drawn from a population of students studying in the Hospitality Management and Dietetics program (N = 500) at a large university (N = 38,000) in California. Efforts were made to recruit at least a male and female participant representing
Asian, African American, Latino, and White ethnicities which reflected the institution’s student demographics. Participants were recruited through recruitment flyers and classroom announcements (Appendix H). Only those individuals who had interviewed for a job in the California restaurant industry within the past twelve months were allowed to participate in this study. Twelve months were considered as an appropriate duration of time from which participants would be able to recollect interview experiences. Participants received $20 as cash incentive after completing the interview.

**Questionnaire Development and Content**

The purpose of the interviews was to explore respondents’ experiences when interviewing for a foodservice job and their views towards ethical hiring. An interview guide containing open-ended questions was developed to better understand the applicant’s experience based on an actual interview they had over the past twelve months. As opposed to focus groups, interview settings allow participants to freely express their thoughts and experiences (Arendt et al., 2012).

The interview guide made up of three sections was developed after a thorough review of literature in the area of employee hiring and job interviews (Appendix J). The first section collected respondents’ demographic information and was completed prior to recording the interview. The second section contained thirteen open-ended questions pertaining to respondents’ experiences with interviewing for foodservice jobs and views on ethical hiring. The questions were worded so that respondents could not answer “yes” or “no”. The third section assessed respondents’ experience from one job interview that the respondent could recollect and contained eleven close-ended questions about the specific interview and ten open-ended questions. Participants were informed at the beginning of the interview that they could share additional information on their interview experiences at any time during the interview.

**Pilot Test**

The guide was reviewed and approved by experts in human resource management and/or foodservice operations (n=6) for content and clarity. Suggestions for revisions were incorporated into the interview guide before proceeding with this phase of the study. The interview guide was pilot-tested with two students at the same university. The purpose of the
pilot test was to seek feedback on clarity of the interview questions, time needed to complete
the interview, and provide additional comments. Suggestions to reword some questions for
better clarity and flow were incorporated to improve the interview guide.

Data collection

The interviews were conducted by the researcher on-campus in a private conference
room. Before beginning each interview, participants were asked to complete an informed
consent form. Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed by a professional
transcriptionist to facilitate data analysis. The interviews lasted between 30-45 minutes.

Interviewer’s observations and field notes were collected. Participants received $20 cash as
incentive for their participation.

Data Analysis

The interviews were audio recorded and transcribed by an experienced
transcriptionist using the qualitative software program, Express Scribe Pro version 5.48. The
transcribed files were then analyzed manually by two researchers for emerging themes.

Emerging themes were grouped in categories and labeled consistent with the quotations
included in each category. Field notes and observations were used to assess the validity of
interview data (Kale and Brinkmann, 2009; Olson, 2011). Demographic data analyzed using
Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 19.0.
CHAPTER 4: HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGERS’ ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF ETHICAL HIRING

A paper to be submitted to the *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*

Durrani, A., & Rajagopal, L.

Abstract

Human resource managers play a vital role in hiring new employees in an organization. This study assessed human resource (HR) managers’ attitudes toward workplace diversity, their perceptions of ethical hiring within the organizations, and their definitions of ethical hiring using a web-based questionnaire. Significant differences were observed between attitudes towards ethical hiring and HR managers’ ethnicity and between HR managers’ organizational size and perceptions of ethical hiring within organizations. Given the diversity in today’s labor market, findings from this study offer a promising view that conveys potential for impacting operations and thus affecting the hiring of millions of foodservice workers.
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Introduction

A fundamental human resources (HR) activity is effective hiring which, if managed well, can significantly influence an organization’s performance (Royce, 2007). “Hiring is the process through which an organization can ensure that it has the ‘right’ employees with the desired skills to achieve organizational objectives” (Payne-Palacio & Theis, 2012). Ineffective hiring often brings cost implications, including low employee morale that can and do affect employee performance thus resulting in lost business opportunities and or high employee turnover. Price (1997) defined turnover as actual movement across the membership boundary of an organization. Garavan, Costine, and Heraty (1995) saw a relationship between effective hiring practices and organizational performance, and advised organizations to ensure a more strategic approach to HR management before focusing on the actual selection and recruitment process. One important aspect of HR managers is the enforcement of fair hiring policies.
The restaurant industry employs approximately 13 million workers, making it one of the largest employers in the United States (U.S.) accounting for nearly 10% of the total U.S. workforce (NRA, 2013). In addition, the restaurant industry expects to add another 1.3 million jobs over the next decade with employment reaching 14.4 million by 2023. To meet the needs of this growing industry, the most effective hiring procedures must be practiced so that the most qualified individuals will be hired. With the increasing diversity of the U.S., population it follows that the industry’s employee applicant pool has also become increasingly diverse (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). Race- and gender-based discrimination in hiring are well documented (Bendick, Rodriguez, & Jayaraman, 2010; Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004; Neumark, Bank, & Van Nort, 1996; Rudman, 1998; Shih, Ambady, Richeson, Fujita, & Gray, 2002), however, there is limited research relating to hiring practices in the restaurant industry (Antun, Strick, & Thomas, 2007; MacHatton, Van Dyke, & Steiner, 1997; Martin & Groves, 2002;), and therefore underscoring a need to study hiring practices.

Human resource professionals are critical to the success of organizations (Ulrich, 1998) and decisions made by them have short-term and long-term impact on organizations (Tracey & Nathan, 2002). Raub, Alvarez, and Khanna, (2006), however, found an apparent disconnect between human resource professionals and the rest of the organization. Causes for this disconnect may be attributed to human resource professionals being involved primarily in the implementation of decisions but lacking interaction with line-level employees or being too involved with routine administrative duties. Moreover, human resource managers serve as role models for their organizations’ employees. Because human resource managers’ actions and attitudes impact the individuals they oversee, it is critical to assess their attitudes toward ethical hiring and diversity. The purpose of this study was to assess human resource managers’ attitudes towards workplace diversity and ethical hiring, their perceptions of ethical hiring within their organizations, and their definition of ethical hiring.

**Literature Review**

The restaurant industry is rich in terms of the diversity of its workforce (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). The restaurant industry employs more minority managers than any other industry, and has a broader representation of minorities and women in management positions than the overall economy. Forty-seven percent of foodservice managers in the U.S.
are women, compared to only 38 percent among all other management occupations in the economy. Ethnic minorities comprise a higher percentage of workers in management positions in the restaurant industry (9% Black/African-American, 15% Hispanic origin, and 11% Asians) compared to other management-oriented occupations in the U.S. (6% Black or African-American, 8% Hispanic origin, and 4% Asian) (National Restaurant Association, 2011). The expectation of increasing diversity in the U.S. population will undoubtedly be mirrored in the workforce.

The term *diversity* was originally meant to underrepresented groups in the workplace, “…individuals’ social identities including age, sexual orientation, physical disability, socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity, workplace role/position, religious and spiritual orientation, and work/family concerns….“ (American Psychological Association, 2002, p. 10). Worell and Remer (2003, p. 11) proposed a definition including “all aspects of a person’s social realities: gender, culture, ethnicity and national origin, immigration and acculturation status, sexual and affectional orientation, age, education, socioeconomic status (SES), physical characteristics and abilities, intellectual abilities, and religious affiliation.”

Aghazadeh (2004) emphasized that a diverse workforce provides unparalleled opportunities for companies and individuals to tap the ideas, creativity, and potential contributions inherent in a diverse workforce. To gain a clearer view of their surroundings, Kary-Siobhan (2002) recommend individuals’ exposure to new ideas, cultures and perspectives as a way to reach out intellectually and understand their place in the world. Culture may be defined as the values, beliefs, underlying assumptions, attitudes, and behaviors shared by a group of people (Klein, Knight, Ziegert, Lim, & Saltz, 2011). This understanding is paramount for all managers and enables them to provide a workplace where people from diverse backgrounds can easily assimilate into the organization.

Part of an organization’s financial and operational success comes from effectively managing people, providing them with a safe working environment and the best opportunities or paths to advancement. “Hiring is the process through which an organization ensures that it always has the proper number of employees with appropriate skills in the right jobs at the right time to achieve the organization’s objectives” (Payne-Palacio & Theis, 2012). Organizations that attract and retain the best employees enjoy a significant operational
advantage over their competition (Meyer, 2002). Managers must be aware of their company’s important platform or policies (i.e., serving customers, projecting a welcoming perception through employees’ demeanor, and few or no lawsuits) and strive to reduce risks by choosing the “right” employee for the job (Lousig-Nont, 2000). With improper hiring, an organization will suffer when staffed with employees who project bad attitudes toward coworkers and customers, unmotivated employees, and employees with poor customer service skills (Wang & Kleiner, 2000).

The manner in which an organization manages its human resources invariably sets the tone and conditions of the employee–employer relationship thereby impacting employee behavior (Tsaur & Lin, 2004). Schneider and Bowen (1985) found overall employee performance optimizes when employees perceive their organization as one that facilitates job performance, enhances careers for its workers and provides positive supervision, hence advocating the role of effective human resources practices. Regardless of organization size, hiring of new employees is a time-consuming and expensive process that includes recruiting, processing, eliminating, and selecting applicants (Fernandez-Araoz, 1999).

Looi, Marusarz, & Baumruk (2004) emphasized that the best practices in HR are doing a few core practices very well; providing an organization with maximum opportunity to remain an employer of choice; sustaining of employee practices maintained through a common focus; and maintaining a culture that reinforces adaptability and diversity. An extensive study of HR professionals by Rynes, Colbert, & Brown (2002) indicated a direct link between HR practices on organizational productivity and a firm’s financial performance. Keeping in mind the demands on an HR professional’s time, evaluating HR job functions and measuring effectiveness of implemented practices is a difficult task, yet one that can reasonably be expected of organizations.

Given the relationship between effective hiring practices and organizational performance, organizations need to ensure a more strategic approach to human resources planning before moving on to the actual recruitment and selection process (Garavan, et al., 1995). With the importance for an organization to succeed in today’s competitive environment, human resource managers must work towards attracting, recruiting, and retaining a capable, efficient, diverse workforce. However, few studies have investigated
ethical hiring from the view of human resource managers in the restaurant industry. The specific objectives of this study were to assess human resource managers’ attitudes towards workplace diversity; their perceptions of ethical hiring within their organization; and their definitions of ethical hiring.

**Methodology**

A questionnaire was developed and used to collect data in this study. The university’s Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviewed and approved the research protocol and questionnaire prior to data collection.

**Sample**

The target population for this study was human resource managers in the United States who belonged to the Council of Hotel and Restaurant Trainers (CHART). CHART (2012) is a professional organization made up of 330 members from more than 300 multi-unit restaurant and hotel companies in the United States. CHART represents a workforce of nearly 5 million workers. CHART members include all facets of hospitality training, learning and performance professionals from entry level to senior executive. Participants with expertise in human resource management and restaurant operations were specifically chosen and sent an email asking them to respond to the survey by providing information on hiring practices.

**Questionnaire Development**

A web-based questionnaire was developed to explore human resources managers’ attitudes towards workplace diversity, their perceptions towards ethical hiring within their organization, and their definition of ethical hiring. The questionnaire consisted of four sections. The first section consisted of questions related to respondent demographics. The second section assessed respondents’ attitudes towards diversity and workplace diversity. A 5-point Likert-type scale and corresponding descriptors (SA = *Strongly Agree*, A = *Agree*, N = *Neutral*, D = *Disagree*, SD = *Strongly Disagree*) were used in the second and third section.

The fourth section consisted of the Social Desirability Scale (SDS-17) developed by Stober (1999, 2001) to identify respondents’ propensity to provide socially desirable
responses. The Social Desirability Scale (SDS-17) is composed of 16 true-false items, e.g., “I will never live off other people,” “I sometimes litter.” It is a balanced index in that one’s score increases by a true response on nine items, and by a false response on seven items. Fisher (2000) considered the SDS-17 “advantageous” over “troublesome” Crowne-Marlowe (CM) Social Desirability (Crowne and Marlowe, 1960) scale’s length of 33 items mainly taking issue with the latter’s length. The reliability and validity of the SDS-17 is well-established (Ellingson, Sackett, & Hough, 1999; Hancock, & Flowers, 2001; Musch, Brockhaus, & Broeder, 2002) and was found to be valid in a previous study conducted in the United States (Blake, Valdiserri, Neuenford, and Nemeth, 2006). In addition, an open-ended question, “Please define what ethical hiring means to you?” was included to determine what respondents considered as “ethical hiring” and if the definition varied among human resource managers.

Three hospitality management educators with expertise in human resource management and foodservice operations evaluated the questionnaire for content and clarity. Suggestions for revisions were incorporated into the questionnaire before proceeding with the pilot study. The questionnaire was pilot-tested with ten human resource managers, belonging to CHART with expertise in human resource management and restaurant operations. Pilot study participants were not included in the final sample. The purpose of the pilot test was to seek feedback on clarity and content of the questionnaire, response choices, time needed to complete the questionnaire, provide additional comments and suggestions for improvement.

**Data collection**

The questionnaire was distributed electronically using SurveyGizmo™, a web-based data collection and research survey tool. Respondents received an email with a hyperlink to the questionnaire along with the informed consent form. The purpose of the study was explained at the beginning of the questionnaire and included a screening question which allowed only respondents working in the restaurant industry to participate in the study. To ensure respondents’ anonymity, Internet Protocol addresses were not collected. Respondents who submitted the questionnaire (complete or incomplete) and provided their email address were included in a drawing to receive one of eight $25 gift cards. Following Dillman’s
recommendation (Dillman, 2008), reminders containing the link to the questionnaire were sent via email at week one, two, and three, to encourage participation.

**Data analysis**

Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 19.0. Data coding and entry followed procedures recommended by Dillman (2008). The Cronbach’s coefficient of reliability (α) was computed to determine the reliability of the scales. Cronbach's alpha determines the internal consistency or average correlation of items in a survey instrument to gauge its reliability (Cronbach, 1951). Data were summarized using descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequencies, and percentage). Independent sample $t$ tests and one-way ANOVA were conducted to explore relationships between HR managers’ attitudes, perceptions of ethical hiring and demographic. An alpha level of $.05$ was used for all statistical tests.

**Results**

**Respondents’ profile**

Two hundred and seventy nine questionnaires were sent to the respondents, nineteen of which were undeliverable, and one hundred and one were returned, thus, resulting in a response rate of 36.2%. Twenty-one questionnaires were improperly filled and excluded from analysis, leaving eighty usable questionnaires. According to Price (1994) and Lucas (1995), obtaining participation in the hospitality industry, especially in research related to HR, is typically difficult, as respondents may hesitate to respond to information they consider “sensitive.” However, in this study the response rate was higher, possibly due to repeated contact with respondents. Schaefer & Dillman (1998) found that response rates to email surveys (n=192-300) could increase as high as 57% with the third or fourth contact. Majority of respondents were male (58.7%), Caucasian (83.8%), and over the age of 46 years (47.4%). Christian or Catholic represented 74% of the respondents were, and more than two-thirds possessed an undergraduate college degree or higher. Most respondents (73.7%) had more than 10 years HR experience. A majority of the respondents (66.5%) worked in companies with 1,000 or more employees. Table 4.1 illustrates respondent demographics.
HR managers’ attitudes towards workplace diversity

Table 4.2 illustrates respondents’ attitudes towards workplace diversity. The Cronbach’s coefficient for reliability was computed at 0.58; removing the item, “I admit my stereotypes about other groups” increased the alpha value to 0.65. Nunnaly (1978) has indicated 0.7 to be an acceptable reliability coefficient but lower thresholds have been used in the literature. This item was excluded from data analysis. The overall mean for the 8 attitudes statements were 4.13±.87 (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree). The statement “I feel that everyone is unique, with differing values and preferences” had the highest mean (4.63±.67), while the statement “I am drawn to others who are different than me” was lowest (3.66±.84). Table 4.3 shows the results for HR managers’ attitudes towards ethical hiring practices and demographic characteristics. The t-tests revealed significant differences between ethnicity and attitudes towards ethical hiring \( t(1,65) = 2.093, p = .04 \); White = 4.13, Non-White = 3.82. No other significant differences were observed.

HR managers’ perceptions of ethical hiring within their organization

The overall mean for nine items assessing HR managers’ perceptions of ethical hiring within their organization was 3.95±.88 (Table 4.4). The Cronbach’s coefficient of reliability was 0.82, which is higher than the 0.70 and considered acceptable (Nunnaly, 1978). HR managers were in agreement that their organization had ethical and fair hiring practices as indicated in response to the statement “My organization’s hiring practices are ethical and fair” (M = 4.42±.69). Human resources managers perceived that their organization promoted diversity at all levels (4.05±.91) and had not seen their organization hire employees who were ill qualified (M=3.10±1.24).

Table 4.5 shows the results for HR managers’ perceptions of ethical hiring practices and demographic characteristics. The t-tests revealed significant differences between company size and perceptions towards hiring, \( t(1,65) = -2.071, p = .043 \); M: Less than 1,000 employees = 3.72, 1,000 employees or more = 4.02. One-way ANOVA revealed a significant relationship between educational level showed and perceptions of hiring, \( F(2,64) = 0.948, p = .050 \); M: high school/GED, some college = 3.94, Bachelor’s degree = 3.87, Graduate degree = 3.89. No other significant relationships were observed.
Definition of ethical hiring

When asked to define ethical hiring, about half of the respondents (n = 49) provided a definition as illustrated in the following statements:

“Hiring the most qualified candidate instead of hiring someone who is not qualified but may share your similar values, beliefs, customs, or attitudes.”

“The practice of hiring an individual based on education, experience, and other work related factors without any bias.”

“Ethical hiring means to be fair to all candidates; evaluating them only against job requirements and eliminating any personal prejudices or stereotyping”

“Non-discrimination of sexual orientation, religion, age, race or any other factors related to a person as an individual”

“Following anti-discrimination policies, having an open and welcoming work environment for everyone, embracing differences”

“It should not matter what a person looks like or their personal background. Can they perform the job that you are hiring for?”

Most respondents had similar definitions of ethical hiring which indicated that respondents were aware of the meaning of ethical hiring. Koza (2004) defined the term ethical to include “consideration of ideas related to principled, just, fair, decent, and distinguishing between what is good and evil.” Hinman (2003) has defined ethics as “the explicit philosophical reflection on moral beliefs and practices and conscious stepping back and reflecting on morality.”

The Cronbach’s alpha for scores on the social desirability on the SDS-17 scale was 0.70, which was considered acceptable (Stöber, 2001). The mean score on the SDS-17 scale was 9.18±3.07 on a scale of 0-16 indicating that the responses provided were not very socially desirable, but still had some level of social desirability.

Discussion

This study investigated human resource managers’ attitudes and their perceptions of ethical hiring. Based on the study’s findings, HR managers generally had positive attitudes towards diversity in the workplace. An effective HR department provides a roadmap to
guide individual restaurant teams in navigating the recruitment process and selecting qualified candidates. In order to bring about sustainable organizational hiring standards, HR personnel must be knowledgeable of the laws that govern their industry and formulate policies that promote ethical hiring standards. Findings from this study suggest that HR managers hold positive attitudes towards workplace diversity, ethical hiring and seek to conduct ethical hiring practices at all levels of the organization. In this study, White respondents ($M = 4.13$) self-reported a more positive attitude towards workplace diversity than non-Whites ($M = 3.82$) which is encouraging because other researchers have found negative attitudes among Whites towards workplace diversity (Shih et al., 2002; Bendick, et al. 2010). The lower mean scores for attitudes towards workplace diversity among non-Whites however is interesting and could be attributed to lower number of non-White participants in the respondent pool.

In this study, HR managers confirmed that their hiring managers follow a HR-mandated hiring process. Organizational size was found to be significant in perceptions of ethical hiring within organizations which could be a result of higher level of transparency, better hiring practices, and improved communication across the board in larger organizations. If an organization’s hiring practices are purposeful, the knowledge and attitudes towards hiring and diversity must be integrated as an important focus throughout the hiring process. An organization must ensure that unit managers fully embrace the organization’s goals and mission to provide a work environment where people are hired, trained, and treated fairly. Providing unit managers with training in the area of hiring and other HR-related activities (i.e., conducting performance evaluations, providing career development programs) not only benefits the employee but also the organization as it attains greater operational success with qualified workers. Tsaur & Lin (2004) found that positive perceptions of human resource practices increase employees’ motivation to provide high quality service.

It is not surprising that the success of an organization begins and ends with its staff. Our findings indicate that both male and female HR managers have similar views on workplace diversity. Even though males represented the majority of respondents, workplace diversity is favorably viewed throughout the organization’s HR department regardless of the HR manager’s gender. Fair and ethical HR-mandated hiring practices, a welcoming
environment for new hires, and taking corrective action against managers who violate ethical hiring processes did not reflect statistically significant differences in the perceptions between males and females. Comparisons of the responses between gender groups reveal agreement on the importance of attitudes towards hiring. The results from this study indicate a consistency between HR managers’ overall demographics and their perceptions that diversity is an important organizational initiative.

Past research has indicated an disconnect between HR professionals and rest of the organization (Tracey & Nathan, 2002; Raub et al., 2006), attributable to human resource professionals being primarily involved in implementing decisions, lacking interaction with line-level employees, and greater involvement in administrative routines. Our findings suggest the human resource community possesses positive attitudes towards workplace diversity and perceived their organizational hiring practices as ethical. Hiring is as an integral part of every organizational action, and cannot be viewed as an isolated function; all members of management must follow a fair hiring process. Researchers recommended that employers review their recruitment practices and selection criteria and promote diversity by removing any potential for discrimination (Carnevale & Stone, 1994; Graziano, Bruce, Sheese, & Tobin, 2007; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Wang & Kleiner (2000) cautioned that improper hiring can have a negative impact on organizational success.

**Conclusions**

Findings from this study will be of interest to those concerned with advancing the equality agenda and all HR professionals. Given the scale of the labor market in the foodservice industry, HR managers’ attitudes and perceptions of ethical hiring offer an encouraging view that can impact operations and affects the hiring of millions of foodservice workers. HR managers are in a position to serve as role models for employees in their organizations because human resource managers’ actions and attitudes can impact the individuals they oversee, assessing human resource managers’ attitudes towards workplace diversity and hiring is critical. Raub et al. (2006) suggested that HR managers should be involved in the change process and share the responsibility with manager at the unit level for effective implementation. Organizations can benefit from HR professionals who know and value workplace diversity and ethical hiring practices.
Limitations and Future Research

This study contains certain limitations that should be considered. While this study provided valuable insights into human resource managers’ attitudes towards workplace diversity and their perceptions of ethical hiring, the sample was drawn from the CHART member list which limits generalization of results. Data collected were based on self-reports by human resource managers, rather than on observations of human resource practices, hence the results of this study should be viewed with caution. HR professionals appear to hold encouraging attitudes towards ethical hiring and workplace diversity, but may be less able to influence practices within their organization. Issues with lack of perceived transparency or challenges may develop where employees working downstream may not perceive their input and participation as valuable in the development and implementation of ethical hiring policies.

Further research should be carried out with a larger sample of HR managers and conduct an in-depth inquiry into the attitudes, knowledge, and perceived importance of workplace diversity and ethical hiring practices using interviews or focus groups. Future studies should also explore attitudes, knowledge, and perceptions of ethical hiring at the unit manager level to detect any differences between corporate and unit level managers. Research is also needed to explore job applicants’ experiences with the interview process conducted by unit managers trained in the implementation of effective hiring practices.
Table 4.1. Demographic Characteristics of Human Resource Managers (N = 63-80)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 – 45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55 years old</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of languages spoken a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No college</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate degree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/Atheism</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 years b</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years or more</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1,000 employees</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 employees or more</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a No respondent could speak three or more languages fluently.

b Responses choices of “less than 5 years” and “between 5 and 9 years” were combined.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that everyone is unique, with differing values and preferences b</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe in fairness in hiring at all levels</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it unsatisfying to work within a diverse team b</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that both newcomers and the organizations in which they work should learn to work together</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel equally comfortable with all groups</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am knowledgeable about the culture of different ethnic groups (e.g., Asian, African, Middle-Eastern)</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I show little patience and understanding with people who speak little or no English b</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am drawn to others who are different than me</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Mean</strong></td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Scale for statements: 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neutral; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree.  
*b* Reverse coded items: 1 = strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = neutral; 4 = disagree; 5 = strongly disagree.  
Coefficient alpha reliability = 0.65
Table 4.3. Human Resource Managers’ Attitudes towards Workplace Diversity and Demographic Characteristics (N = 67-80)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean Attitude Score(^a) (SD)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.11 (0.42)</td>
<td>t-value = -1.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.99 (0.51)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 45 years</td>
<td>4.06 (0.49)</td>
<td>t-value = -0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 years and older</td>
<td>4.07 (0.43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4.13 (0.42)</td>
<td>t-value = 2.093*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>3.82 (0.59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Languages Spoken</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>4.07 (0.39)</td>
<td>t-value = -0.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>4.17 (0.68)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Company size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1,000 employees</td>
<td>4.00 (0.41)</td>
<td>t-value = -0.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 employees or more</td>
<td>4.12 (0.48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school/Some college</td>
<td>4.15 (0.36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>4.00 (0.40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree or higher</td>
<td>4.04 (0.50)</td>
<td>F-value = 0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious beliefs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/Atheism</td>
<td>2.39 (0.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2.29 (0.26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>2.41 (0.46)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.40 (0.45)</td>
<td>F-value = 0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HR Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>4.18 (0.37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>3.97 (0.55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
<td>4.06 (0.37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years or more</td>
<td>4.07 (0.49)</td>
<td>F-value = 0.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Mean Sum score for all attitude items rated on a 5-point Likert type scale with 1 (Strongly Disagree) and 5 (Strongly Agree)

\(*p<.05\)
Table 4.4. Human Resource Managers’ Perceptions of Ethical Hiring within their Organization (N = 62-80)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean a</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organization's hiring practices are ethical and fair.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring managers in my organization understand the meaning and value of ethical and fair hiring.</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring managers strictly follow a hiring process mandated by HR.</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization hires employees of various ethnicities and diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization has a welcoming environment for newly hired workers.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization promotes diversity at all levels.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see hiring managers in our organization show patience and understanding with people who speak little English. b</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have taken disciplinary action towards hiring managers who violate ethical hiring process.</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have seen employees hired in our organization that had little to no required qualifications. b</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.88</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Scale for statements: 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neutral; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree.
b Reverse coded items: 1 = strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = neutral; 4 = disagree; 5 = strongly disagree.  
Coefficient alpha reliability = 0.82
Table 4.5. Human Resource Managers’ Perceptions of Ethical Hiring Within Organizations and Demographic Characteristics  \( (N=62-67) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean Attitude Score (SD)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.91 (0.56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.89 (0.62)</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 45 years</td>
<td>3.94 (0.46)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 years and older</td>
<td>3.87 (0.68)</td>
<td>0.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.90 (0.57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>3.92 (0.61)</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Languages Spoken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>3.91 (0.54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>3.85 (0.77)</td>
<td>-0.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1,000 employees</td>
<td>3.72 (0.62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 employees or more</td>
<td>4.02 (0.51)</td>
<td>-2.071*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school/Some college</td>
<td>3.94 (0.46)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>3.87 (0.62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree or higher</td>
<td>3.89 (0.63)</td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/Atheism</td>
<td>2.39 (0.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2.29 (0.26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>2.41 (0.46)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.40 (0.45)</td>
<td>0.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>3.97 (0.48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>3.92 (0.68)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
<td>3.87 (0.52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years or more</td>
<td>3.84 (0.64)</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean Sum score for all attitude items rated on a 5-point Likert type scale with 1 (Strongly Disagree) and 5 (Strongly Agree)

\( p < .05 \)
CHAPTER 5: INTERVIEWING PRACTICES IN CALIFORNIA RESTAURANTS: PERSPECTIVES OF RESTAURANT MANAGERS AND JOB APPLICANTS
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Abstract

Adherence to hiring practices that are fair, ethical, and non-discriminatory are vital to both organizations and job applicants. This study examined employee hiring with a focus on the interview step and was examined from the perspectives of unit managers as well as job applicants. Results of this study revealed that California unit managers believed they had adequate policies and procedures in place to ensure ethical hiring. On the other hand, job applicants perceived verbal and non-verbal behaviors of the interviewer as indicators of ethical or non-ethical hiring practices.
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Introduction

With a diverse workforce of over 13 million workers, the restaurant industry is one of the largest employers in the United States. It accounts for nearly 10% of the total workforce and is expected to reach 14.4 million by 2023 (NRA, 2013). For the operation of any organization run smoothly and efficiently, hiring the “right” employees is critical. Managers must be aware of what policies and guidelines are essential to their organization and strive to reduce the risk of choosing the “wrong” employee (Lousig-Nont, 2000) for the job. Organizations stand to benefit significantly both in reputation and on the bottom line by attracting and hiring the best employees (Meyer, 2002), while poor hiring practices may well cause an organization to suffer adversely financially and socially (Wang & Kleiner 2000). In 2012, 99,412 charges were filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) which resulted in $365.4 million in monetary awards to individuals. This amount did not include monetary awards that individuals received through litigation (EEOC, 2012).

The hiring process includes a number of steps that begins with recruiting and concludes when the employee is hired (Fernandez-Araoz, 1999; Gregoire, 2010). All steps are important, should be conducted with the needs of the organization in mind, and should conform to prescribed federal, state, and organizational guidelines. The interview is the
initial and integral part of the process as it provides the applicant and the employer an opportunity to meet and discuss the job and ascertain if they are a good fit (Kristof, 1996). In addition, employers can utilize a number of other methods such as interviews, personality tests, cognitive tests, and reference checks to assess job applicant’s stability (MacHatton, Van Dyke, & Steiner, 1997).

Despite the presence of federal, state, and organizational regulations for ethical hiring, discrimination in hiring decision has been documented (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004; Biernat & Kobrynowicz, 1997; Carton & Keliner, 2001; Pager, Western, & Bonikowski, 2009; Rudman & Glick, 1999). Durrani and Rajagopal (2013) found that human resource managers valued workplace diversity and perceived their organizational hiring practices to be ethical. Distinct differences, however, exist between the perceptions and policy application of human resource managers at the corporate and unit level (Raub, Alvarez, & Khanna, 2006) wherein the application of developed organizational policies and procedures may be lost in translation as they trickle down to the unit level sometimes resulting in disparate hiring practices.

**Literature Review**

Hiring new workers is a time-consuming, multi-step expensive process (Fernandez-Araoz, 1999; Gregoire, 2010). An effective hiring process helps individual restaurant management teams navigate the recruitment process and select the “right” candidates for the job. The hiring process, if done correctly, can benefit both the employer and employee. While the selection process should be conducted in accordance with federal, state, and organizational guidelines, the process may still be susceptible to bias that might impact the hiring process. Employment hiring decisions have been found to be influenced by, but not limited to, the factors of race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, age, disability, gender orientation, and personal characteristics thereby limiting employment opportunities for historically excluded groups such as African-Americans, Asians, Hispanics, homosexuals, persons with disabilities, women (Bendick & Nunes, 2012).

A study conducted by Bendick, Rodriguez, and Jayaraman (2010) of applicants seeking employment in upscale restaurants in Manhattan, New York found that, while applicants of all demographics were treated with equal courtesy, discrimination (conscious or
unconscious) was documented in 31% of the restaurants. In-depth interviews with employers from retail stores, hotels, furniture manufacturers, and printing plants found that employers’ perceptions of worker “manageability and pliability” influenced employers’ attitudes towards African-Americans and immigrant Latino workers (Shih, 2002). Some employers perceived African-Americans as those who might challenge their authority while Latino workers might not challenge authority because they came to the United States to live the “American Dream.” This study, however, also found some employers who perceived immigrant Latino workers to be “permanent, low-skilled workers,” thus highlighting the role of racial attitudes when comparing workers of different races.

During judgment-making situations, a person’s ambiguity and subjectivity can hinder the judgment process and facilitate discrimination (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003; Hodson, Dovidio & Gaertner, 2002). Perceptual distortions and errors (Dougherty, Turban, & Callender, 1994), stereotyping (Fletcher, 1990), and personal “likes and dislikes” (McDonald & Hakel, 1985) can also influence the interviewer’s bias during the interview process. To ensure ethical hiring practices are followed and thereby reducing claims of discrimination from employees, many organizations have adopted highly-structured hiring practices (Bielby, 2000), trained individuals about making hiring decisions (Bendick, Egan & Lofhjelm, 2001) and how to manage workplace diversity (Kochan et al., 2003).

A study of chain and independent restaurants recruitment and interview preferences made by MacHatton et al. (1997) found that restaurant managers preferred reference checks (61.6%), structured (57.1%) and unstructured (30.4%) interviews when selecting management-level staff. Dermondy (2002) found, however, that independent restaurants personnel relied on restaurant reputation, personal recommendations, newspaper advertisements, word of mouth, and internet webpage. Chain restaurant managers relied on newspaper advertisements, pay for referrals, flyers at local colleges, career fairs, and signage in the restaurant to recruit management and non-management level employees.

The employment interview is the most commonly used selection tool of many organizations (McCarty, Van Id Dekinge, & Campion, 2010). The interview allows applicants to learn more about the job, provides interviewers an opportunity to answer applicant’s questions and thereby gain insight on the applicant’s qualification, skills level,
personality, and fit. Interviews can be structured or unstructured. Structured interviews use a standard predetermined questionnaire format that allows for consistency amongst all applicants, while unstructured interviews, by their very name, are not standardized and allow the interviewer to ask any question that pertains to the job. However, the validity of unstructured interviews is questionable (Reilly & Chao, 1982).

An interviewer’s evaluation of a job applicant has been found to be highly predictive of a job offer (Cable & Gilovich, 1997). Dipboye, Fontenelle, and Garner (1984) found that in practice, many interviewers browse the applicant’s application or resume during the interview. Groves, Martin and Beck (2001) found a direct link between of inadequate hiring processes and employee turnover and cited poor employment interviews as the main reason. Past research has recommended that employers review their recruitment practices, selection criteria and promote diversity by removing any potential for discrimination (Carnevale & Stone, 1994; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Graziano, Bruce, Sheese, & Tobin, 2007). Tracey and Nathan (2002) proposed a more decentralized human resource model wherein hiring decisions are made by the employee’s immediate supervisor because, “the farther away from the source that these decisions are actually made, the less likely it is that real-time and relevant information about the decision and its outcome will be available for the decision maker” (p. 17).

High turnover rates in the restaurant industry may cause some managers to capitulate and hire workers who are less than ideal for frequent job openings. Unit managers and companies without an effective hiring process in place are more likely to find themselves contributing to the employee turnover and/or hire workers with less qualifications or skills. Job applicants who have had a negative experience at the job interview might warn other potential applicants or may bring legal action against the restaurant. The purpose of this study was to assess unit level restaurant managers’ perspectives and job applicants’ experiences with interviewing for jobs in the California restaurant industry. The California restaurant industry is a major contributor to the state’s economy. There are 62,469 eating and drinking places in the state of California that employ over 1.4 million workers (10% of total workforce) (NRA, 2013). The California restaurant industry expects to add an additional 140,500 jobs in the next decade pushing employment to nearly 1.6 million by 2023.
Approximately 7.4% of discrimination charges field with the EEOC were received from the state of California (EEOC, 2012), which underscores the need for this study. By examining the perspectives of these unit managers and job applicants, human resource professionals can attempt to bridge gaps in the hiring process by providing improved training, and developing standard policies for the practice and enforcement of ethical hiring practices.

Methodology

To gain insights into the interview process from the perspectives of unit-level restaurant managers and job applicants, a mixed methods approach (questionnaires and interviews) was used. Unit-level managers completed a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews were conducted with a sample of college students who had interviewed for jobs in the California restaurant industry. The research protocol and questionnaires were reviewed and approved by the university’s Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (IRB) prior to data collection.

Questionnaires

Sample

A sample of unit-level managers from multi-unit restaurant chains (three or more units) belonging to the California Restaurant Association (CRA) was used in this study. The CRA directory lists 53 multi-unit companies that operate 667 restaurants, some of which have central hiring departments and some that do not.

Questionnaire Development

A questionnaire was developed to assess unit-level managers’ attitudes, knowledge, current procedures and the training methods used when hiring workers in their organizations. The questionnaire consisted of five sections. The first section consisted of 26 questions that related to organizational practices and procedures currently being used in the hiring process. The second section of six questions assessed respondents’ answers about interview questions they considered as acceptable when conducting a job interview. There were three response options: Yes, No, Unsure. In addition, six items that assessed respondents’ perceptions of federal and state regulations regarding ethical hiring practices were developed using a 5-point Likert-type scale and corresponding descriptors (SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, N = Neutral, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree).
The third section assessed respondents’ attitudes towards interviewing and ethical hiring using a 5-point Likert-type scale and corresponding descriptors (SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, N = Neutral, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree). The fourth section consisted of the Social Desirability Scale (SDS-17) composed of 16 true-false items to measure social desirability bias (Stober, 2001). Researchers have found SDS-17 to be easy to use (Fisher & Katz, 2001), and a reliable and valid measure of social desirability bias (Ellingson, Sackett, & Hough, 1999; Hancock, & Flowers, 2001). The fifth section consisted of demographic questions.

**Pilot test**

Five individuals with expertise in human resource management and restaurant operations reviewed and approved the questionnaire prior to use. The questionnaire was pilot-tested with ten unit level restaurant managers for clarity and appropriateness.

**Data collection**

Web-based questionnaires were distributed electronically to 467 recipients using SurveyGizmo™, a web-based survey tool and 200 paper-based questionnaires were distributed to all organizations belonging to the CRA. Some organizations requested paper-based questionnaires because their policies did not allow employees access to the internet for non-organization related tasks. An e-mail was sent to respondents with a hyperlink directing them to the questionnaire which also contained the informed consent form. Internal Protocol (IP) addresses were not collected to ensure the anonymity of respondents. Email reminders were sent at week 2, 3, and 4 to organizations that received the web-based questionnaires, while a reminder email was sent at week two to central administrative offices of organizations that received paper-based questionnaires, which then sent reminders to its employees through their organization’s internal email to complete the questionnaire. Respondents who submitted the questionnaire and provided their email address were included in a drawing to receive one of eight $25 gift cards.

**Data analysis**

Questionnaires were coded and data processed and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 19.0. Data coding and entry followed the procedures recommended by Dillman (2008). Descriptive statistics (mean, standard
deviation, frequencies, and percentage) were computed. The Cronbach’s coefficient of reliability (α) was computed to establish reliability of scales.

**Interviews**

**Sample**

Participants in this study were drawn from a population of students currently studying in the Hospitality Management and Dietetics program (N = 500) at a large university (N = 38,000) in California. Only those participants who had interviewed for jobs in California restaurants were allowed to participate in this study. Participants were recruited through recruitment flyers and classroom announcements. During recruitment, efforts were made to ensure at least one male and one female from each ethnicity were represented to examine gender differences in interview experiences within ethnicities. A total of 52 participants expressed interest in the study and 11 participants completed the interviews.

**Instrument**

Interviews aimed to explore participants’ experiences when interviewing for a job in the California restaurant industry and their views on ethical hiring. An interview guide with open-ended questions was developed to better understand the applicant’s experience based on an actual interview they had completed in the past 12 months. It was determined that participants would most likely be able to recall events from their immediate past and recalling details from events beyond one year might be challenging. Interviews allow participants to freely express their thoughts and experiences versus focus groups due to the socially sensitive nature of topics (Arendt et al., 2012).

The interview guide was made up of three sections. The first section consisting of 8 questions about participant demographics was completed prior to recording the interview. The second section contained 13 open-ended questions that explored participants’ experiences while interviewing for jobs in California restaurants and views on ethical hiring. The third section assessed participants’ experience from one job interview that the participant could recollect and contained 13 close-ended questions about that specific interview and eight open-ended questions.

Six experts in human resource management and/or foodservice operations reviewed the interview guide for content and clarity. The interview guide was pilot-tested with two
students at the same university. The purpose of the pilot test was to seek feedback on clarity of the interview questions, time needed to complete the interview, and additional improvements needed. Suggestions for improvements were incorporated into the interview guide before proceeding with this study.

Data collection

Interviews were conducted by the researcher on-campus in a private conference room. Before beginning each interview, the purpose of the interviews was clearly explained to the participants, informed consent was obtained and the demographic questionnaire was completed. Interviews were audio recorded and lasted 30-45 minutes. Interviewer’s observations and field notes were collected. All participants received $20 cash incentive for their participation.

Data Analysis

The recorded interviews were transcribed by an experienced transcriptionist using Express Scribe Pro v5.48, qualitative analysis software. Interview transcripts were analyzed manually by two researchers for emerging themes. Field notes and observations were used to assess the validity of interview data (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009; Olson, 2011).

Results

Respondents Profile

A total of 667 questionnaires (paper-based = 200; web-based = 467) were sent to unit managers from multi-unit restaurant chains listed in the California Restaurant Association (CRA) directory. One hundred and twenty-two web-based questionnaires and twenty-two paper-based questionnaires were returned resulting in a response rate of 26.1% and 11.0%, respectively. Other researchers have obtained a response rate of 17.0 % with human resource managers of chain restaurants (Martin & Groves, 2002) and 14.0% with foodservice employers (Geng-qing & Qu, 2003).

For the questionnaires, male (52.4%) and female (47.6%) respondents were almost equally represented. A majority of the participants were Caucasian (90.0%) between the ages of 41 to 56 years (82.0%). Most participants were unit managers (95.2%), some identified themselves as owner/operator (1.9%), some as human resource managers (1.9%), and a few as other (1.0%). This could be because in some establishments a unit manager may be
involved in more than one role. Fifty percent of the respondents had been working in their current position for more than twelve years. The number of employees under the direct supervision of the respondent varied from “Less than 25” (24.0%) to “More than 300” (8.7%). Respondent demographics are shown in Table 5.1.

For the interviews, 13 respondents contacted the researcher and 11 participants completed the interviews. Majority of the participants were female (72.7%), and over half were between the ages of 18-24 years (63.6%) while the rest were between 25-34 years old (36.4%). Participants’ demographic profiles (White = 27.3%, Asian = 27.3%, Latino = 22.7%, African-American = 22.7%) were reflective of the population from which the sample was derived (California State University, 2012). Most participants were employed part-time (81.8%) with job responsibilities in the front of house (45.5%), back of house (9.0%), or both (45.5%). Participants were employed in casual (45.5%), quick-service (45.5) or fine dining restaurants (9.0%) and 81.9% had worked in the restaurant industry for 0-6 years.

**Hiring practices and procedures**

Table 5.2. shows the hiring practices and procedures currently used by unit-level managers in California restaurants. When advertising their job openings respondents used online job advertisements (73.6%), word of mouth (56.4%), and employee referrals (55.0%), while others used methods such as the recruitment website LinkedIn and social media (2.9%). Job descriptions were used by 87.7% of respondents as a foundation when developing job announcements in their organization, however, only 45% always used job descriptions.

Majority of the respondents (60.7%) conducted interviews in a public area (i.e., dining area or in the kitchen). Interviews for management-level applicants typically lasted more than 45 minutes (54.3%) and 15-30 minutes for non-management-level applicants (38.6%). One-on-one type interviews were most commonly used for management-level positions (71.4%) and non-management-level positions (80.7%) and were conducted in English (81.4%). An interview guide was the most commonly used tool to conduct interviews for non-management-level (53.6%) and management-level (41.4%) positions.

Majority of unit-level managers conducted at least three interviews for management-level applicants (35.0%) and two interviews for non-management-level applicants (42.1%)
before reaching a decision. Background checks were only conducted for management-level applicants (46.4%), while 22.1% respondents did not conduct any background checks. Reference checks were conducted by 39.3% of respondents on all applicants, 27.9% of respondents conducted reference checks only for management-level applicants. Most respondents did not conduct medical/health test prior to extending a job offer to applicants, while 3.6% of respondents required testing for all employees.

Most respondents notified applicants about the job offer via telephone (75.7%) and few used postal mail (5.7%). The applicants who did not receive the job offer (63.6%) were notified. Interestingly, 59.3% of respondents’ indicated their organization did not require documentation as evidence of if an applicant was not hired. Majority of the organizations had not been cited for violation of ethical hiring practices (70.0%). Only 2.9% of the respondents indicated that disciplinary actions were taken by their company against hiring managers if violations of ethical hiring practices were reported. Most participants received training from their organization on how to conduct the hiring process in an ethical manner (70.7%), and this training was provided by a designated human resources employee from within their organization (52.9%).

Training was received by attending seminars/workshops (57.1%), reading written materials/policy documents (50%), one-on-one instruction on the job (45.7%), and personal observation of other employees on the job (45%). In a survey of training techniques in foodservice organizations, Harris and Bonn (2000) found lecture, textbook/manuals, teleconferencing, and computer-based training methods to be common. If respondents attended training sessions, they lasted for from more than 1 hour (24.3%) or less than 1 hour (2.9%). Respondents believed that receiving training effectively contributed to their ability to properly conduct the hiring process (60.0%), however, 3.6% of respondents perceived receiving training not useful. Most restaurant companies had a human resource department (68.6%) and assistance was available from the departments in the event the respondents were unable to decide on hiring of individuals (57.9%).
Restaurant managers’ knowledge about interviewing

Table 5.3 shows respondents’ knowledge about interviewing (α = 0.88). The Cronbach’s alpha for the knowledge items was 0.88. Nunnally (1978) indicated that a value of 0.7 to be an acceptable reliability coefficient. Most respondents were knowledgeable that questions about the applicant’s marital status (96.3%), religion (96.3%), educational qualifications (87%), and geographical/ethnic origin (74.3%) should not be asked. However, respondents provided varied responses when asked if interview questions about the applicant’s special accommodation needs were acceptable (No = 51.9%; Unsure = 22.2%).

The overall mean score for 6 knowledge statements was 3.84±.87 (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree). The statement, “I am knowledgeable about the types of questions that should not be asked during an interview” was highest (4.12±.78), while the statement, “I am aware of the recent developments in rules and regulations at the federal and state level in terms of hiring,” was the lowest (3.54±.81).

Restaurant managers’ attitudes towards ethical hiring

Restaurant managers’ attitudes towards ethical hiring are show in Table 5.4 (α = 0.64). The Cronbach’s alpha was found to be lower than those deemed acceptable by Nunnally (1978), while other studies consider an alpha of 0.6 or higher to be acceptable when scales contain fewer items (Lindmeier, 2011). The overall mean score for the 7 attitude statements was 4.04±.98 (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree). Respondents disagreed with the statement “It is not possible to always follow ethical hiring practices” (4.63±.53) on a 5-point Likert style scale (1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = neutral, 4 = disagree, 5 = strongly disagree). More than half of the respondents agreed that their organization’s hiring practices were ethical (4.45±.84). The statement, “I believe my organization has hired workers who I felt were not qualified for the job” had the lowest mean (3.10±1.17). The mean score on the SDS-17 scale was 8.11±1.98 on a scale of 0-16 indicating a moderate level of bias in respondents’ responses (α = 0.72) (Stöber, 1999).

Job Applicants Experiences with Interviews

Experiences of job applicants who had interviewed for employment in California restaurants were mostly positive and they believed they were treated ethically during the interviews.
**Interview Characteristics**

Participants had heard about the job vacancy through word of mouth (n=5), internet searches (n=5), and visiting the restaurant (n=1). All interviews were conducted face to face/in person by the manager/supervisor and were mostly conducted in a public area within the restaurant (n=9). Interviews lasted for 15-60 minutes and were mostly conducted by males (n=9). Interviews were conducted by either one interviewer (n=8) or a panel consisting of 2-4 individuals (n=3). Participants were interviewed 1-5 times for a particular position, with the first interview often conducted over the phone and subsequent interviews conducted face to face.

**Definition of Ethical Hiring**

While participants seemed confident about defining ethical hiring, differences were noted between definitions of ethical hiring. Ethical hiring was defined as “hiring with no bias”, “based on qualifications”, “fair and equal treatment”, “conducted with moral standards”, “no conflict with restaurant requirement”, and “not ask personal questions”.

Some examples of definitions of ethical hiring were (names have been changed to ensure anonymity of participants):

“Ethical hiring means bringing people onto staff based on their qualifications. Gender, race, religion, etcetera should not matter when taken into consideration for a job position” (Nicole)

“Ethical hiring means...they want to hire someone that could able to perform the job, that ethically...not conflict with restaurant requirement” (Amy)

“Hiring in a manner that isn't, that is appropriate to the person and doesn’t offend people or their morally, or their moral standards” (Sarah)

“Ethical hiring means that you're hired with morals in mind and with ethical values that the interviewer is using when they hire you” (Kim)

“Ethical hiring. I don't know. Does it mean like equal opportunity kind of like being fair to everyone?” (Tim)

“Hiring in a manner that isn't, that is appropriate to the person and doesn’t offend people or their morally, or their moral standards” (Tiffany)

Participants considered resume evaluation, avoidance of discriminatory questions (based race or gender), professional behavior of interviewer during interviews, adherence to
standardized interviewing and evaluating procedure, asking questions limited to the job and applicants skills as examples of what an ethical hiring should entail or include.

“An evaluation the person's education? Of the person's, I guess, appearance. Not as in like race wise or anything. Like just how they're dressed. ......... I think it's important in an interview to come in dressed pretty well” (Tim)

“It includes the company reading through resumes searching for appropriate qualifications. And if the company, if they match the company's, then an interview would be the next step” (Nicole)

“It would entail...I mean, a normal hiring process that no questions would be asked based on race or gender or...anything that could be considered a discriminatory question. It should be done in a very fair manner with an equal opportunity to all applicants” (Kylie)

“Judge just by looking at them, how they present themselves, I would kinda get a better understanding of where they're coming from and what kinda job I'm getting myself into” (Sean)

Positive Interview Experiences

When interviewing for restaurant jobs, almost half of the participants indicated having a positive experience (n=7). Positive experiences were associated with the interviewer asking questions related to the job, applicant's skills/educational background, interviewer making eye contact with applicant, shaking hands, not asking personal questions, and demonstrating professional behavior and positive attitude.

“It was just done in a very professional manner, you know—a nice greeting, shaking hands in the beginning, eye contact. The interviewer didn't seem to be distracted by anything about myself or, you know, she, she asked questions relating to the job and it seemed that I was being asked all the same questions that any other applicant would be...” (Kylie)

“For the franchise restaurants I worked at, it had a very specific process of interviewing. And you can tell (laugh) everyone was asked the same exact questions in the same exact way. And for the privately owned, it just really felt fair and like I wasn't treated any different” (Tara)

“She asked me questions based on my experience and like my actual abilities like on...based on my volunteer work, she saw like my responsibilities and asked further questions on that. So it wasn't really based on...like who you...based on like what, who I was or anything. It was just based on my abilities” (Ann)

Non-verbal cues were included by participants as part of their positive interview experience along with verbal cues. Participants perceived the interview to be a positive
experience if they felt comfortable at the interview. Interviewee’s self-confidence was also considered to impact the perception of a positive interview experience.

“Maybe a mix of both because...I’m Asian and my English is not that good, so I got interview with one of the American restaurant and...at the time, I was kind of nervous and didn't speak loud enough and have some problem with pronunciation” (Tina)

**Negative Interview Experiences**

Negative interview experiences included verbal cues such as questions related to applicant’s age, marital status, physical appearance, ambiguous questions, unprofessional behavior (flirting, touching), while non-verbal cues were lack of eye contact, distracted interviewer, and body language. One participant considered the interview experience to be positive but was uncomfortable when asked questions pertaining to marital status.

“.........it made me feel kind of uncomfortable, like he was...trying to delve in more into my life and kinda where I was going instead of it being a job interview. It was more like a personal interview.............I answered it in a very short statement. I said yes, pretty much, "Yes, I'm engaged." He said, "When are you getting married?" "August." And that was it. I tried to kinda cut the conversation off” (Anna)

Participants considered personal or ambiguous questions to be unethical as it made them feel uncomfortable or caught them off guard and made them wonder what the appropriate answer would be or if they should provide an answer the interviewer might want to hear.

“I was treated in an unethical manner because I felt that going so much into detail about the gender roles and how I thought my femininity was going to benefit me was a little unethical and in a means of a very informal interview” (Sarah)

“....one of my interviewers was a little too chummy and a little too comfortable with me. And it, it felt like we weren't really interviewing. It was like I was on a date with the guy” (Kim)

“He was very flirtatious, I guess I could say. And always tried to like reach out and touch my hand while we were speaking. He was just looking at me in an odd...manner” (Tiffany)

Despite some negative experiences, most participants were confident of receiving a job offer (n=8) and seven participants received job offers. However, one participant believed that the job was not offered to her because of the answers she provided to questions about her views on femininity.
“I think I acted a little appalled by the certain questions that they were asking. And I think that they didn’t appreciate that” (Sarah)

Participants with positive interview experiences were confident about receiving a job offer and were offered the job. Participants who did not receive job offers were never informed about the hiring decision or given a reason for not being hired.

Changes in Future Interviews (Applicant and Organization)

Participants responded that if they are asked an unethical question or a question that made them uncomfortable at future interviews, they would reply to the best of their ability or in a professional manner, answer reluctantly, decline to answer, or get up and leave.

“I think I would respond the best I could and in the most appropriate manner possible. But I don't think I'd actually wanna work for that employer in the future” (Tiffany)

“I'd get up and leave” (Tim)

Based on their interview experiences, participants made suggestions on the changes they would like to see in the way interviews are conducted. Suggestions were for the interviewer to be more friendly and professional, use standardized interviewing procedures, ask questions that only pertain to the position, require the applicant to supply a resume at the time of interview, and conduct less interviews if not hiring the individual. One participant suggested that interviewers and interviewees should belong to the same gender thus avoiding issues with gender differences.

“I feel like maybe sometimes it's easier to have a same sex interviewer. And I'm sure that's probably hard to control, but maybe it would be more ethical to have a female manager interviewing a female prospective and a male manager interviewing...just so they can communicate on the same base level and then not have that gender differentiation and could lead to something unethical” (Sarah)

Discussion

The study reported here assessed interviewing from the perspectives of unit level restaurant managers and job applicants in the California restaurant industry. Hiring practices and procedures employed in this study were similar to those commonly used in the restaurant industry. Similar to findings by Dermondy (2002), restaurant management personnel in this study also relied on online job advertisements, word of mouth, and employee referrals for recruiting employees. Use of online recruitment tools is now commonly utilized by 90% of
major companies in the United States for recruiting (Cober, Brown, Blumental, Doverspike, & Levy, 2000), including social networking sites such as Facebook (Chang & Madera, 2012). While a well-written job description is the essential first step in the recruiting process (Newton & Kleiner, 1999), only half of the respondents in this study used them regularly.

One-on-one interviews were the most commonly used method when interviewing applicants for both management level and non-management level positions, as it is the quickest way to evaluate the candidate on a personal level and it also provides a stage for applicants to assess the organization and job fit. Surprisingly, not many interviewers used an interview guide when interviewing applicants for management (41.4%) or non-management (53.6%) positions. Studies conducted with independent and chain restaurants found that some restaurants used a structured interview process, while others used an unstructured process (Dermondy, 2002; MacHatton et al., 1997). According to Van der Zee, Bakker, & Bakker (2002), as opposed to structured interviews, an unstructured interview lends itself to interviewer bias due to lack of consistency across applicants. Therefore, best practice suggests employing a structured interview method when interviewing all types of applicants.

Prior to hiring, unit-level managers interviewed applicants at least three interviews for management-level applicants (35.0%) and two interviews for non-management-level applicants (42.1%), while Dermondy (2002) found that managers of independent and chain restaurants required at least two interviews for applicants, along with reference checks. While background checks and reference checks were being conducted, not all companies conducted them. However, studies by Van Dyke and Strick (1988) and MacHatton, et al., (1997) found that hospitality managers relied mostly on reference checks and internal checklists during the selection process, but much less on background checks (15.2%). Pre-employment health testing was rarely used probably because of the cost associated with tests, that there are no regulations requiring testing, and employee attitudes towards them (Kitterlin & Erdem, 2009). Kitterlin and Moreo (2012) found no differences in employees’ absenteeism, turnover, or accidents in establishments with and without pre-employment drug testing.

The federal Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 USC §1681 et seq.) does not have any regulatory mandate that requires organizations to conduct background checks, reference checks, or pre-employment health testing. An exception exists for the health care industry
where any employer who has an interest in hiring a person with access to patients can ask about sex related arrests. Additionally, when an employee may have access to medications, an employer can ask about drug related arrests (California Labor Code §432.7).

While most organizations informed applicants of their hiring decision, it was interesting to note that 59.3% of respondents were not required to provide documentation of the final hiring decision by their organization. This practice highlights an issue within organizations as not providing documentation about final hiring decisions can result in unethical hiring practices at the unit level going unnoticed at a higher level in the organization. Respondents were not aware of their organization being involved in violations of ethical hiring, but respondents attitudes towards the statement I believe my organization has hired workers who I felt were not qualified for the job” had the lowest mean (3.10±1.17), indicating while respondents were unaware of issues with ethical hiring in their organization they thought that their organization had hired unqualified individuals on occasions. Most respondents had received some form of training on how to conduct the hiring process. The training was provided using different methods or a combination of different methods such as seminars, workshops, on the job training, and observations. This result is encouraging because employee attitudes play an important role in the success of training programs and their impact on the organization (Karp & Sammour, 2000).

Respondents were fairly knowledgeable about the ethical hiring process as evidenced by the mean score on knowledge statements (3.84±.87), but were not very confident about their awareness of recent developments in state and federal rules and regulations in relation to hiring. Nearly 70% of the respondents were unsure or believed that asking applicants about their special accommodation needs was not acceptable which highlights the lack of knowledge in managers in regard to which questions are acceptable or unacceptable to ask during an interview. A greater effort should be made to communicate the latest developments via workshops, organizational newsletters, updated organizational policies, and training for the employees who hire and how those regulations impact the hiring process and decision making. Communication is key to avoiding lapses in the hiring process and ensures all applicants receive fair and consistent treatment. Most respondents had a positive attitude towards ethical hiring (4.04±.98) and agreed that it was possible to conduct ethical hiring.
Respondent scores on the SDS-17 scale (8.11±1.98) suggested that respondents’ responses to attitudes and knowledge sections were reflective of their opinions.

Semi-structured interviews conducted with job applicants who interviewed for positions in California restaurants considered their experience at interviews to be mostly positive and perceived they were treated ethically. Most respondents defined ethical hiring as it related to race, equality across all levels, and equal opportunity for all; while some respondents considered ethical hiring to relate to personal and organizational morals, hiring individuals that do not conflict with organizational requirements, or hiring that is not offensive. Interviewees defined ethical hiring in a more personal and emotional manner, while, interviewers provided a technical definition of ethical hiring in terms of preventing discrimination and providing equal opportunity. In a study of restaurant industry human resource managers, Durrani and Rajagopal (2013) also defined ethical hiring similar to the interviewers in this study. This suggests that interviewees and interviewers view ethical hiring differently, with interviewees considering ethics and morals to be more important. According to interviewees, ethical hiring practices include fairness, standard interviewing protocols, and professional behavior. Professional behaviors included verbal (friendliness, questions limited to applicant’s skill/knowledge) and non-verbal cues (shaking hands, eye contact). Verbal and non-verbal cues exhibited by the interviewer and interviewee are important as they influence the interview and the interview outcome (Posthuma, Morgeson, & Campion, 2002).

Respondents in this study viewed behaviors such as flirting, asking ambiguous questions, attempting to touch, asking personal questions, lacking eye contact, being distracted during the interviewers to be unethical and discriminatory as it did not give them an opportunity to express themselves and made them feel uncomfortable. A study by Hebl, Foster, Mannix, and Dovidio (2002) found that discrimination occurs in two ways – formal and informal. Formal discriminatory behaviors are “obvious, overt, and illegal,” while interpersonal discriminatory behaviors are “subtle and nonverbal.” These issues can be addressed by organizations through development of standardized protocols for interviews and providing training on ethical hiring practices that go beyond employment regulations and organizational policies. Training can include role playing, mock interviews with ethical and
unethical scenarios played out to bring home the message of the effect of verbal and non-verbal behaviors during job interviews. Development of standardized protocols for interviewing will be useful to reduce interviewer bias and ensure fair, consistent, and comfortable interview experience for the interviewee. While it may not be possible to always have structured interviews for all types of positions within an organization and given the diversity of the applicant pool attempts should be made to develop a standardized interview protocol which is consistent across the board but can also be customized for individual situations.

**Conclusions**

As the workforce continues to become more diverse, the restaurant industry should work towards creating an inclusive and welcoming environment. The first step towards creating this environment is at the hiring stage. Restaurant companies should develop ethical hiring practices that comply with federal, state, and organizational guidelines, followed by hands-on training of those practices. Results from this study showed that the hiring practices in the California restaurant industry were similar to those typically used in the United States restaurant industry. Unit managers rated ethical hiring as important to them and utilized a variety of methods for this purpose.

Interviewees view ethical hiring differently from interviewers and place importance on non-verbal cues. It is advisable for organizations to design their training towards “humanizing” the training they provide to their hiring staff for a successful interview and finding the “right” job-applicant fit. Most respondents who interviewed for jobs in the restaurant industry reported positive experiences and perceived receiving ethical treatment. While outcomes of this study suggest that California restaurants are doing a satisfactory job with hiring, there is room for improvement. Organizations that adopt ethical hiring practices throughout their organization gain to benefit by reducing employee turnover, increasing productivity, and enhancing their financial gains and reputations.

**Limitations and Future Research**

Findings from this study must be viewed with caution as the data collected was self-reported and was from a small sample. In addition, results from this study reflect the responses from respondents belonging to chain restaurants in California and cannot be
generalized to include independent restaurants in California or elsewhere in the United States. Organizations that had initially agreed to allow access to their employees opted out of this study making recruitment very challenging. Participants in the interview phase were chosen from a sample of college students from one institution; hence their experiences might be different from those who are not college students. Since this study focused on individuals who had interviewed for positions in restaurants, experiences of those applicants who interviewed in other sectors of foodservice might be different. Participants were asked to recall their interview experiences from interviews over the past 24 months, however, participants may not be able to recall details of their interviews which is a limitation that needs to be considered.

Future research should investigate hiring practices in other geographical areas to determine differences in hiring practices and job applicants’ experiences. Conducting research on hiring practices and applicants’ experiences in independent restaurants in California will be helpful to determine if differences exist with chain restaurants. Future studies should explore hiring practices and applicant experiences in minority-owned restaurants. Interviews can be conducted with top, middle, and lower level managers and applicants within select organizations to determine if differences exist within an organization using a case study approach. Exploring employee experiences with workplace discrimination after hiring will be helpful in determining discrimination in the presence of ethical hiring practices. Owing to the sensitive nature of the topic, use of qualitative research methods might yield in-depth insights into hiring practices and job applicant experiences. Participants in this study were limited to members of CRA. Future research should utilize a random sample of restaurants for better generalization of results.
Table 5.1. Demographic Characteristics of Unit-level Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency (n)(^a)</th>
<th>Percent (%)(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 – 40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 – 56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 years old or older</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current job function</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Operator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Manager</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Part-time unit manager)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure in current position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 7 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – 12 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 12 years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of employees supervised</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 or less</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 - 300</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 300</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)\( n = 84-104 \)

\(^b\)Percent is more than 100 for each category as respondents chose all answers that applied.
Table 5.2. Hiring Practices and Procedures currently used by Unit-level Managers in California Restaurants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices and Procedures</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percent&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods of job advertisement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of Mouth</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Referrals</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercompany bulletin</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Wanted Sign</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of Job Description</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of Job Description in Developing Job Advertisements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where Interviews Conducted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Area</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Area</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Method Used (management level positions)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one/In-person</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Method Used (non-management level positions)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one/In-person</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>n = 84-104  
<sup>b</sup>Percent is more than 100 for each category as respondents chose all answers that applied.
Table 5.2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices and Procedures</th>
<th>Frequency (n)ᵃ</th>
<th>Percent (%)ᵇ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Used in Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Tool Used (Management Level Interviews)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Guide</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Assessment Tool</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper-based Assessment Tool</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Tool Used (Non-management Level Interviews)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Guide</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Assessment Tool</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper-based Assessment Tool</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Duration (Management Level Interviews)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15 minutes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-30 minutes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45 minutes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 45 minutes</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Duration (Non-management Level Interviews)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15 minutes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-30 minutes</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45 minutes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 45 minutes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Interviews Prior to Hiring (Management Level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Interviews Prior to Hiring (Non-management Level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices and Procedures</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Party Providing Training about Ethical Hiring Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Human Resource Personnel</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Supervisor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Agency/Firm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Training Received About Hiring Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Seminar/workshop</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read Written Material/Policy Documents</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one On-the-job Instruction</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation On-the-job</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewed Video</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online training</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of Training Session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one hour</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One day (8 hours)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half a day (4 hours)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one day</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one hour</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Effectively Contributed to Conduct Hiring Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Training Would Have Helped if Training was not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided by the Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization has Human Resource Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance Available if Unable to Decide on Hiring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation Needed by Organization if Applicant Hired or Not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.3 Unit-level Managers Knowledge about Interviewing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it Acceptable to ask Interview Questions Relating to?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>104 (96.3)</td>
<td>4 (3.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>104 (96.3)</td>
<td>4 (3.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin (Geographical/Ethnic)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>104 (74.3)</td>
<td>4 (3.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td>94 (87.0)</td>
<td>10 (9.3)</td>
<td>4 (3.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Accommodations Needs</td>
<td>28 (25.9)</td>
<td>56 (51.9)</td>
<td>24 (22.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>M±SD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am knowledgeable about the types of questions that should not be asked during an interview.</td>
<td>4.12±.78</td>
<td>4 (3.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>68 (63.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am unsure at times about the meaning of ethical hiring practices</td>
<td>4.05±.97</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>12 (11.1)</td>
<td>7 (6.5)</td>
<td>53 (49.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I thoroughly understand the purpose of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).</td>
<td>3.89±.92</td>
<td>5 (5.2)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>16 (16.7)</td>
<td>54 (56.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I thoroughly understand the provisions of the Civil Rights Act in terms of hiring.</td>
<td>3.77±.87</td>
<td>5 (5.2)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>20 (20.8)</td>
<td>58 (60.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I thoroughly understand the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act in terms of hiring.</td>
<td>3.69±.89</td>
<td>5 (5.2)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>27 (28.1)</td>
<td>51 (53.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of recent developments in rules and regulations at the federal and state level in terms of hiring.</td>
<td>3.54±.81</td>
<td>4 (4.2)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>40 (41.7)</td>
<td>44 (45.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Mean 3.84±.87

\( ^a n = 84-104 \)

\( ^b \)Mean±Standard Deviation

\( ^c \)Scale for statements: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly Agree

\( ^d \)Reverse coded items: 1 = Strongly Agree; 2 = Agree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Disagree; 5 = Strongly Disagree.
Table 5.4 Unit-level Managers Attitudes towards Ethical Hiring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>M±SD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Frequency of Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is not possible to always follow ethical hiring practices.</td>
<td>4.63±.53</td>
<td>77(65.7)</td>
<td>53(49.1)</td>
<td>7(6.5)</td>
<td>12(11.1)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe my organization's hiring practices are ethical.</td>
<td>4.45±.84</td>
<td>4(3.7)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>1(0.9)</td>
<td>41(38.0)</td>
<td>62(57.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe in fairness in hiring at all levels.</td>
<td>4.44±.96</td>
<td>5(3.6)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>6(5.6)</td>
<td>28(25.9)</td>
<td>69(63.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe interviewers should be allowed to ask any personal question they want during an interview.</td>
<td>4.11±1.19</td>
<td>61(56.5)</td>
<td>15(13.9)</td>
<td>20(18.5)</td>
<td>7(6.5)</td>
<td>5(4.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe my organization’s job descriptions for position I hire for are fair.</td>
<td>4.10±.90</td>
<td>4(3.7)</td>
<td>1(0.9)</td>
<td>12(11.1)</td>
<td>54(50.0)</td>
<td>37(34.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe it is unacceptable to ask interview questions that are not specifically related to the job.</td>
<td>3.45±1.29</td>
<td>6(5.6)</td>
<td>31(28.7)</td>
<td>6(5.6)</td>
<td>38(35.2)</td>
<td>27(25.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe my organization has hired workers who I felt were not qualified for the job.</td>
<td>3.10±1.17</td>
<td>13(12.0)</td>
<td>22(20.4)</td>
<td>22(20.4)</td>
<td>43(39.8)</td>
<td>8(7.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td>4.04±.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a n =84-104  
b Mean±Standard Deviation  
c Scale for Statements: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly Agree  
d Reverse coded items: 1 = Strongly Agree; 2 = Agree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Disagree; 5 = Strongly Disagree.
CHAPTER 6. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of hiring practices through the views of human resources managers, unit level managers, and job applicants. This was accomplished through three distinct phases using qualitative and quantitative methods.

This chapter provides a summary of the results, conclusions, limitations, and recommendations for future research.

Summary of Results

In phase one, 279 questionnaires were sent to human resources managers belonging to The Council of Hotel and Restaurant Trainers (CHART). One hundred and one questionnaires were returned resulting in a response rate of 36.2%. Majority of respondents were male (58%), Caucasian (83%); and over the age of 46 years. Seventy-four percent of the respondents were Christian or Catholic and two-thirds possessed an undergraduate college degree or higher. Most respondents (73%) had human resources experience in excess of 10 years. Majority of the respondents (66%) worked in companies with 1,000 or more employees. Ethnicity had a significant effect on attitudes towards ethical hiring and organizational size had a significant effect on perceptions of ethical hiring within organizations.

Human resources managers’ agreed their organizational hiring practices were ethical and fair, their hiring managers’ were knowledgeable and follow a mandated hiring process, they had a welcoming environment for newly hired workers, and their organization promoted diversity at all levels. Most respondents had similar definitions of ethical hiring which indicated that they were aware of what ethical hiring meant:

“Hiring the most qualified candidate instead of hiring someone who is not qualified but may share your similar values, beliefs, customs, or attitudes.”

“The practice of hiring an individual based on education, experience, and other work related factors without any bias.”
“Ethical Hiring mean to be fair to all candidates; evaluating them only against job requirements and eliminating any personal prejudices or stereotyping.”

In phase two, 667 unit managers from multi-unit restaurant chains who were members of the California Restaurant Association (CRA) were sent questionnaires (paper-based = 200; web-based = 467). One hundred and twenty-two, web-based questionnaires and 22 paper-based questionnaires were returned resulting in a response rate of 26.1% and 11%, respectively. Respondents were male (52.4%) and female (47.6%). Majority of the respondents were Caucasian (90.4%); and between the ages of 41 to 56 years (82.0%). Most respondents were unit managers (95.2%) and some identified themselves as owner/operator (1.9%) or human resource managers (1.9%) or other (1.0%). Half of the respondents had been working in their current position for more than 12 years. Number of employees under the direct supervision of the respondents varied from “Less than 25” (24.0%) to “More than 300” (8.7%).

Respondents used multiple methods for advertising their job openings, such as online job advertisements (73.6%), word of mouth (56.4%), and employee referrals (55.0%), while some used other methods (recruitment website LinkedIn) and social media (2.9%). Most of the respondents used job descriptions (87.7%) as a foundation when developing job announcements in their organization, however, less than half (45.0%) used job descriptions frequently. Majority of the respondents (60.7%) stated that they conducted interviews in a public area (i.e., dining area or in the kitchen). One-on-one type interviews were most commonly used for management-level positions (71.4%) and non-management-level positions (80.7%). Interviews were mostly conducted in English (81.4%). An interview guide was the most commonly used tool to conduct interviews for non-management-level positions (53.6%) than management-level positions (41.4%). No interview tools were used by 24.3% of the respondents for non-management-level and 32.1% of respondents for management-level positions.

Interviews typically lasted more than 45 minutes (54.3%) for management-level and 15-30 minutes for non-management-level applicants (38.6%). At least, three interviews were conducted before reaching a decision to hire a management-level applicant (35%), and two interviews were conducted with non-management-level applicants (42.1%).
checks were only performed for management-level applicants (46.4%), while 22.1% of respondents did not conduct background checks on any applicants. Only 39.3% of respondents conducted reference checks on all applicants (39.3%), but 27.9% of respondents only conducted background checks for management-level applicants. Most respondents did not conduct medical/health test prior to extending a job offer to applicants (62.9%), while 3.6% of respondents required testing for all employees.

Most respondents notified applicants about the job offer via telephone (75.7%) and few used postal mail (5.7%). Applicants who did not receive the job offer were usually notified by the company (63.6%). Interestingly, respondents’ indicated their organization did not require documentation as evidence of if an applicant was hired or not (59.3%). Majority of the organizations had not been cited for violation of ethical hiring practices (70.0%). Only 2.9% of the respondents indicated that disciplinary actions are taken by their company if violations of ethical hiring practices are reported. Most participants received training from their organization on ethical hiring practices (70.7%) and this training was provided by a designated human resources employee from within their organization (52.9%).

Training methods were: seminars/workshops (57.1%), reading written materials/policy documents (50.0%), 1-on-1 instruction on the job (45.7%), and observation of other employees on the job (45.0%). Duration of training sessions ranged from more than 1 hour (24.3%) to less than 1 hour (2.9%). Sixty percent of respondents considered receiving training to have effectively contributed to their ability to conduct the hiring process, while 3.6% of respondents’ perceived training to not be useful. More than half of the respondent companies had a human resource department (68.6%). Assistance from the human resource department was available in the event respondents’ were unable to make a decision on hiring (57.9%).

Most respondents indicated they were knowledgeable that questions about an applicant’s marital status (96.3%), religion (96.3%), educational qualifications (87.0%), and geographical/ethnic origin (74.3%) should not be asked. However, respondents provided varied responses when asked if interview questions about the applicant’s special accommodation needs were acceptable (No = 51.9%; Unsure = 22.2%). The overall mean on 6 statements related respondents’ knowledge of ethical hiring was 3.84±.87.
Respondents disagreed that “It is not possible to always follow ethical hiring practices” (4.63±.53) on a 5-point Likert style scale (1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = neutral, 4 = disagree, 5 = strongly disagree). More than half of respondents agreed that their organization’s hiring practices were ethical (4.45±.84). The statement “I believe my organization has hired workers who I felt were not qualified for the job” had the lowest mean (3.10±1.17) with respondents indicating agree (39.8%) and strongly agree (7.4%). The overall mean for the 7 attitudes statements was 4.04±.98.

For the interviews with job applicants, semi structured interviews were conducted with 11 participants. Majority of the participants were female (72.7%), and between the ages of 18-24 years (63.6%). Experiences of job applicants who had interviewed for employment in California restaurants were mostly positive and participants believed they were treated ethically during interviews. However, some respondents provided examples of experiences they considered as unethical.

Interviews were conducted face to face/in person by the manager/supervisor and were conducted in a public area within the restaurant (n=9). Duration of interviews were between 15-60 minutes and were mostly conducted by male interviewer’s (n=9). Interviews were conducted by one interviewer (n=8) or a panel consisting of 2-4 individuals (n=3). Participants were interviewed 1-5 times for a particular position. In case of multiple interviews for the same position, the first interview was usually conducted over the phone and subsequent interviews were conducted face to face.

While participants seemed confident about defining ethical hiring, differences between definitions of ethical hiring were noted. Ethical hiring was defined as “hiring with no bias”, “based on qualifications”, “fair and equal treatment”, “conducted with moral standards”, “not conflict with restaurant requirement”, and “not ask personal questions”. Some illustrative participants’ definitions of ethical hiring were (names have been changed to ensure anonymity of participants):

“Ethical hiring means bringing people onto staff based on their qualifications. Gender, race, religion, etcetera should not matter when taken into consideration for a job position” (Nicole)

“Hiring in a manner that isn’t, that is appropriate to the person and doesn’t offend people or their morally, or their moral standards” (Tiffany)
When interviewing for restaurant jobs, almost half of the participants indicated having a mostly positive experience (n=7). Positive experiences were associated with the interviewer asking questions related to the job/applicant’s skills/educational background, interviewer making eye contact with applicant, shaking hands with the applicant, demonstrating a professional attitude, not asking personal questions, and having a positive attitude.

Conclusions

One specific objective of this study was to assess current hiring practices and methods used by various restaurant sectors operating in California and unforeseen challenges and significant delays prevented that objective from being met. Nonetheless, findings from this study will be of interest to human resource professionals and those concerned with advancing ethical hiring practices in their organization. Given the workforce diversity in the foodservice industry, human resource managers’ attitudes and perceptions of ethical hiring offer an encouraging view that carries the potential to impact hiring of millions of foodservice workers. The perspective of unit managers and job applicants helps provide a balanced view of the hiring process. Following best practices in human resources can provide an organization maximum opportunity to remain an employer of choice (Looi et al, 2004). Results from this study showed that the hiring practices in the California restaurant industry were similar to those typically used in the United States restaurant industry. Unit managers rated ethical hiring as important to them and utilized a variety of methods for this purpose.

Human resource managers are in a position to serve as role models for employees in their organization and their knowledge and attitudes acts as an example to unit managers. The demonstration of correct hiring practices by unit managers confirms support for HR initiatives. Interviewee’s view ethical hiring differently from interviewer’s and place importance on non-verbal cues. It is advisable for organizations to design their training towards “humanizing” the training they provide to their hiring staff for a successful interview and finding the “right” job-applicant fit. Most respondents who interviewed for jobs in the restaurant industry reported positive experiences and perceived receiving ethical treatment. An effective hiring process can induct superior talent and raise employee attitudes and job performance to bring forth organizational change. However, job applicants reported
situations when verbal or non-verbal cues (flirting, ambiguous questions, attempts to touch, asking personal questions, lack of eye contact, distracted interviewers) of interviewer’s made them uncomfortable and they perceived those behaviors to be unethical.

While outcomes of this study suggest that California restaurants are doing a satisfactory job with hiring, there is room for improvement. Organizations that adopt ethical hiring practices throughout their organization gain to benefit immensely by reducing employee turnover, increasing productivity, and enhancing their financial gains. Organizations can benefit from employing HR professionals who know how to lead the hiring process effectively and keep a check on enforcement of polices at the unit level. Better communication between human resource managers and unit level managers along with training can help ensure all the individuals involved in the hiring process are following consistent policies and procedures. Professional HR organizations (e.g., The Council of Hotel and Restaurant Trainers) that are increasingly offering ways to sharpen management skills and reinforce best practices and can rely on this study’s findings for guidance.

The hiring process by its very nature can be seen as an investment and improper hiring methods can lead to higher costs. Organizations that are ‘bottom line driven’ may need little convincing to see the bottom line impact of proper hiring practices. This study offers evidence for organizations to embrace hiring practices that are both fair and ethical. Furthermore, unit managers can also find value in providing their assistants training in hiring practices and using tools to select high quality candidates.

**Limitations**

This study contains certain limitations that should be considered. Results of this study are reflective of respondents’ who are members of CHART and CRA and cannot be generalized to other chain restaurants in the United States. Data collected was based on self-reports by human resource and unit level managers, rather than observations of actual practices, hence the results of this study should be viewed with caution. HR professionals hold encouraging attitudes towards ethical hiring and workplace diversity, but they may be less able to influence practices within their organization especially when unit-level hiring is conducted.
Since semi structured interviews were conducted with participants who were college students, their experiences might be different from those who are not college students. Only students who interviewed for restaurant jobs were chosen for this study, hence the findings from this study cannot be generalized to interview experiences in other sectors of foodservice. The researcher was also employed at the university as an instructor which may have impacted results. Nonetheless, this study provided information about hiring from the views of three separate audiences giving a holistic view into the hiring process.

**Future Research**

Future research should investigate hiring practices and applicants’ experiences in independent restaurants in California to determine if differences exist with chain restaurants. Future research should replicate findings with a larger sample of HR managers and conduct in-depth inquiry into the attitudes, knowledge, and perceived importance of ethical hiring practices using interviews or focus groups. Researchers can investigate hiring practices in their respective geographical areas to determine differences in hiring practices and job applicants’ experiences. Future research can also look at different management groups who received training versus those who did not. Additionally, assess the value of corporate training and non-corporate training.

Interviews can be conducted with top, middle, and lower level managers and applicants within select organizations to determine if differences exist within an organization using a case study approach. Lack of perceived transparency where employees working downstream may not perceive their input and participation in the development and implementation of ethical hiring policies as valuable are challenges that need to be considered by organizations. To determine if differences exist between management attitudes towards workplace diversity, ethical hiring, and job applicants’ experiences, similar research should be conducted with minority-owned restaurants.
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PRESIDENTTalks

The Power of Pinterest...Who Can You Trust?

I was a Pinterest fan before the social site became popular. It’s true. For those of you who aren’t familiar with the hottest social platform on the web, Pinterest now drives more referral traffic than Google+, YouTube and LinkedIn combined. In short, it is a network where members capture recipes, craft projects, home decor, books - you name it - into a digital scrapbook of their favorites.

You ‘follow’ people on Pinterest when you trust their opinions. The idea of trust, reminds me of CHART. CHART is a network of like-minded trainers. Our organization exists because we share opinions in the art of learning and development. I personally trust my CHART colleagues without reservations!

CHART groups on LinkedIn, Facebook and Ask My Peers have quickly become a network of sharing; a way to solicit ideas or contribute to topics on speaker selection, program design, upcoming Regional Training Forums and much, much, more. Our CHART Trainer on Twitter provides another opportunity for you to share and keep connected.

I encourage you to join a CHART online network as a trusted source of information and inspiration. Oh, and follow me on Pinterest!

Jen Swan

CHART News

Member Seeks Help with Hiring Practices Survey

PhD student and CHART member Amir Durrani, Norms Restaurants, is conducting a study to explore the experiences of restaurant industry applicants during the hiring process and compare those to the beliefs of human resources professionals to determine if fair and ethical hiring practices are being employed.

Interested CHART members are asked to take a short, web-based survey. In return, you’ll not only be entered to win eight $25 Amazon gift cards; but also have access to the findings.

The information gained in this study will benefit the industry by helping identify fair and ethical hiring practices and helping the human resources community develop strategies and policies to improve the hiring process, worker diversity, and organizational productivity.

Can you please take a few moments to take this survey? Thank you.
http://humansciences.hiringpractices.sozumo.com/s3/
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QUESTIONNAIRE COVER LETTER

Dear CHART Member:

Organizations today are increasingly recognizing that their human resources are their most important resource. An effective hiring process can help individual restaurant teams navigate through the recruitment process and select the right candidate for the job who becomes a member of their diverse team. In order to better understand hiring processes it is important to identify current hiring practices and the requirements that enable managers to provide a workplace where people from different backgrounds are easily assimilated into the organization.

As researchers at Iowa State University’s Hotel, Restaurant, and Institution Management Program, we are conducting a questionnaire to gain your viewpoints about current hiring practices, methods used for hiring at the unit level, as well as attitudes and knowledge related with ethical hiring and diversity. Results of the project will provide information for the restaurant industry about incorporating strategies to promote ethical hiring practices.

We need your input! Whether you directly hire workers, or do not hire workers and are responsible for developing human resources policy, your input is valuable. This is an opportunity for you to provide information on the hiring processes and help identify potential ethical concerns. 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.

Amir Durani, MBA
PhD Candidate
Iowa State University
adurani@iastate.edu
562-688-8865
CHART Member Since 2000

Lakshman Rajagopal, PhD
Assistant and Major Professor
Iowa State University
lraj@iastate.edu
515-294-9740
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INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

Title of Study: Current Hiring Practices: An Example of the California Restaurant Industry

Investigators: Amir Durrani, MBA, PhD student and Lakshman Rajagopal, 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 better understand the experiences of job applicants when they apply for a job and compare those to the beliefs of human resources professionals to determine if fair and ethical hiring practices occur in the restaurant industry. You are being invited to participate in this study because of your position and the valuable feedback you could provide through firsthand knowledge. You should not participate if: 1) you are not 18 years of age or older and 2) are not a human resources management professional who is involved in the hiring process in your organization.

DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURES

If you agree to participate, you will be asked to provide information in a web-based questionnaire about hiring procedures and practices within your organization that ensure ethical hiring. You will be asked the following type of questions:

How strongly do you agree or disagree with these statements?

1. I am knowledgeable about the culture of different groups.
2. I admit my stereotypes about other groups.
3. My organization’s hiring practices are ethical and fair.
4. Hiring managers in my organization understand the meaning and value of ethical and fair hiring.
5. My organization hires employees of all various ethnic and diverse backgrounds.
6. Hiring managers strictly follow a hiring process mandated by human resources.
7. I find it more satisfying to work within a diverse team.
8. I feel that everyone is unique, with differing values and preferences.

Each questionnaire will take about 10 - 12 minutes to complete. The questionnaire will also consist of questions about demographic information.

RISKS

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

BENEFITS

If you decide to participate in this study there may be no direct benefit to you. It is hoped that the information gained in this study will benefit the industry by helping identify fair and ethical hiring practices. Identifying the issues will help in the development of strategies that will
encourage the human resources community to develop strategies and policies to improve the hiring process, worker diversity, and organizational productivity.

COSTS AND COMPENSATION
You will not have any costs from participating in this study. If you successfully complete and submit the questionnaire, you will be invited to enter into a random drawing to win one out of eight $25 Amazon.com gift cards.

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. You can skip any questions that you do not wish to answer.

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: participants will be assigned a unique three letter code instead of their name. Only the researchers identified will have access to study records. Records will be kept confidential in a locked office and all electronic data will be kept in password protected computer files. All other data will be retained for 5 years before erasure or destruction. If the results are published, your identity will remain confidential. Data will not be shared with individuals at your place of work.

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

- For further information about the study contact Amir Durrani at (562) 688-8665 or Lakshman Rajagopal, (515) 294-9740.

- 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 for Responsible Research, 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. Please print a copy of the informed consent for your
own files or you can request a copy of this consent form by contacting the Principal Investigator at adurrani@iastate.edu.

Please mark your selection below:

( ) I agree to participate in this study.  ( ) I do not wish to participate in this study.
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Phase 1: Questionnaire

Section 1.
1. What is your Gender? (Please select one)
   - [ ] Male
   - [ ] Female

2. What is your age? (Please select one)
   - [ ] 18 years old
   - [ ] 19 - 25
   - [ ] 26 - 35
   - [ ] 36 - 45
   - [ ] 46 - 55
   - [ ] over 55 years old

3. What is your ethnicity (Please select one)
   - [ ] Asian or Pacific Islander
   - [ ] African American or Black (Non-Hispanic origin)
   - [ ] Caucasian/White
   - [ ] Hispanic
   - [ ] Multiracial
   - [ ] American Indian or Alaskan Native
   - [ ] Ethnicity unknown
   - [ ] Other (Please Specify) _______________________

4. What is the highest level of education you have completed? (Please select one)
   - [ ] High School/GED
   - [ ] Some college
   - [ ] Associates degree
   - [ ] Bachelors degree
   - [ ] Masters degree
   - [ ] Doctoral degree

5. What is your current Marital Status? (Please select one)
   - [ ] Single
   - [ ] Married
   - [ ] Separated
   - [ ] Domestic Partner

6. What is/are your Religious Beliefs? (Please select one)
   - [ ] None/Atheist
   - [ ] Buddhist
   - [ ] Catholic
   - [ ] Christian
   - [ ] Hindu
   - [ ] Jewish
7. Which of the following languages can you speak fluently? (Please check any that apply)
   - Arabic
   - Chinese
   - English
   - Farsi
   - French
   - German
   - Hindi/Urdu
   - Italian
   - Japanese
   - Korean
   - Spanish
   - Tagalog
   - Other (Please Specify) ________________

8. How long have you worked in the field of Human Resources Management? (Please select one)
   - Less than 5 years
   - Between 5 and 9 years
   - Between 10 and 14 years
   - Between 15 and 19 years
   - 20 years or more
   - None

9. Do you work full-time or part-time at your current place of employment?
   - Full-time (35 or more hours per week)
   - Part-time (less than 35 hours per week)

10. What is your current job title? (Please Check One That Most Applies)
    - HR Generalist
    - HR Manager
    - HR Director
    - HR Consultant
    - HR Vice President
    - Vice President
    - Other (Please Specify) ________________

11. How long have you worked for your current employer?
    - Less than 6 months
    - 6 months to less than 1 year
    - 1 – 2 years
    - 4 – 7 years
    - 8 – 12 years

12. Which best describes your company’s primary function?
    - Hotel/Lodging
    - Foodservice
    - Other ________________ (Please specify)
13. Approximately, how many employees are in your organization?
   - □ Less that 25
   - □ 26 to 50
   - □ 51 to 100
   - □ 101 to 300
   - □ 301 to 500
   - □ 501 to 1000
   - □ Greater than 1000

Section 2
Please respond to the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. I am knowledgeable about the culture of different ethnic groups (e.g., Asian, African, Middle-Eastern).</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I admit my stereotypes about other groups.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I feel equally comfortable with all groups.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I am drawn to others who are different than me.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I find it unsatisfying to work within a diverse team.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I feel that everyone is unique, with differing values and preferences.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I show little patience and understanding with people who speak little or no English.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I feel that both newcomers and the organizations in which they work should learn to work together.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 3

Please indicate how the following statements apply to your organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. My organization’s hiring practices are ethical and fair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Hiring managers in my organization understand the meaning and value of ethical and fair hiring.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. My organization hires employees of various ethnicities and with diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Hiring managers strictly follow a hiring process mandated by human resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I have seen employees hired in our organization that had little to no required qualifications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. My organization has a welcoming environment for newly hired workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I see hiring managers in our organization show patience and understanding with people who speak little English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I know hiring managers who harbor stereotypes towards others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. My organization promotes diversity at all levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I have taken disciplinary action towards hiring managers who violate ethical hiring process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Please define what “ethical hiring” means to you.

Section 3. 
*Instructions.* Below you will find a list of statements. Please read each statement carefully and decide if that statement describes you or not. If it describes you, check the word "true"; if not, check the word "false":

35. I sometimes litter.  
   - True  
   - False

36. I always admit my mistakes openly and face the potential negative consequences.  
   - True  
   - False

37. In traffic I am always polite and considerate of others.  
   - True  
   - False

38. I always accept others' opinions, even when they don't agree with my own.  
   - True  
   - False

39. I take out my bad moods on others now and then.  
   - True  
   - False

40. There has been an occasion when I took advantage of someone else.  
   - True  
   - False
41. In conversations I always listen attentively and let others finish their sentences.
   - True
   - False

42. I never hesitate to help someone in case of emergency.
   - True
   - False

43. When I have made a promise, I keep it — no ifs, ands, or buts.
   - True
   - False

44. I occasionally speak badly of others behind their back.
   - True
   - False

45. I would never live off at other people's expense.
   - True
   - False

46. I always stay friendly and courteous with other people, even when I am stressed out.
   - True
   - False

47. During arguments I always stay objective and matter-of-fact.
   - True
   - False

48. There has been at least one occasion when I failed to return an item that I borrowed.
   - True
   - False

49. I always eat a healthy diet.
   - True
   - False

50. Sometimes I only help because I expect something in return.
   - True
   - False

If you would like to be entered into a drawing to win one of eight $25 Amazon Gift Cards, please provide your email address below. If you prefer not to enter the drawing, please accept our thanks for your time and input.

Email address:
November 28, 2012

Dear California Restaurant Association Member,

My name is Amir S. Durrani and I am writing to you to seek your assistance with my doctoral dissertation work. I report directly to Mr. Phil Singerman, President of Norm's Restaurants and California Restaurant Association (CRA) board member. I have been Director of Training for Norm's since 2006. During my 25 year career, I have worked for various hospitality companies (Wolfgang Puck Restaurants, Marie Callender's, Hilton Hotel and Norm's Restaurants) performing human resources functions. Mr. Carl Winston and Mr. Jot Condie are aware of the objectives of my study and suggested that I contact you for further assistance.

I am currently a doctoral student at Iowa State University pursuing my doctoral degree in hospitality management. The title of my dissertation is "Current Hiring Practices: An Example from the California Restaurant Industry. Outcomes of this study will be helpful in determining the process of hiring currently being used in the California restaurant industry and identify areas for improvement.

I would greatly appreciate if you could please forward my electronic questionnaire (Questionnaire link: http://human sciences.ca-restaurant.spizmo.com/s3/) to your unit managers and ask the person/s in who is responsible for hiring complete this questionnaire. If internet access is unavailable at the unit level, a paper version of the survey can be mailed along with a self-address stamped envelope for easy return. Kindly inform me of how many I would need to send along with the physical mailing address of the unit.

I would like to assure you that all the information collected in this study will be kept strictly confidential and participant identities will not be disclosed nor will they be asked for proprietary information which could reveal their position or company identity. All participants will be included in a random drawing for Amazon gift cards. Members of CRA will receive a complimentary copy of the results of my study. As an industry leader, access to this type of knowledge can only help improve hiring practices and positively affect your bottom line.

Thank you for your time and I look forward to hearing from you. If you’d like to discuss any of this further, please do not hesitate to call me at: (562) 588-8665.

Sincerely,

Amir S. Durrani, MBA
PhD Candidate
Iowa State University
adurrani@iastate.edu
562-688-8665

Lakshman Rajagopal, PhD, CHE
Assistant Professor
Iowa State University
lraj@iastate.edu
515-294-6740
APPENDIX G: PHASE 2 INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

Title of Study: Current Hiring Practices: An Example from the California Restaurant Industry

Investigators: Amir Durrani, Ph.D. candidate; Lakshman Rajegopal, Ph.D., CHIE

This is a research study. Please feel free to ask questions at any time. The purpose of this study is to gather information from restaurant managers in California about their attitudes, knowledge, procedures, and training methods in place in relation to hiring. It is hoped that the information gained in this study will help improve hiring practices in the restaurant industry and encourage the restaurant industry to identify strategies and policies to improve worker diversity and organizational productivity. You should participate in this study if: a) you are 18 years of age or older; and b) are responsible for hiring employees in your organization.

If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete a four-part questionnaire about your attitudes, knowledge, procedures and training methods in place in relation to hiring. If you decide to participate in this study there may be no direct benefit to you. If you participate you will be invited to enter into a drawing to receive one of eight $25 Amazon.com gift cards.

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. You can skip any questions that you do not wish to answer. There are no foreseeable risks at this time from participating in this study.

For further information about the study, please contact Amir Durrani, adurrani@iastate.edu, at 562-688-8665. 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 for Responsible Research, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011.

Do you agree to participate in this study?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Current Hiring Practices: An Example from the California Restaurant Industry
Section 1. HIRING PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES.
The section below pertains to the procedures for hiring in your organization. Please answer all questions.

1. Which of the following sources do you use when advertising a job opening in your organization? (Select all that apply)
   - Online job advertisement
   - Printed job advertisement
   - A posted ‘Help Wanted/Now Hiring’ sign
   - Word of mouth
   - Employee referrals
   - Inter-company bulletin
   - Other __________________________ (please specify)

2. Do you use a job description (a summary of the tasks to be performed and states specific position requirements) as a foundation for developing job announcements in your organization?
   - Yes
   - No (skip to question 4)

3. If you answered “Yes” to question 2, how often is a job description used for developing job announcements in your organization?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Never

4. When conducting interviews with applicants, where are the interviews usually conducted?
   - In a private area (i.e., the manager’s office)
   - In a public area (i.e., in the dining area, in the kitchen area)
   - Other __________________________ (please specify)

5. What type of interviews do you conduct with applicants who are interviewing for management-level positions (managers)? (Select all that apply)
   - Telephone interviews (The applicant is asked questions over the phone)
   - One-on-one in person (The interviewer and applicant are the only ones present)
   - Panel Team (A group of two or more persons are interviewing the applicant at the same time)
   - Other __________________________ (please specify)

6. What type of interviews do you conduct with applicants who are interviewing for non-management-level positions (dishes, servers)? (Select all that apply)
   - Telephone interviews (The applicant is asked questions over the phone)
   - One-on-one in person (The interviewer and applicant are the only ones present)
   - Panel Team (A group of two or more persons are interviewing the applicant at the same time)
   - Other __________________________ (please specify)

7. In which language do you usually conduct the interview?
8. Which type of interview tool do you use when interviewing management level applicants? (Select all that apply)

☐ An interview guide with specific questions (Closed-ended interview)
☐ Online candidate assessment tool
☐ Paper-based candidate assessment tool
☐ No interview tool used (Open-ended interview).

9. Which type of interview tool do you use when interviewing non-management level applicants? (Select all that apply)

☐ An interview guide with specific questions (Closed-ended interview)
☐ Online candidate assessment tool
☐ Paper-based candidate assessment tool
☐ No interview tool used (Open-ended interview).

10. What is the approximate length of an interview for a management level position (manager)?

☐ Less than 15 minutes
☐ More than 15 minutes but less than 30 minutes
☐ 31 to 45 minutes
☐ 46 to 60 minutes
☐ More than 1 hour

11. What is the approximate length of an interview for a non-management level position (dishwasher, server)?

☐ Less than 15 minutes
☐ More than 15 minutes but less than 30 minutes
☐ 31 to 45 minutes
☐ 46 to 60 minutes
☐ More than 1 hour

12. How many interviews do you conduct with an applicant who has applied for a management level position (manager) before reaching a decision?

☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3
☐ 4 or more

13. How many interviews do you conduct with an applicant who has applied for a non-management level position (server, dishwasher) before reaching a decision?

☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3
☐ 4 or more
14. Do you typically perform background checks on applicants?
   □ Yes, for all applicants (management and non-management level)
   □ Yes, only for management-level applicants
   □ Yes, only for non-management-level applicants
   □ No background checks are performed for any applicant

15. Do you typically perform reference checks on applicants?
   □ Yes, for all applicants (management and non-management level)
   □ Yes, only for management-level applicants
   □ Yes, only for non-management-level applicants
   □ No background checks are performed for any applicant

16. Do you require medical/health testing prior to extending a job offer?
   □ Yes, for all applicants (management and non-management level)
   □ Yes, only for management-level applicants
   □ Yes, only for non-management-level applicants
   □ No background checks are performed for any applicant

17. If chosen, how are applicants notified about the job offer? (Select all that apply)
   □ Immediately after the final interview with the interviewee present on site.
   □ Via telephone
   □ Via e-mail
   □ Via postal mail

18. When making the job offer, what details do you provide to the applicant? (Select all that apply)
   □ Description of job position
   □ Location of employment
   □ Hourly wage/Salary
   □ Work hours
   □ Benefits
   □ Information about employee orientation
   □ Start date
   □ Other ________________ (please specify)

19. Do you notify applicants that will not be hired?
   □ Yes
   □ No

20. To your knowledge, has your organization ever been cited for violation of ethical hiring practices?
   □ Yes
   □ No (please skip question 21)

21. If you answered “yes” to question 20, does your organization take disciplinary actions towards interviewers who violate ethical hiring practices?
   □ Never
22. Have you received training from your organization on how to conduct the hiring process in an ethical manner?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No (Go to question 27)

23. If you answered “yes” to question 22, who provided you the training on how to conduct the hiring process in an ethical manner?
   ☐ A designated human resources employee within my organization
   ☐ An outside firm or agency
   ☐ My immediate supervisor
   ☐ Other __________ (please specify)

24. What type of training did you receive from your organization on how to conduct the hiring process?
   ☐ Received online training
   ☐ Attended a seminar/workshop
   ☐ Received one-on-one instruction on the job
   ☐ Observed another person on the job
   ☐ Viewed a video
   ☐ Read written material/policy documents
   ☐ Other __________ (please specify)

25. Approximately, how long was the training session you received on how to conduct the hiring process?
   ☐ Less than one hour
   ☐ More than one hour
   ☐ Half a day (4 hours)
   ☐ One day (8 hours)
   ☐ More than one day

26. Did the training contribute to your ability to effectively conduct the hiring process?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

27. If you answered “no” to question 22 above, do you think receiving training from your organization would have helped you to know how to conduct the hiring process in an ethical manner?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

28. Does your organization have a Human Resource Management Department?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No (skip question 29)
29. When you are unable to decide on hiring an individual, can you obtain assistance from your organization’s human resources department?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No
   ☐ Sometimes

30. When conducting the hiring process, are you required by your organization to provide documentation on whether an applicant was hired or not?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

Section 2: KNOWLEDGE
The section will assess your knowledge in relation to hiring. Please answer all questions.

31. Is it acceptable to ask interview questions relating to an applicant’s marital status (i.e., “Are you married?”)?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No
   ☐ Unsure

32. Is it acceptable to ask interview questions relating to an applicant’s religion (i.e., “What is your religion?”)?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No
   ☐ Unsure

33. Is it acceptable to ask interview questions relating to an applicant’s race (i.e., “Do you consider your race as African-American?”)?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No
   ☐ Unsure

34. Is it acceptable to ask interview questions relating to an applicant’s origin (i.e., “Where are you originally from?”)?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No
   ☐ Unsure

35. Is it acceptable to ask interview questions relating to an applicant’s educational qualifications (i.e., “In what area did you receive your degree in?”)?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No
   ☐ Unsure

36. Is it acceptable to ask interview questions relating to an applicant’s accommodation needs (i.e., “Will you require any special accommodation?”)?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No
   ☐ Unsure
Please indicate your agreement with the following statements using the scale provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am unsure at times about the meaning of ethical hiring practices.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of recent developments in rules and regulations at the federal and state level in terms of hiring.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I thoroughly understand the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act in terms of hiring.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I thoroughly understand the provisions of the Civil Rights Act in terms of hiring.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I thoroughly understand the purpose of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am knowledgeable about the types of questions that should not be asked during an interview.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3: ATTITUDES
The section will assess your attitudes in relation to hiring.
Please indicate your agreement with the following statements using the scale provided:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43. It is not possible to always follow ethical hiring practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I believe it is unacceptable to ask interview questions that are not specifically related to the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. I believe interviewers should be allowed to ask any personal question they want during an interview.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I believe in fairness in hiring at all levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I believe my organization’s hiring practices are ethical.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. I believe my organization has hired workers who I felt were not qualified for the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. I believe my organization’s job descriptions for positions that I hire for are fair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 4.
Below you will find a list of statements. Please read each statement carefully and decide if that statement describes you or not.
If it describes you, check the word "true"; if not, check the word "false":

50. I sometimes litter.
    - [ ] True
    - [ ] False

51. I always admit my mistakes openly and face the potential negative consequences.
    - [ ] True
    - [ ] False
52. In traffic I am always polite and considerate of others.
   □ True
   □ False

53. I always accept others' opinions, even when they don't agree with my own.
   □ True
   □ False

54. I take out my bad moods on others now and then.
   □ True
   □ False

55. There has been an occasion when I took advantage of someone else.
   □ True
   □ False

56. In conversations I always listen attentively and let others finish their sentences.
   □ True
   □ False

57. I never hesitate to help someone in case of emergency.
   □ True
   □ False

58. When I have made a promise, I keep it – no ifs, ands, or buts.
   □ True
   □ False

59. I occasionally speak badly of others behind their back...
   □ True
   □ False

60. I would never live off at other people's expense.
   □ True
   □ False

61. I always stay friendly and courteous with other people, even when I am stressed out.
   □ True
   □ False

62. During arguments I always stay objective and matter-of-fact.
   □ True
   □ False

63. There has been at least one occasion when I failed to return an item that I borrowed.
   □ True
   □ False
64. I always eat a healthy diet.
   - [ ] True
   - [ ] False

65. Sometimes I only help because I expect something in return.
   - [ ] True
   - [ ] False

Section 5. Demographic Information

66. What is your gender? (Please select one)
   - [ ] Male
   - [ ] Female

67. What is your age? (Please select one)
   - [ ] 18 - 25
   - [ ] 26 - 33
   - [ ] 33 - 40
   - [ ] 41 - 48
   - [ ] 49 - 56
   - [ ] 57 years old or older

68. What is your ethnicity? (Please select one)
   - [ ] Asian or Pacific Islander
   - [ ] African American or Black (Non-Hispanic origin)
   - [ ] Caucasian/White
   - [ ] Hispanic
   - [ ] Multiracial
   - [ ] American Indian or Alaskan Native
   - [ ] Ethnicity unknown
   - [ ] Other (Please Specify) 

69. Which of the following closely describes your current job function?
   - [ ] Owner/Operator
   - [ ] Unit Manager
   - [ ] Human Resources
   - [ ] Human Resource Consultant
   - [ ] Other (Please Specify) 

70. How long have you been working in your current position?
   - [ ] Less than 1 year
   - [ ] 1 - 3 years
   - [ ] 4 - 7 years
   - [ ] 8 - 12 years
   - [ ] More than 12 years
71. Approximately, how many employees are under your direct supervision?

☐ Less than 25
☐ 26 to 50
☐ 51 to 100
☐ 101 to 300
☐ More than 300

If you would like to be entered into a drawing to win one of eight $25 Amazon Gift Cards, please provide your email address below. Email address:

Thank you for your time.

Your input is valuable!!
APPENDIX I: PHASE 3 RECRUITMENT FLYER

PARTICIPANTS NEEDED!!

Have you APPLIED and INTERVIEWED for a RESTAURANT JOB in the past 12 months?

You may qualify to participate in an exciting research study exploring experiences of job applicants when applying and interviewing for any job in the restaurant industry (chef, cook, dishwasher, food delivery).

You will participate in a 45-60min interview. You will receive $20 as compensation for your time. All information will be kept confidential.

Requirements:
- Current CSULB student (part-time or full-time).
- Must have applied and interviewed for a foodservice (i.e., restaurant) job in the past 12 months.
- Must be 18 years or older.

Contact Amir Durrani to set up interviews:
Amir.Durrani@csulb.edu
APPENDIX J: PHASE 3 INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT
Interviews

Title of Study: Current Hiring Practices: An Example from the California Restaurant Industry

Investigators: Amir Durrani, Ph.D. candidate; Lakshman Rajagopal, Ph.D., CHE

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

This is a research study. Please feel free to ask questions at any time. The purpose of this study is to gather information from restaurant managers in California about their attitudes, knowledge, procedures, and training methods in place in relation to hiring. It is hoped that the information gained in this study will help improve hiring practices in the restaurant industry and encourage the restaurant industry to identify strategies and policies to improve worker diversity and organizational productivity. You should participate in this study if: a) are a current CSULB student (part-time or full-time), b) have applied and interviewed for a foodservice (i.e., restaurant) job in the past 12 months, and c) are 18 years or older.

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 be compensated $20 dollars 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:
Amir Durran, 562-688-8665
Lakshman Rajagopal, 515-294-4566

If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact the IRB Administrator, (515) 294-4566, IRB@astate.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)
APPENDIX K: PHASE 3 INTERVIEW GUIDE

PHASE 3: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Name: ____________________________  Interview Date: ________________
Title: ____________________________  Interview Time: ________________
Employer: ________________________  Interviewer: _________________

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this interview. My name is Amir Durrani and I will be asking you some questions related to the process that you experienced when interviewing for a job in the restaurant industry in the past 24 months. Before we start, do you have any questions regarding the consent form or questionnaire or the interview process? The information you share here is confidential, I request that you please not use your real name. Please feel free to ask any questions you may have any point during the course of this interview. There is no right or wrong answers. Your input is highly valued.

Section 1. Demographic Information

1. What is your gender?
   ___ Female  ___ Male

2. What is your age?
   ___ 18 - 24 years
   ___ 25 - 34 years
   ___ 35 - 44 years
   ___ 45 - 54 years
   ___ over 55 years or

3. Please specify your race:
   ___ White
   ___ African-American
   ___ Hispanic/Latino
   ___ Asian
   ___ Not sure
   ___ Other ______ (Please specify)

4. Which year of college are you in?
   ___ 1st year
   ___ 2nd year
   ___ 3rd year
   ___ 4th year
   ___ 5th year

5. What is your current employment status?
   ___ Part-time (up to 35 hours a week)
   ___ Full-time (40 or more hours a week)
   ___ Not employed currently

1
6. At what type of restaurant do you currently/have worked in?
   _____ Fast food restaurant
   _____ Casual restaurant
   _____ Fine dining restaurant
   _____ Other (Please specify____________________)

7. Where are/were your major duties performed?
   _____ Front of House (Greeting and seating guests, Taking food orders, Serving food, 
   Cashier, ) Please specify________
   _____ Back of House (Food preparation, Cooking, Cleaning dishes) Please specify 
   ______________
   _____ Both (Front of House and Back of House) Please specify__________

8. How long have you worked in the foodservice industry?
   ____ Less than 1 year
   ____ 1-2 years
   ____ 3-4 years
   ____ 5-6 years
   ____ more than 7 years
Section 2: The following questions pertain to your experiences with interviewing for foodservice jobs and ethical hiring.

1. What does the word "ethical hiring" mean to you?

2. According to you, what does an ethical hiring process include/entail?

3. Including your present job, how many job interviews have you participated in for a foodservice job?

4. From your experience with interviewing for foodservice jobs and from the perspective of ethical hiring would you describe your experience as being positive, negative or a mix of both? Why?

5. From the experiences that you have had from interviewing for jobs in foodservice, were you ALWAYS asked questions that were directly related to the job position (i.e., your qualifications, your past employment experience, your abilities) that you were interviewing for? Please provide examples.

6. Tell me about a time you were asked questions that were not directly related to the job position that you were interviewing for (Age, sexual orientation, family)? Please provide examples.

7. From the experiences that you have had from interviewing for jobs in foodservice, do you recollect ever feeling that you were treated in an unethical manner during the interview process? Please indicate if you have had more than one experience. If YES, please answer the next question. If NO, then go directly to question 11.

8. If you think you were treated in an unethical manner during the job interview, can you please elaborate on your experience(s) and provide examples of questions that were asked?

9. How did you react? How did you feel? What lasting impact on you did it have?

10. What do you think was/were the reason/s that made you feel that you were treated in an unethical manner?

11. Were there any non-verbal cues that made you feel that you were treated in an unethical manner? Please elaborate.
12. If you feel you were treated in an ethical manner, what about the interview process made you think it was done in an ethical manner?

13. What non-visual clues led you to believe the interview process was done in an ethical manner? Please explain or provide some examples:

Section 3: Please reflect on one job interview you remember and answer the following questions.

14. How did you come to hear about the position/job?
   ______ Online job advertisement
   ______ Printed job advertisement
   ______ A posted ‘Help Wanted/Now Hiring’ sign
   ______ Word of mouth
   ______ Other _____________ (please specify)

15. How was the interview conducted?
   ______ In person (face to face)
   ______ Via telephone
   ______ Via email
   ______ Via Skype (video conference)
   ______ Not interviewed, I was offered the job based on my online application
   ______ Other (Please specify)

16. Did you have to do more than one interview for this position?
   ______ Yes, with the same person.
   ______ Yes, with different persons
   ______ No, only had to interview once

17. Do you recollect what was the job title of the person interviewing you?
   ______ Yes (Please specify _____________)
   ______ No

18. What was the gender of the person interviewing you?
   ______ Female
   ______ Male

19. What was the approximate age of the person interviewing you?
   ______ 18 - 24
   ______ 25 - 34
   ______ 35 - 44
   ______ 45 - 54
   ______ 55 - 64
   ______ 65 or older
   ______ Not sure
20. What was the race of the person interviewing you?
   _____ White
   _____ African-American
   _____ Hispanic/Latino
   _____ Asian
   _____ Not sure
   _____ Other ________ (Please specify)

21. Where did the interview take place, if conducted in person? (Skip question if interview was not conducted in person)

22. Approximately how long did the interview last? ______ hours ________ minutes

23. Were you asked questions about the following?
   _____ Race
   _____ Age
   _____ Religion
   _____ Ethnicity
   _____ Sexual orientation
   _____ Marital status
   _____ Number of children in your household

24. Were you asked any question(s) that took you completely by surprise or caught you off guard? Y/N
   If yes, describe the interview question(s). How did it make you feel? How did you react when it was asked? What lasting impact on you did it have?

25. Were you asked an interview question that made you uncomfortable? If yes, how did you feel about the question? If yes, did you respond? If asked, but did not respond, what would you wish you could have said or done?

26. After your interview did you feel confident about getting the job? Y/N. Why?


28. If you accepted the job, what factor(s) led you to accept the job?
   _____ I liked the company very much and wanted to be a part of the team
   _____ I liked the people that worked there
   _____ The salary was what I wanted
   _____ The schedule was what I preferred
   _____ I like the food they serve there
   _____ I work close to my home
   _____ Other ______________

29. If you didn’t get hired, were you informed if you did not receive the job?
_____ Yes  
_____ No (please skip question 27)

30. If you didn't get hired, what reason(s) were you given from the company for being rejected? Did you agree with the reason(s) for being rejected?

31. Did you think or believe that you were not offered the job because of the type of questions that you were asked at the interview? Please elaborate.

32. What would you do if you are asked an uncomfortable question at a job interview?

33. What lasting impressions do you have from that job interview?

34. What changes would you like to see in the way interviews are conducted?

35. What else would you like to add to this discussion? Is there something that I have not asked that you think is important to mention?
APPENDIX L: PHASE 1: HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGERS' DEFINITIONS OF ETHICAL HIRING

Hiring anyone based on qualifications; never making decisions based on their ethnic background.

Hiring the most qualified candidate instead of hiring someone who is not qualified but may share your similar values, beliefs, customs, or attitudes.

Hiring the right person for the job and not having any prejudice.

The practice of hiring an individual based on education, experience, and other work related factors without any bias. It's the right thing to do and person to hire for the position.

Hiring best qualified candidate regardless of other considerations.

Hiring on ability and skills alone.

Hiring the right candidate with the qualifications to do the job that's required.

Not "not hiring" someone based on race, appearance, etc.

Treating every single applicant on an equal level.

Hiring the best person for the job, period.

Hiring the best person for the job following company guidelines.

Hiring the employee who is qualified to do the job and possesses the characteristics needed for the position.

Employing the most qualified person no matter race, religion, ethnicity, creed, color, gender, or disability.

Hiring individuals based solely on qualifications - not based upon demographics.

Ethical Hiring mean to be fair to all candidates; evaluating them only against job requirements and eliminating any personal prejudices or stereotyping.

Hiring people based on their ability to complete the required job, not if they fit a hiring profile.

Non-discrimination of sexual orientation, religion, age, race or any other factors related to a person as an individual.
Following anti-discrimination policy, having an open and welcoming working environment for everyone, embracing differences.

Hiring the best person for the job based on skills, talent and experience, not who they know or based on cultural bias.

Not discriminating due to age, gender, race, ethnicity, etc.....

Following hiring guidelines defined by our State and the specific employer.

Following procedures set forth by the company. Doing the right thing despite our personal feelings.

Hiring on one’s ability to due the job without consideration of their ethnic background or culture.

Considering and hiring a candidate/employee based on the requirements needed to perform the job duties.

Hiring the right individual for the right position regardless of any bias.

Considering anyone who is qualified for a job regardless of their ethnic background, religious preference, etc.

Hiring the best qualified person for the job regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation or religious views.

Hiring the person most qualified for the job, regardless of ethnicity, religious beliefs, physical handicaps, etc.

Hiring qualified people no matter what race, origin, ethnicity or culture.

Hiring based on the job description, ability, and availability to do the job, period.

Abiding by all labor laws in regards to age, sex, race, religion, etc. It should not matter what a person looks like or their personal background. Can they perform the job that you are hiring for.

Abiding by all legal requirements and company policy to hire a diverse workforce.

Hiring the best suited candidate without being biased by their diverse characteristics.

Not discriminating or harboring any ill will towards those that are different in color, sex, religious beliefs.
Making sure people are hired because they possess the skills to do the job not because of their color.

Hiring without prejudice.

I believe it means hiring a person based on their merit, not on discriminating factors. It means hiring the best candidate for the job.

Being honest and fair irrespective of the law. Hiring people who are qualified and nothing else.
Diversity.

You hire to fill a need and the need can be filled by a diverse group of people.

Hiring the best candidate for the position, period.

Evaluate candidates on the same criteria or score.

Using no judgment prior to hiring based upon race, gender, orientation or personal choices.

Hiring the right person to do the best job for the company.

Ethical hiring is hiring the best candidate for the job without expecting anything in return except a hard working employee - do discrimination based on looks, stereotypes, gender, age race, etc...

Hiring based on qualifications over any stereotypes.

Ensure all are treated fairly and we are not discriminating based on anything, whether protected or not.

Hiring the most qualified applicant regardless of their background.
APPENDIX M: PHASE 3: JOB APPLICANTS DEFINITIONS OF ETHICAL HIRING

“Ethical hiring means bringing people onto staff based on their qualifications. Gender, race, religion, etcetera should not matter when taken into consideration for a job position”

“Ethical hiring means that the hiring is done with no bias. It's done in a fair manner, and it's not discriminatory in any way”

“Ethical hiring means...they want to hire someone that could able to perform the job, that ethically...not conflict with restaurant requirement?”

“The word ethical hiring, to me, would mean there’s no bias on anything. The person is straightforward with you on what they want. There is no judgments. The person is...just as real as can be”

“To me it means hiring on a fair basis, not...because of someone’s, you know, appearance or maybe you have something to gain out of hiring them o-, other than, than what they can perform on the, on the job. So I think hiring someone from their, their experience, their qualifications, and their potential to do the job right...”

“To me, fair and equal treatment. I'm treated as the same as the next...”

“Hiring in a manner that isn't, that is appropriate to the person and doesn't offend people or their morally, or their moral standards”

“It means hiring someone based on their abilities, knowledge, and skills instead of other personal aspects of the person”

“Ethical hiring means that you're hired with morals in mind and with ethical values that the interviewer is using when they hire you”

“Ethical hiring, to me, means abiding by the current laws when it comes to...not discriminating against people. So, basically, if you were to interview somebody behind a, a black curtain—it doesn't matter what they look like or where they came from, what their background was—it was based on their experience and how well they would fit with the company”

“Ethical hiring. I don't know. Does it mean like equal opportunity kind of like being fair to everyone?”
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