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Literature Review

Related Work

- Handwashing training method and handwashing equipment matter (Allwood, Jenkins, Paulus, Johnson, & Hedberg, 2004)

- Despite knowledge of food safety, safe food handling practices were not followed (Henroid & Sneed, 2004)

- Unsafe restaurant food handling as corporate violence (Walczak & Reuter, 2004)
Expectancy Model

Abilities, skills, traits

Effort → Performance

Role Perception

Value of Reward

Perceived Effort-Reward Probability

Perceived Equity

Rewards → Satisfaction

Adapted from work by Vroom and Lawler & Porter
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Objectives

1. Identify factors that would motivate college-age foodservice employees to follow safe food handling practices.

2. Examine college-age students' perceptions of foodservice employees' self efficacy, outcome expectations, and goals related to safe food handling.

3. Determine potential for use of expectancy theory to explain employee motivation to follow safe food handling practices.
Methods
Questionnaire

- Belief questions related to theory
- Open-ended questions
  - Motivators to wash hands
  - Motivators to monitor temperatures
  - Motivators to clean and sanitize
  - Motivators to wear clean uniforms
Methods
Sample and Data Collection

- One university
- Three hospitality management courses
- Questionnaires administered
Methods

Data Analysis

- Descriptive statistics (SPSS)
- ANOVA for comparisons
- Qualitative coding and theming
Demographics (n=169)

- 66% female
- 95% 25 years old or younger
- 66% junior or senior
- 83% worked in foodservice
Previous Training/Education

- 87% Proper handwashing
- 77% Preventing cross contamination
- 76% Temperature danger zone
- 49.5% Trained at work and 65.5% in class
With more training, foodservice employees would likely do a better job of following safe food handling practices (4.2 ± .7).

Most foodservice employees think they can follow food safety practices (3.8 ± .6).

Most foodservice employees understand that if they do their job improperly, they can make people sick (3.5 ± .9).
### Motivation statement responses based on foodservice work experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Experienced (n=139)</th>
<th>No experience (n=29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training impacts food handling</td>
<td>4.2 ± .8</td>
<td>4.0 ± .6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think they can follow safe practices</td>
<td>3.8 ± .6</td>
<td>3.8 ± .5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to do job properly</td>
<td>3.5 ± .8</td>
<td>3.6 ± .6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can make people sick</td>
<td>3.5 ± .9</td>
<td>3.6 ± .9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Know importance of food handling</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.3 ± .9</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.8 ± .7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand role in food safety</td>
<td>3.3 ± .8</td>
<td>3.6 ± .7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know how to perform</td>
<td>3.3 ± .9</td>
<td>3.5 ± .7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated based on food safety</td>
<td>3.2 ± .9</td>
<td>3.4 ± .7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Motivation statement responses based on classification status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Lower (n=56)</th>
<th>Upper (n=113)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training impacts food handling</td>
<td>4.2 ± .7</td>
<td>4.2 ± .8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think they can follow safe practices</td>
<td>3.8 ± .5</td>
<td>3.7 ± .7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Know importance of food handling</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.6 ± .7</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.3± .9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know how to perform</td>
<td>3.5 ± .9</td>
<td>3.3 ± .9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to do job properly</td>
<td>3.4 ± .7</td>
<td>3.5 ± .8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand role in food safety</td>
<td>3.4 ± .8</td>
<td>3.4 ± .9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can make people sick</td>
<td>3.4 ± .9</td>
<td>3.5 ± .9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated based on food safety</td>
<td>3.2 ± .8</td>
<td>3.2 ± .9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Themes Identified: Washing Hands

- Accountability
- Consequences/Impact
- Policy/Standards
- Facilities/Resources
- Fear/Punishment
- Incentives
- Reinforcement/Reminders
- Supervision/Role Models
- Training
Themes Identified: Clean Uniform

- Tell/Show
- Set rules/policy
- Monitoring/Enforcement by management
- Training
- Discipline (punitive, threat)
- Supervision/Role Models
- Incentives
- Potential Benefits
- Provide clean uniforms
- Customer focus
- Internal motivation
Themes Identified:

Monitoring Temperatures

- Accountability
- Consequences/Impact
- Ease in performance/Equipment
- Fear/Punishment
- Incentives
- Reinforcement
- Supervision/Role Models
- Training
Themes Identified:

Clean and Sanitize

- Consequences (scare tactics)
- Incentives/Rewards
- Past experience with FBI
- Penalize (fear/punishment)
- Supervision/Role models
- Time
- Training/Knowledge
Identification of Core Category

Supervisor’s Role

- Establish policy, standards
- Expect Accountability
- Serve as role models
- Provide Supervision
- Control rewards and punishment
- Provide training
- Provide facilities/equip
Statements Supporting

- **Accountability**
  - Initial a sheet after clocking in, have reminders (handwashing)
  - Have a temperature log that they have to initial or disciplinary action will be taken (temperatures)
Statements, cont.

■ Role Models
  – Have supervisors who both demonstrate and reward appropriate behaviors (cleaning and sanitizing)
  – Watch management do it (monitor temperatures)
  – Watch management also washing their hands (hand washing)
Theory of Safe Food Handling for Retail Foodservice Employees

Organization
Policies/standards
Accountability
Supervision
• Role model
• Rewards/punish
Training
Facilities and Equipment

Employee Food Handling Practices

Safe Food

Properties
• Knowledge
• Supervisory interactions
• Expectations
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Next Steps…

- Work on Psychometrics
- Test Model
- Confirm Theory
Questions and comments are welcomed.