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ABSTRACT

To protect organizations from liabilities and litigation, background checks are becoming increasingly common during the hiring process. Correspondingly, many individuals have committed criminal offenses which often excludes them from being selected for a job. This study examines the effects of criminal offenses, such as those often identified through background checks, on selection decisions such as interviewing, hiring, and starting salary. For this study, a résumé with an accompanying background check similar to what is used in many organizations were provided to professionals and to undergraduate psychology and business students at a midsized university located in the southeastern United States. As hypothesized, criminal offenses were found to negatively impact job applicants on selection decisions except salary.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Up to 90% of U.S. Employers conduct background checks as part of the hiring process (Kuhn, 2013). Although background checks are not often seen as employment tests, research has shown they often influence selection decisions (Stoll & Bushway, 2008; Uggen, Vuolo, Lageson, Ruhland, & K. Whitham, 2014). A background check provides information on job applicants that is used in making selection decisions and, therefore, can lead to the exclusion of individuals from hiring consideration based solely on the findings of a criminal background check (Kuhn, 2013; Loafman & Little, 2014). From an organizational standpoint, background checks promote effective organizational functioning and help protect the organization from liabilities such as employee theft and/or workplace violence. Employers are required to exercise reasonable care ensuring that all workers are free of the risk of harm from unsafe coworkers (Woska, 2007). As a result, individuals with criminal histories are less likely than individuals without a criminal offense to be interviewed and hired (Hickox & Roehling, 2013). On the surface, this result appears valid as past behavior is often the best predictor of future behavior. However, contrary to existing opinions and beliefs, some research has found that after short periods of time, applicants with criminal convictions were less likely to exhibit problematic behaviors at work (Hickox & Roehling, 2013). This could be due to the
individual’s ability to learn from past experiences, possibly driven by the fear of losing one’s job (Kuhn, 2013).

Conversely, the argument can be made that potentially valuable qualified employees are being excluded from employment consideration based on factors that are not directly relevant to job performance (Terpstra & Kethley, 2002). When tied to disparate treatment of individuals within legally protected categories, selection discrimination cases often result in high organizational costs from back-pay settlements, punitive damages, and even changes to procedural and selection devices (Connerley, Arvey, & Bernardy, 2001). Bendick and Nunes (2012) defined selection discrimination as excluding applicants from being considered during the hiring process on the sole basis of ethnicity, relation, gender, age, disabilities and other legally referenced categories in Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. While criminal histories are not a protected category, applicants with criminal histories are often members of an existing protected class. Given evidence that organizations continue to use blanket policies that reject all applicants with any criminal offense, this practice contributes to the risk organization take regarding potential lawsuits of disparate impact unless business necessity can be shown (Woska, 2007).

An influential court case in 1975, Green v. Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., was the first to consider selection discrimination based on criminal convictions using background checks (Loafman & Little, 2014). The plaintiff served twenty-one months in prison for refusing to be inducted into the military and was automatically excluded from hiring due to a potential employer’s blanket policy. The courts ruled that such a policy was not valid, that it would result in adverse impact, and the business necessity
justification was not adequate. The EEOC refers to this finding as “Green factors” that require an organization to consider the nature of the offense, the time since the conviction, and the nature of the job being considered. Loafman and Little (2014) also recommended that criminal history be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Selection discrimination resulting from criminal background histories are receiving increased attention from Federal and State agencies (Lapidus, 2013). Providing examples to employers and organizations that people can and do change will emphasize that applicants with criminal records can be a smart investment (Henry & Jacobs, 2007; Smith, 2014). The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) developed recommendations to mitigate the risks of discrimination during the selection process (Loafman & Little, 2014). These include determining whether the criminal conduct is relevant to the job and if enough time has passed that the conduct is irrelevant (Lapidus, 2013). Not only has the EEOC produced guidelines to protect applicants but it has also created guidelines to guard certain protected classes. Higher rates of crimes committed by some minority groups can lead to selection discrimination ultimately excluding protected classes resulting in lower employment rates for those groups (Lapidus, 2013).

The EEOC’s guidelines should be taken into account when considering the job duties and the organizational context of the job (Hickox & Roehling, 2013). Recognizing these issues, fair employment regulations have been passed to protect individuals with criminal records from selection discrimination (Pager, 2003). Kuhn (2013) described the consequences from criminal background discrimination against applicants resulting in both disparate impact and disparate treatment evaluated by the four-fifths rule. Disparate impact occurs when selection standards are applied consistently across all applicants for
all groups and results of those selection decisions produce differences in various groups (Gatewood, Feild, & Barrick, 2011). Disparate treatment occurs when selection decisions are dependent on the situation and applied to various members of protected groups or individuals with or without intentional prejudice (Gatewood et al., 2011).

Research has now acknowledged that criminal background checks are not all equivalent and can result in a misinformed hiring decision (Gardner, Lewis, & Keaveney, 2008; Harris & Keller, 2005; Socolof & Jordan, 2006; Uggen et al., 2014). The accuracy of information often varies depending on the source used to conduct the criminal background check. Background checks also differ in the nature of the information presented. Many background checks only provide information that resulted in felony convictions as opposed to simply arrests. Some sources will not include arrest records if those arrests were more than one year old (Harris & Keller, 2005). Therefore, the information obtained can be inconsistent resulting in misinformed hiring decisions made by the interviewer. The majority of background checks provide information regarding age, address, credit report, and criminal history. Due to the instability of background check sources, Schloss and Lahr (2008) recommend relying on the résumé, interview, and reference checks to thoroughly investigate the applicant and not rely only on background checks. In addition, organizations should provide clear policies, guidelines, and training to all employees on the relevance of criminal background information for making hiring decisions (Hickox & Roehling, 2013).

Training employees on how to evaluate applicants with criminal background checks can mitigate potentially inaccurate and/or discriminatory hiring decisions (Hickox & Roehling, 2013). Few studies have focused solely on the consequences of rejecting
applicants due to their criminal histories, even though these decisions have important implications for society as a whole, including limiting the ability for an individual with a criminal history to acquire a job with a corresponding lower likelihood of reentry to society (Hickox & Roehling, 2013). Overall, organizations use many sources of information when considering applicants and clear standards should be set on how to properly manage background information and résumés to prevent selection discrimination (Harris & Keller, 2005). The present study will address the influence that criminal background information can have on interviewing probabilities, hiring odds, and recommended starting salary.

**Employer Attitudes**

Few studies have examined employers’ attitudes towards applicants with criminal histories; however, most research suggests that employers understand the challenges that former offenders face when attempting to enter the workforce (Hickox & Roehling, 2013). Swanson, Langfitt-Reese, and Bond (2012) explored these challenges to identify barriers to employment. Barriers to employment of former offenders may occur through both direct and indirect measures (Harris & Keller, 2005). Direct barriers include those industries that are legally required to exclude all former offenders. These exclusions are created based on the type of offense committed regarding a specific industry and occupation. For example, a money laundering charge may preclude employment in a position at a financial institution (Hickox & Roehling, 2013). Indirect barriers are those in which the organization uses caution concerning arrests that do not lead to convictions in determining whether to hire an individual (Harris & Keller, 2005).
Swanson et al. (2012) used a survey that focused directly on criminal background histories to determine the beliefs and hiring practices of organizations on former offenders. The survey included questions such as: “Have you ever hired a person who had a felony? Why did you decide to hire that person? Do you remember how long it’s been since that person’s conviction?” Results showed that 63% of employers knowingly hired a person who has at least one felony conviction. Independently owned businesses are more likely to hire individuals with felony convictions than corporations.

Type of criminal histories that were least likely to impact hiring decisions included drug-related offenses (24%), driving under the influence (17%), theft (16%), domestic violence (6%) and armed robbery (3%) (Swanson et al., 2012). Research by Holzer, Raphael, and Stoll (2006) found similar results regarding employer willingness to hire those with drug related charges (60%) compared to violent or property crimes (31%). Research has also found that offenders who previously committed violent crimes were the least likely to be selected (Holzer et al., 2006; Swanson et al., 2012). Swanson et al. (2012) also found that a domestic violence charge would be highly influential during the selections process resulting in only six percent of employers hiring those applicants.

According to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), workplace violence impacts over two million people in the workplace each year thus employers are least likely to hire those with a violent criminal past (Loafman & Little, 2014).

Swanson et al. (2012) also found that sixty-six percent of organizations reported the lack of a formal hiring policy regarding criminal convictions. Most employers reported hiring applicants if the offense occurred more than 10 years prior for non-violent convictions demonstrating recidivism (Bushway, Nieuwbeerta, & Blokland, 2011).
Employer’s opinions regarding criminal convictions were that applicants with felonies were seen as riskier than applicants with misdemeanors. Uggen et al. (2014) measured this concern on a 10 point Likert-type scale, finding a 4.2 for misdemeanors versus an 8.2 for felonies. When employers reported reasons for hiring applicants with criminal convictions, the most common reason was qualifications to do the job (42%). Additional factors organizations considered during the hiring process were good interviewing skills (22%), reference from a person known by the employer (18%), belief that the person has changed (15%), and length of time since last conviction (14%) (Swanson et al., 2012).

Graffam, Shinkfield, and Hardcastle (2008) found that employers were more likely to hire individuals with criminal backgrounds if applicants had a college degree or trade. Employers were least likely to hire those with violent crimes or crimes against children. Similarly, Uggen et al. (2014) found that a misdemeanor crimes were unlikely to fully discredit the applicant but it did reduce callbacks by 4% for both African Americans and Caucasians. Individuals with criminal backgrounds were found less likely to be hired than individuals with chronic illnesses, physical or sensory disabilities, and individuals with communication issues (Graffam et al., 2008).

Unfair Consideration

Selection decisions that result in unfair consideration of applicants occurs in approximately 20% - 40% of all hiring decisions (Bendick & Nunes, 2012). Unfair consideration occurs not only due to criminal background checks, but can also be attributed to age, race, ethnicity, personality, gender, and other characteristics of importance to society resulting in hiring bias (Castro & Gramzow, 2015; Purkiss,
Perrewe, Gillespie, Mayes, & Ferris, 2006). Federal and State laws have been established to prevent hiring biases in an effort to reduce discrimination. A few examples of these laws are the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which mandated equal opportunity for race, sex, color, religion, national origin and the Americans with Disabilities Act (Bendick & Nunes, 2012). As stated by the National Employment Law Project (NELP), “In an era of extreme mass incarceration, these fair chance campaigns provide a platform to educate the public about the stigma of a criminal record and the real consequences to our society of depriving millions of Americans with past convictions of economic stability” (Smith, 2014).

The problem with hiring bias is that an applicants’ ability to perform is often based off a subjective opinion that exists of one individual’s perception. One way hiring bias occurs can be through stereotyping when employers evaluate the applicant’s behavior without explicitly addressing the unconscious attitudes and perceptions that underlie these decisions (Bendick & Nunes, 2012).

Bendick and Nunes (2012) defined hiring bias as the unconscious association of traits for a specific demographic group. Hiring bias can influence the interviewer during the hiring process by increasing the likelihood of exhibiting biased behavior toward traditionally excluded groups. This prohibits member of these groups from competing for a job since interviewers pay closer attention to information that supports the stereotype and attribute inconsistent findings to luck. Uggen et al. (2014) found that African Americans with arrest records had the lowest callback rates when applying at all White organizations, which can be explained through stereotyping. Interviewers are often not
aware that they may have exhibited bias due to subconscious opinions of the applicant (Bendick & Nunes, 2012).

Bertrand, Chugh, and Mullainathan (2005) examined hiring bias through the evaluation of résumés. Hiring decisions are often made in time pressured situations where the screeners evaluate applicants through a large pile of résumés along with juggling other aspects of work. There is also a considerable about of ambiguity in the search for a good job applicant. A more structured review process that would draw attention to the positive and negative aspects of each résumé could prevent implicit biases. A structured process would benefit not only all applicants but specifically applicants with criminal background offenses by evaluating each applicant on the sole basis of job criteria.

**Incarceration Effects**

Multiple studies examined the effects of incarceration on employment and wages to determine whether age and education increase the likelihood of an individual entering the labor market (Western, Kling, & Weiman, 2001). Western et al. (2001) reported that applicants were less likely to be hired with a criminal history due to the stigma associated with criminal convictions. This negative viewpoint during the hiring process can create a sense of untrustworthiness and completely discredit the applicant (Thompson & Cummings, 2010; Uggen et al., 2014). These effects differed between applicants on age, sex, race, education, and prior criminal records. Schwartz and Skolnick (1962) conducted a field experiment and while low for both, found significant positive response rates among applicant with equal attributes for both white (34%) and blacks.
(14%). The stigma associated with criminal convictions serves as a preventative boundary into the interview phase of the application process (Pettit & Lyons, 2009).

Stigmas can also vary in magnitude depending on the information provided from the background checks, including arrests, convictions, probation, jail time, and prison time (Western et al., 2001). Many studies address jail time and prison time effects on employment, negative consequences have been found on both employment and wages. For entry-level jobs in non-college degree applicants, a seven percent decrease in earnings occurred for applicants with prior incarcerations (Western, 2002). A classic study performed by Schwartz and Skolnick (1962) focused on individuals with a criminal record applying for an unskilled hotel job. Employers were sent matched job applicant resumes, except for criminal records, and found that applicants without a criminal record received twice as many positive responses (Henry & Jacobs, 2007). Nagin and Waldfogel (1998) demonstrated that individuals with a single conviction were more likely to receive a lower hourly wage compared to those without a conviction. Hourly wages have major repercussions over an applicant’s life cycle and significantly affect wage growth (Western, 2002). With the recent emphasis on selection discrimination, criminal background checks have shown the potential to limit earning as well as employment (Pager, 2003). Therefore, establishing any discrepancies in salary will be beneficial knowledge for organizations.

The present study examined the relationship between criminal background checks and employment opportunities for qualified and educated applicants. Criminal background checks were provided in a format similar to what is used in present day organizations and follows EEOC recommendations such as the “Green factors.” As
previous studies have found that uneducated and inexperienced applicants experience
bias from criminal background offenses on unskilled jobs. Even with those uneducated
and inexperience applicants my not completely parallel educated and experienced
applicants, we expect some similarities as previous research has shown decreases in
interview, hires, and starting salaries. This study examined how varying types of
criminal background checks impacted applicants for likelihood to interview,
recommendation to hire, and starting salary. Criminal background offenses often
discredit the applicant, which can be attributed to stereotyping. According to previous
research, criminal background offenses will negatively impact selection decisions.

Hypotheses

H1a: Applicants with no criminal history will receive the highest recommendation to
interview compared to applicants with driving under the influence (DUI),
misdemeanor marijuana, and domestic violence offenses.
H1b: Applicants with a domestic violence offense will receive the lowest
recommendation to interview compared to applicants with DUI and misdemeanor
marijuana offenses.
H2a: Applicants with no criminal history will receive the highest recommendation to
hire compared to applicants with DUI, misdemeanor marijuana, and domestic
violence offenses.
H2b: Applicants with a domestic violence offense will receive the lowest
recommendation to hire compared to applicants with DUI and misdemeanor
marijuana offenses.
H3a: Applicants with no criminal history will be awarded the highest starting salary compared to applicants with DUI, misdemeanor marijuana, and domestic violence offenses.

H3b: Applicants with a domestic violence offense will be awarded the lowest starting salary compared to applicants with DUI and misdemeanor marijuana offenses.
CHAPTER 2
METHOD

Participants

Participants in this study were professionals and students. Undergraduate students, graduate students, and alumni were located at a midsized university in the southeastern United States. Participants were recruited with a background in Psychology, Business, and Engineering. Additional participants were recruited from the Society for Human Resources Management (SHRM), Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP), and Young Professionals (YP) through LinkedIn© and Facebook©. In total the sample size was 255. Of the total sample, 142 were students compared to 95 professionals.

The mean age of participants was 25.66 (SD = 7.52) and the range of ages was 17 to 76. The mean GPA of participants was 3.55 (SD = .473). The participants were majority female of 182 (71.4%). Participants included 226 (88.6%) Caucasian, 18 (7.1%) African American, 5 (2.0%) Latino, 3 (1.2%) Asian, 2 (.8%) other and 1 (0.4%) did not report ethnicity. Employment status was reported as 142 (55.7%) were employed full-time, 65 (25.5%) were employed part-time, 19 (7.5%) were unemployed, 15 (5.9%) were unemployed but previously employed, and 3 (1.2%) did not report employment status. Participants education level included 24 (9.4%) freshman, 18 (7.1%) sophomore, 21 (8.2%) junior, 29 (11.4%) senior, 26 (10.2%) graduate school 1st year, 24 (9.4%)
graduate school 2nd year, 95 (37.3%) reported other and 18 (7.1%) did not report education level. The most commonly reported majors were business at 81 (31.8%) and psychology at 71 (27.8%). Mean family income of participants was $91,930.88 (SD = $75,598.38). Some participants reported previous or current enrollment in human resource related classes (N = 77, 30.2%) and human resource related experience (N = 77, 30.2%). Some participants also reported current or previous enrollment in law related classes (N = 87, 34.1%) and law related experience (N = 39, 15.3%).

Materials

Materials were given to participants through the Qualtrics survey creator (http://www.qualtrics.com/). The survey included a consent form, job description, job candidate résumé, criminal background check, background check evaluation, personality evaluation, and demographic questions. One fictitious male electrical engineering résumé was used and reflected qualifications for an electrical engineering position with 15 years of experience. All participants received the same job description, résumé, and one type of criminal background check. Job description, résumés, and background checks were created with fictitious information regarding past employer information, name, and address. The applicant also committed the criminal infraction after the hire date at the current organization and the applicant had no gaps in employment.

Criminal background information sheets were created for four conditions to provide additional information to be used for the evaluation form (see Appendix C). Fictitious information on all criminal background was included for the applicants name to match the résumé, employment history, and education history. The criminal background
check was manipulated according to offense type. In each of the scenarios, applicants committed the criminal infraction while working at the current employer with no jail time to prevent any lapse in work experience. Job candidates were described as having a driving under the influence (DUI), misdemeanor of marijuana possession, domestic violence charge all occurred approximately 13 years prior to date to display recidivism, or no criminal offense. Each participant received one of the four background checks.

_Design and Procedure_

Data were collected as a between subjects design. The students were given the link to the Qualtrics survey or provided access through the University’s SONA system (https://www.sona-systems.com). The packet took approximately 20 minutes to complete. Alumni received the link through LinkedIn©, Facebook©, or e-mail and were asked to complete at the earliest convenience. To protect the confidentiality of the individuals, Qualtrics assigned each participant an identifying number. The survey included one résumé and one criminal background check. All participants were given an electrical engineering résumé and one criminal background offense (No crime, DUI, Marijuana, and Domestic Violence). Participants were then asked to provide information for selection decisions on the evaluation form. Decisions included recommendation to interview, recommendation to hire, and starting salary. All responses were recorded using a 7-point Likert-type scale, except for salary which participants were given a salary range and asked to provide an awarded salary amount to that job applicant. After completing the selection evaluation form participants were asked to complete the IPIP. The IPIP
measured the big-five personality characteristics (Agreeableness, Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Openness to Experience, and Emotional Stability).

Participants began by reading the consent form followed by a résumé and criminal background check. The consent form instructed participants to play the role of Human Resources hiring manager and asked to evaluate the job applicants using the job description, résumé, and background check. Lastly, the participants answered questions on personality followed by demographic questions.

Recommendations to Interview – Participants were asked to respond to the questions of “I recommend interviewing Seth Johnson for this position.” on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree).

Recommendations to Hire – Participants were asked to respond to the following: “I recommend hiring Seth Johnson for this position” for the applicant on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree).

Salary – Participants were given a salary range for the electrical engineering position as well as an minimum salary, maximum salary and median salary collected from O*Net. Participants were asked to select a salary for the job applicant based on a continuum bar by sliding the cursor to the desired salary.

Factors of the Selection Decisions– Participants were asked in an open-ended question “What factors did you consider when making hiring decisions based on the applicants résumé and criminal background information?”

Self-reported Personality – Participants personality was measured using the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) 50 item survey (Goldberg, 1999). Items were recorded using a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree).
Sample questions for extraversion included “I am the lift of the party”, I don’t talk a lot”, “I feel comfortable around people”. Sample questions for agreeableness included “I feel little concern for others”, “I am interested in people”, “I insult people”. Reliability was evaluated for each subscale consisting of 10 items for extraversion ($\alpha = .79$), the agreeableness subscale consisted of 10 items ($\alpha = .73$), the conscientiousness subscale consisted of 10 items ($\alpha = .64$), the emotional stability subscale consisted of 10 items ($\alpha = .54$), the openness to experience subscale consisted of 10 items ($\alpha = .74$).

Lastly, participants were asked to complete demographic information including race, gender, age, employment status, major, GPA, graduation date, and previous human resource related classes or human resource related experience as well as law classes or law experience. Additional information included estimated family income to address socioeconomic status.
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

A multiple regression analysis with contrast coding was used to evaluate the main effects of criminal convictions on likelihood to interview, recommendation to hire, and salary. The dependent variables were likelihood to interview, recommendation to hire, and recommended starting salary. The independent variable was the criminal background check information reported to participants. The four possible types of offenses were no criminal offense, DUI, marijuana possession, and domestic violence.

Descriptive statistics including means and standard deviations were examined for dependent variables on each condition (see Table 1). Likelihood to interview, recommendation to hire, and starting salary were found to significantly correlate with one another (see Table 2). Emotional stability was found to significantly correlate with likelihood to interview ($r = .13, p < .05$). Agreeableness was found to significantly correlate with recommendation to hire ($r = .13, p < .05$). Conscientiousness was found to significantly correlate with starting salary ($r = .15, p < .05$), as well as emotional stability ($r = .13, p < .05$), and openness to experience ($r = .14, p < .05$). Information participants used for making selection decisions were coded and found that of 155 (60.8%) of participants reported using multiple factors in the selection process followed by 35 (13.7%) for experience, 25 (9.8%) criminal background, 3 (1.2%) education, and 15 (5.9%) as other. Favorability ratings were created in the form of z-scores for
determining whether participants were favorable (positive), unfavorable (negative), or neutral regarding applicants with criminal offenses.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics for Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Likelihood to Interview</td>
<td>No Crime</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Misdemeanor Marijuana</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recommendation to Hire</td>
<td>No Crime</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Misdemeanor Marijuana</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Starting Salary</td>
<td>No Crime</td>
<td>$95,138.55</td>
<td>$15,517.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>$92,269.66</td>
<td>$15,092.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Misdemeanor Marijuana</td>
<td>$91,821.90</td>
<td>$13,722.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>$90,702.06</td>
<td>$13,821.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations Among Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Likelihood to Interview</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.69 **</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recommendation to Hire</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.35 **</td>
<td>.43 **</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Starting Salary</td>
<td>$92,352.60</td>
<td>$14,515.26</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Extraversion</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13 *</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.40 **</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Agreeableness</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15 *</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13 *</td>
<td>.22 **</td>
<td>.21 **</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Emotional Stability</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14 *</td>
<td>.28 **</td>
<td>.29 **</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.17 **</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Openness to Experience</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\(p < .05\).  **\(p < .01\).

When considering the likelihood of interviewing job applicants, there was a significant main effect found for criminal offenses (see Table 3), \(F(3,249) = 3.51, p < .05, R^2 = .04\). The mean likelihood to interview for applicants in the no crime condition
was higher than the mean likelihood across DUI, marijuana possession, and domestic violence ($\beta = .17, t(250) = 2.71, p < .05$). A second orthogonal comparison showed that mean likelihood to interview for those in the DUI and marijuana conditions did not differ significantly from the mean likelihood for domestic violence ($\beta = .10, t(250) = 1.66, p > .05$). A third orthogonal comparison revealed no significant differences for the likelihood to interview for DUI and the likelihood to interview for marijuana possession ($\beta = -.03, t(250) = -.44, p > .05$).

Table 3 Results of Planned Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood to Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Crime &gt; DUI, Marijuana, and Domestic Violence</td>
<td>0.168**</td>
<td>0.016*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence &lt; DUI and Marijuana</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana &gt; DUI</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation to Hire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Crime &gt; DUI, Marijuana, and Domestic Violence</td>
<td>0.224**</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence &lt; DUI and Marijuana</td>
<td>0.157**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana &gt; DUI</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Crime &gt; DUI, Marijuana, and Domestic Violence</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence &lt; DUI and Marijuana</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana &gt; DUI</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorability Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Crime &gt; DUI, Marijuana, and Domestic Violence</td>
<td>0.186**</td>
<td>0.006**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence &lt; DUI and Marijuana</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana &gt; DUI</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.   **p < .01.

For likelihood of recommending job applicants for hire, there was a significant main effect found for criminal offenses, ($F(3,249) = 7.08, p < .001, R^2 = .08$). Applicants with no criminal offenses were given higher recommendations to hire than applicants
with DUI, marijuana possession and domestic violence offenses shown in Figure 3.2, (β = .22, t(250) = 3.68, p < .001). Applicants with DUI and marijuana possession offenses were given higher recommendations to hire than applicants with domestic violence offenses (β = .16, t(250) = 2.58, p < .05). Applicants with DUI and marijuana possession offenses did not differ significantly from recommendation to hire (β = .04, t(250) = .73, p > .05).

The analysis revealed that regarding recommended starting salary, there was not a significant main effect for criminal offenses, (F(3,251) = 1.02, p > .05, $R^2 = .01$). Shown in Figure 3.3, applicants with no criminal offenses were not shown to significantly differ from applicants with DUI, marijuana possession, and domestic violence on starting salary (β = .10, t(252) = 1.61, p > .05). Applicants with DUI and marijuana possession offenses were not shown to significantly differ on starting salary from applicants with domestic violence charges (β = .04, t(252) = .63, p > .05). Applicants with DUI and marijuana possession offenses did not differ significantly on starting salary (β = -.01, t(252) = -.18, p > .05).

Additionally, there was a significant main effect for favorability rating across criminal offenses (F(3,251) = 4.27, p < .05, $R^2 = .05$). Applicants with no criminal offenses were viewed more favorably compared to applicants with DUI, marijuana possession, and domestic violence offenses (β = .19, t(252) = 3.02, p < .05). Favorability attitudes did not differ significantly for applicants with DUI, marijuana possession, and domestic violence offenses (β = .11, t(252) = 1.84, p > .05). In addition, applicants with DUI and marijuana possession offenses did not differ significantly on favorability attitudes (β = .01, t(252) = .211, p > .05).
CHAPTER 4
DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to examine the impact that criminal background information has on selection decisions. Multiple studies have shown that most organizations conduct background checks but few studies have evaluated the influence this has on qualified and educated applicants. Employer attitudes and beliefs suggest that, when criminal offenses are found on background checks, there is a high probability of bias in selection decisions. Employers seek any information that would contribute to determining whether an applicant should, or should not, move forward in the selection process. Building on previous research, this study focused on how varying types of criminal offense (No Crime, DUI, Marijuana Possession, and Domestic Violence) affected the evaluations of applicants.

Hypothesis 1a, applicants with no criminal history will receive the highest recommendation to interview compared to applicants with DUI, misdemeanor marijuana and domestic violence was supported. Often employers report unwillingness to interview individuals with criminal histories liken driven by the stigma associated with criminal offenses. Organizations are also required by OHSA to provide employees a risk free work environment. As employers feel pressure to abide by the “Green factors” and interview former offenders, employers feel superior pressure from the organization to protect current employees from any potential liabilities (Hickox & Roehling, 2013).
Hypothesis 1b, applicants with domestic violence offense will receive the lowest recommendation to interview compared to applicants with DUI and misdemeanor marijuana offenses, was not supported. Interestingly, Pager (2003) found that even when employers were aware of misdemeanor criminal offenses, it did not always result in selection exclusion. Uggen et al. (2014) found that among applicants equal on race, there was not a significant difference between those without criminal offenses only on misdemeanor arrests for interviewing purposes. Research leads to the assumption that although criminal offenses are not desired, misdemeanors rarely disqualify an applicant from the interview phase. During the interview phase, employers mostly accredited the choice to interview previous offenders on the presumption of innocence to prevent losing a “good person” that would ultimately benefit the organization (Uggen et al., 2014). By employers evaluating previous offenders on a case-by-case basis, selection decisions can exhibit less bias.

Another plausible explanation from the present study findings suggest that participants evaluated applicants as being over qualified thus resulting in favorable selection decisions regardless of criminal background information. This study used an over qualified electrical engineer, with more than the required ten years experience. Kuhn, Johnson, and Miller (2013) found evidence of this effect, supporting the belief that interviewers typically form impressions of applicants from resume information. These impressions can be formed in such a positive manner that any subsequent negative findings on the criminal background check could potentially be dismissed. These favorable judgments would likely result in interviewing all applicants regardless of criminal offenses (Cole, Feild, & Giles, 2003). Also, Dovidio and Gaertner (2000) found
that, among over qualified applicants, bias was not evident for differences between whites and blacks. However, when applicants were marginally qualified, there was reported bias favoring whites. From existing research, it appears that participants were willing to give over qualified applicants with criminal offenses the opportunity to interview.

Hypothesis 2a, applicants with no criminal history will receive the highest recommendation to hire compared to applicants with DUI, misdemeanor marijuana and domestic violence offenses, was supported. Even as the study complied with the EEOC’s recommended “Green factors”, hiring bias still occurred for applicants with criminal offenses (Loafman & Little, 2014). Hiring decisions are also driven by an employer’s openness to applicants with varying types of criminal offenses. Stoll and Bushway (2008) studied reasons for unwillingness to hire previous offenders and found a strong negative correlation between employers that conducted background checks and hiring practices on former offenders. Holzer (1996) found that two-thirds of employers were unwilling to hire any persons with a criminal record. Due to the stigma and risk associated with hiring previous offenders, employers report that unwillingness is due to the requirement to protect employees from harm (Stoll & Bushway, 2008). Criminal offenses carry such a negative stigma that employers reported a greater willingness to hire applicants that were unemployed for one year or more (67%) or welfare recipients (81%) than those with criminal offenses.

Hypothesis 2b, applicants with domestic violence offense will receive the lowest recommendation to hire compared to applicants with DUI and misdemeanor marijuana offenses, was also supported. Stoll and Bushway (2008) found support for these finding
as employers willingness to hire previous offenders was heavily based on the type of crime. Pager (2003) reported that only 23% would hire a violent offense. Swanson et al. (2012) found similar employer attitudes as most likely to hire drug and DUI offenses compared to domestic violence. Factors that were found to influence willingness to hire previous offenders included violent or non-violent crime, time since offense, and work experience. Hiring bias was likely influenced by the stigma associated with previous offenders and the participants beliefs about the applicants ability to perform (Bendick & Nunes, 2012).

Hypotheses 3a and 3b were not supported and showed that participants were willing to assign an equal starting salary for all applicants regardless of the type of crime. Hypothesis 3a stated that applicants with no criminal history would be awarded the highest starting salary compared to applicants with DUI, misdemeanor marijuana, and domestic violence. Hypothesis 3b stated that applicant with a domestic violence offense would be awarded the lowest starting salary compared to applicants with DUI and misdemeanor marijuana offenses. There are mixed findings when examining criminal offenses on earning differences. In relation to qualified and educated applicants, Grogger (1995) found significant earning differences on arrest records, immediately after the offense, but those differences were only modest in magnitude. Approximately two years after the offense, there were no significant differences found among non-offender’s verses offenders on earnings. Therefore, the impression of arrest records on earnings was that earning differences are time bound and that more education and longer employment records can refute earning differences. Due to existing research, earning differences form criminal offenses are likely attributed to incarceration time driven by offender’s gaps in
employment history and time spent away from the labor market. Grogger (1995) also found that to maintain earning differences across time, applicants would have needed to commit multiple offenses. Further, even for applicants with multiple convictions, differences in earnings disappeared over longer amounts of time. The present study did not find any biases in earnings from criminal offenses because the applicant did not serve any time, had no gaps in employment, and had a single offense.

Limitations

There are several limitations in this study that can inform future research regarding criminal background information. A limitation is that most participants were female and Caucasian. Including a more diverse gender and race would increase the generalizability of the study. In addition, a more geographically dispersed sample would allow for a mixture of attitudes and beliefs on criminal offenses.

Another limitation of this study was the use of an engineering resume. The ability for participants to understand and comprehend the job requirements on the applicant’s knowledge, skills, and abilities was problematic. Future research should examine if similar results were found for other types of positions such as sales manager.

In addition, including more items for evaluating likelihood to interview, recommendation to hire, and starting salary such as “How qualified is this person for the job?” and “How attractive is this applicant as a potential employee of an organization?” could aid in preventing a restriction of range (Kluemper, Rosen, & Mossholder, 2012).

Power was also an issue for the present study. Obtaining a larger sample would have likely shown significant differences for domestic violence offenses and
misdemeanor marijuana and DUI differences on recommendation to interview. Most importantly, the proposed hypotheses were supported in the expected direction but were just not large enough to be detected as significant.

**Practical Implications and Direction for Future Research**

The results of the present study suggest that criminal background checks negatively impact educated and experienced applicants on selection decisions due to type of criminal offense. Although existing research suggests that employers understand the difficulties previous offenders face, there is still evidence of bias during the selection process particularly for non-offenders in comparison of previous offenders. Therefore, policy changes on criminal background checks could greatly benefit previous offenders. It would be effective for organizations to consider designing a policy that would balance both former offenders ability to stay out of trouble over time and the employer access to information regarding prior offenses. Recommendations would include only providing information within certain time thresholds with the criminal justice system and/or never having offended (Kurlychek, Brame, & Bushway, 2006).

Due the design of the present study, it is possible that participants were not able to differentiate between arrests and convictions on the criminal background check. This is problematic because Uggen et al. (2014) used a Likert-type severity scale and found that convictions at 7.5 were shown to decrease selection decisions at a higher rate than arrests at 3.5. Future research should evaluate whether same results are found for females with criminal background checks to establish any gender differences across varying types of offenses. Further research could determine the amount of time needed for criminal
offenders to be considered of equal value to an organization compared to non-criminal offenders based on selection decisions.

In addition, providing training to recruiters on the EEOC's recommendation such as the “Green factors” would raise awareness in the proper use of criminal background information. Training programs may also be needed to address biases of favoring individuals due to the stigma associated with certain offenses. When organizations choose to use background checks as a screening tool, organizations should be required to demonstrate job-relatedness. Organizations also need to demonstrate due diligence in selecting a valid provider of background information. The ability for organizations to demonstrate job-relatedness, as well as a reliable and valid background checker could protect the organization from future litigation.
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APPENDIX A

IRB APPROVAL LETTER
MEMORANDUM

TO: Brittany Sentell
    Bart Weathington
FROM: Lindsay Pardue, Director of Research Integrity
      Dr. Bart Weathington, IRB Committee Chair
DATE: May 20, 2015
SUBJECT: IRB #15-060: The use of criminal background checks: Does type of offence influence salary?

The IRB Committee Chair has reviewed and approved your application and assigned you the IRB number listed above. You must include the following approval statement on research materials seen by participants and used in research reports:

The Institutional Review Board of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (FWA00004149) has approved this research project #15-060.

Please remember that you must complete a Certification for Changes, Annual Review, or Project Termination/Completion Form when the project is completed or provide an annual report if the project takes over one year to complete. The IRB Committee will make every effort to remind you prior to your anniversary date; however, it is your responsibility to ensure that this additional step is satisfied.

Please remember to contact the IRB Committee immediately and submit a new project proposal for review if significant changes occur in your research design or in any instruments used in conducting the study. You should also contact the IRB Committee immediately if you encounter any adverse effects during your project that pose a risk to your subjects.

For any additional information, please consult our web page http://www.utc.edu/irb or email instrb@utc.edu

Best wishes for a successful research project.
Consent to be a Research Participant in the Study

Effects of Alternative Information Used In Hiring Decisions

A research project on hiring decisions and the effects of alternative information is being conducted by Brittany Sentell in the Department of Psychology at The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga. The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of alternative information on hiring decisions.

You are being asked to take part in this study by completing a series of questionnaires. Your participation will take approximately 20 minutes. Please be aware that you are not required to participate in this research study and may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty. You may also omit items on the questionnaire(s) if you prefer not to answer them. You must be 18 years or older to participate in the study.

Your responses will be confidential to protect your privacy. There will be no direct benefit to you from participating in this research study. The anticipated benefit of this research is to better understand the effects of alternative information on hiring decisions.

There are no risks other than the rare potential for mild boredom for participants completing this research study. If you should experience this risk, please be aware that you may contact the principal investigator, Brittany Sentell, for assistance.

If you have questions regarding this study or would like to be informed of the results when the study is completed, please feel free to contact Brittany Sentell at (256) 509 – 5925 or Dr. Bart Weathington (423) 425 – 4289; Brittany Sentell can also be contacted through email at gdr221@mocs.utc.edu. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the manner in which the study is conducted, you may contact the chair of the Human Subjects Committee, contact the Institutional Review Board at (423) 425 – 5867. Additional contact information is also available at www.utc.edu/irb. IRB # 15-060

Please indicate that you have read and understand the above information by adding your signature and the date.

__________________________________________

(Print Name)
APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONS, RESUMES, AND BACKGROUND CHECKS
Instructions

Please be assured that the information you provide is completely anonymous and confidential. All information will be used only for the summary statistics of our participants.

For this study, you are being asked to play the role of a Human Resources hiring manager. As a manager, you will be presented with a series of résumés and background checks for an open position. Based on the information and the description of the job, you will answer questions regarding your perception of the applicant’s ability. Please read the below description of the job and then read the job applicants résumé and background check. After the résumé and background check, you will complete a form based on the information provided.

*In an effort to maintain the integrity of the study, please complete the questionnaire in the order that it is presented. Answer the questions in chronological order and do not turn ahead to other pages in the questionnaire. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Job Description:
Electrical Engineer – KBSB Group

KBSB Group is looking for a qualified and dedicated individual to join our staff as an Electrical Engineer.

Key Responsibilities of the position include:
- Research and design new and existing hardware products, tools, machines, software application, and other mechanically functioning equipment
- Schedule work to meet completion dates and technical specifications
- Coordinate designers, technicians, and drafters assigned to projects
- Evaluate progress and results of projects

Requirements:

A Bachelors Degree in Electrical Engineering and/or 10 + years experience in a related field is desired. The successful candidate will also have experience in CANBUS, CoDeSys, circuit designs and using electrical measurement instruments. The candidate should have strong interpersonal skills and the ability to work effectively within a team.

KBSB Group is an Equal Opportunity Employer and supports diversity in the workplace. A background check and résumé check will be performed prior to employment.
OBJECTIVE:

Electrical Engineer with 15 years experience seeking employment with an established, growth-oriented company.

EXPERIENCE:

Electrical Engineer, RIBR Inc.
July 2000- Current
- Monitored cost control and schedules and investigated problems that would arise.
- Wired components and ran circuitry; running extensive test to make sure everything is working properly.
- Coordinated projects with other departments, outside agencies, contractors and consultants.
- Performed highly specialized research and design for each project following code compliance laws

EDUCATION:

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee
Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering, May 2000
- Dean’s List

TECHNICAL/SPECIAL SKILLS:
- Microsoft Office
- AutoCAD
- CoDeSys
- Skilled in code compliance laws
Name: Seth Johnson  
Date: August 10, 2015  
Customer #: 292094752900

**Employment History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization: RIBR Inc.</th>
<th>Verified: Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start Date: July 2000</td>
<td>Verified: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Date: Current</td>
<td>Verified: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Electrical Engineer</td>
<td>Verified: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: Jim Parker</td>
<td>Verified: Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School: The University of Tennessee</th>
<th>Verified: Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion Date: 2000</td>
<td>Verified: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree: Bachelor of Science, Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>Verified: Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criminal History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #: 293094821</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offense Type: No Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges filed:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other information:
Name: Seth Johnson  
Date: August 10, 2015  
Customer #: 292094752900

**Employment History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Verified</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Verified</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Verified</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Verified</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Verified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIBR Inc.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>July 2000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Electrical Engineer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Jim Parker</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Verified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University of Tennessee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion Date</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Verified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science, Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criminal History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>293094821</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offense Type</td>
<td>Driving Under the Influence (DUI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood Alcohol Content of .08 or Greater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges filed</td>
<td>8 / 22 / 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Information</td>
<td>No time served</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name: Seth Johnson
Date: August 10, 2015
Customer #: 292094752900

### Employment History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization: RIBR Inc.</th>
<th>Verified: Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start Date: July 2000</td>
<td>Verified: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Date: Current</td>
<td>Verified: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Electrical Engineer</td>
<td>Verified: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: Jim Parker</td>
<td>Verified: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Information:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School: The University of Tennessee</th>
<th>Verified: Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion Date: 2000</td>
<td>Verified: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree: Bachelor of Science, Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>Verified: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Information:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Criminal History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #: 293094821</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offense Type: Misdemeanor marijuana possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1 Kilogram, not for resale or distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges filed: 8 / 22 / 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other information: No time served</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name: Seth Johnson  
Date: August 10, 2015  
Customer #: 292094752900

### Employment History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization: RIBR Inc.</th>
<th>Verified: Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start Date: July 2000</td>
<td>Verified: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Date: Current</td>
<td>Verified: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Electrical Engineer</td>
<td>Verified: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: Jim Parker</td>
<td>Verified: Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Information:**

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School: The University of Tennessee</th>
<th>Verified: Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion Date: 2000</td>
<td>Verified: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree: Bachelor of Science, Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>Verified: Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Information:**

### Criminal History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #: 293094821</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offense Type: Domestic Violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent acts committed by a family member or household member against another</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges filed: 8 / 22 / 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Information: No time served**
Use the job description, résumé, and background information to determine your responses to all items.

1. I recommend interviewing Seth Johnson for this position.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree

2. I recommend hiring Seth Johnson for this position.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree

3. The salary range for electrical engineers:

   Low: $57,300        Median: $89,200        High: $139,400

   • "High" indicates 90% of workers earn less and 10% earn more.
   • "Median" indicates 50% of workers earn less and 50% earn more.
   • "Low" indicates 10% of workers earn less and 90% earn more.

   Move the square left and right to assign Seth Johnson a salary.

4. What factors did you consider when making hiring decisions based on Seth Johnson’s job description, résumé and criminal background information?
APPENDIX D

IPIP
Instructions

On the following pages, there are phrases describing people's behaviors. Please use the rating scale below to describe how accurately each statement describes you. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of your same sex, and roughly your same age. So that you can describe yourself in an honest manner, your responses will be kept in absolute confidence. Please read each statement carefully, and then fill in your response that corresponds to the number on the scale.

Response Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Inaccurate</th>
<th>Neither Inaccurate nor Accurate</th>
<th>Very Accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am the life of the party.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I feel little concern for others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am always prepared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I get stressed out easily.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I have a rich vocabulary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I don't talk a lot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I am interested in people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I leave my belongings around.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I am relaxed most of the time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I fell comfortable around people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I insult people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I pay attention to details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I worry about things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I have a vivid imagination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I keep in the background.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I sympathize with others’ feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I make a mess of things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I seldom feel blue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I am not interested in abstract ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I start conversations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I am not interested in other people's problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I get chores done right away.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I am easily disturbed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I have excellent ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I have little to say.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I have a soft heart.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I often forget to put things back in their proper place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I get upset easily.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I do not have a good imagination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I talk to a lot of different people at parties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I am not really interested in others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I like order.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I change my mood a lot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I am quick to understand things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>I don't like to draw attention to myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I take time out for others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>I shirk my duties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>I have frequent mood swings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I use difficult words.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>I don't mind being the center of attention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>I feel others' emotions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I follow a schedule.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>I get irritated easily.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>I spend time reflecting on things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>I am quiet around strangers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>I make people fell at ease.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>I am exacting in my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>I often feel blue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>I am full of ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

DEMOGRAPHIC FORM
Please answer all the questions to allow us to get to know you better.

Your Age: _______ (years)

Your Gender: _______Female _______Male

Your Ethnicity (Race):
- ______White/Caucasian
- ______Black/African American
- ______Latino/Hispanic
- ______Asian/Asian American
- ______Native American
- ______Other (please specify)_____________________

What is your current employment status?
- ______Unemployed
- ______Unemployed-Previously Employed
- ______Employed Part-time
- ______Employed Full-time
- ______Other (please specify)_____________________

What year are you in school?
- ______Freshmen
- ______Sophomore
- ______Junior
- ______Senior
- ______Graduate 1st Year
- ______Graduate 2nd Year
- ______Other (please specify)_____________________

Graduation date / Expected graduation date? ___________________

Major __________________________________________________

Grade Point Average (GPA) ____________

Have you completed any Human Resource classes? Yes _______ No _________

Do you have any Human Resource related experience? Yes _______ No _________

Have you completed any Law classes? Yes _______ No _________

Do you have any Law related experience? Yes _______ No _________

What is your estimated family income? ________________
APPENDIX F

FIGURES
Figure 3.1 Recommendation to interview by type of crime.
Figure 3.2 Recommendation to hire by type if crime.
Figure 3.3 Recommendation for starting salary by type of crime.
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