

Fairness Reactions to Personnel Selection Techniques in Greece: The role of core self-evaluations

Ioannis Nikolaou* and Timothy A. Judge**

*Department of Management Science and Technology, Athens University of Economics and Business, Athens, Greece. inikol@aueb.gr

**Department of Management, Warrington College of Business, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA

The current study examines fairness reactions to personnel selection methods and the role of core self-evaluations (CSE) in Greece using two samples of employees ($N = 158$) and students ($N = 181$). Interviews, résumés, and work samples were the best-rated and most favourably appraised methods across students and employees. Students demonstrated more positive attitudes towards psychometric (i.e., ability, personality, honesty) tests than did employees. As far as the procedural dimensions are concerned, similarly to previous studies, face validity and opportunity to perform were the strongest correlates of considering personnel selection methods favourably. Overall, the relationship between fairness reactions and CSE was weak. Our findings are compared with the results from studies of other countries using similar methodologies.

1. Introduction

Organizational staffing has traditionally focused on the most appropriate methods and techniques in recruiting and selecting the suitable person to do the job. Personnel psychologists and human resource professionals have achieved significant improvements in the methodologies used in scientific personnel selection, continuously striving to increase the practicality, reliability, and validity of selection methods. However, since the late 1970s (e.g., Dodd, 1977; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976), the focus of attention has also started to shift towards another significant area – the exploration of applicant reactions to personnel recruitment and selection methods. This shift in focus can be attributed to the increased interest to the applicant perspective, as a significant ‘actor’ of the selection process, one who often possesses equal, if not stronger, power in the selection process. Marcus (2003) and Rynes and Connerley (1993) suggested that since the selection-recruitment process is often the first personal contact

between the applicant and the prospective employer, researchers, and practitioners should concentrate on fairness reactions. Such reactions might influence not only the applicant’s decision making during the selection process, but also his post-recruitment perceptions and attitudes both as an employee and/or as a customer, although research in the latter is relatively scarce (Hausknecht, Day, & Thomas, 2004).

The purpose of the current study is twofold. First, it intends to extend previous findings of fairness reactions to various selection methods using a well-established methodology (Moscoso & Salgado, 2004; Steiner & Gilliland, 1996) with both an employee and a student sample but, moreover, to also explore the role of individual differences in fairness reactions, using the newly established construct of core self-evaluations (CSE) as a basis for our research. A number of researchers (Chan & Schmitt, 2004; Ryan & Ployhart, 2000) have called for further exploration of the role of individual differences as potential antecedents of applicant reactions or moderators of test-specific effects on

reactions. In the next section of the manuscript, we review research on applicant reactions, and discuss the possible role of CSE.

2. Research in fairness reactions to personnel selection methods

From the vantage point of today, applicant reactions to personnel selection methods are widely accepted as significant facilitators of, or determinants to, the success of employee staffing. Ryan and Ployhart (2000) defined applicant reactions as the 'attitudes, affect or cognitions an individual might have about the hiring process' (p. 566). Numerous studies have explored the potential impact of applicant reactions on organizations. For example, Macan, Avedon, Paese, and Smith (1994) have demonstrated that applicants' impressions of the selection process influence their intentions to accept or reject job offers, as well as their forming a positive or negative view of the organization and the job itself, and are also associated with overall attraction to the organization. Moreover, Schmit and Ryan (1992) among others have shown that test attitudes can moderate the criterion-related validity of ability and personality tests. A recently published meta-analysis (Hausknecht *et al.*, 2004) demonstrated moderate to large positive associations between positive applicant reactions and organizational attractiveness, intentions to recommend the employer to other applicants, and offer acceptance intentions. However, the authors (Hausknecht *et al.*, 2004) note that most of the outcomes studied involve intentions rather actual outcomes. These are two examples of the two-level effect of applicant reactions; the former describes a series of significant practical implications of immediate concern for organizations, and the latter describes an issue of utmost importance for test developers and researchers in the field of personnel selection.

Most of the studies exploring candidate reactions to selection methods have used a mixture of research designs (e.g., assessing fairness reaction prior and/or after the selection takes place) and samples (e.g., job applicants in true selection settings, employees and students). Nevertheless, the results regarding the favourability of various selection methods and tools are relatively similar, especially in West European and US samples where most of these studies have been carried out (Steiner & Gilliland, 2001). In their meta-analysis, Hausknecht *et al.* (2004) revealed that interviews, work sample tests, *résumés*, and references were perceived relatively favourably. Psychometric tests (i.e., cognitive ability and personality tests) and biodata received moderate favourability ratings, whereas personal contacts, honesty tests, and graphology were perceived the

least favourably (p. 669). However, the authors note that none of these studies surveyed participants when they actually competed for a position during a selection process, and participants did not actually complete the selection tools they were asked to evaluate.

Ryan, McFarland, Baron, and Page (1999), in their extensive international study across 20 countries, have demonstrated that employment interview is the most widely used selection method. Early research on interviews concentrated on the positive association between interviewer's personal qualities and behaviour, such as warmth, sincerity, empathy, and good listening skills on various outcome variables, such as job offer expectancy, perceived probability of receiving, and accepting an offer, and overall company impressions. Candidates also seem to prefer certain interview formats (e.g., face-to-face as opposed to telephone interviews) (Anderson, Born, & Cunningham-Snell, 2001). An advantage of the employment interview (especially for the semi-structured and structured forms of interviewing), from the candidate point of view, is its perceived job-relatedness (face validity), and the opportunity it provides to candidates to emphasize their individual qualities that differentiate them from other applicants (i.e., opportunity to perform) (Moscoso & Salgado, 2004; Steiner & Gilliland, 1996).

Less well-structured selection methods such as *résumés*, personal references/contacts, and graphology have received mixed ratings from applicants. *Résumés* are widely used in most countries and they systematically receive favourable ratings by most job applicants, despite their poor validity. On the other hand, personal references receive moderate ratings in most countries, whereas personal contacts and graphology are generally considered negatively in most countries with the exception of graphology in France, where it is oft-used and viewed relatively more favourably (Steiner & Gilliland, 2001).

The remaining methods include techniques with moderate to high criterion-related validity, such as biodata, psychometric tests (i.e., ability, personality and honesty testing) and work samples (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). Anderson *et al.* (2001) suggest that despite their strong validity, biodata are rarely used, partly because of their poor face validity. Steiner and Gilliland (2001) claim that biodata revealed the most variability in applicant reactions across countries, with the exception of US and South African samples. Candidates tend to have more positive attitudes towards psychometric tests; face validity is again a very significant issue and candidates 'tend to rate tests with concrete items as more job-related than abstract tests' (Anderson *et al.*, 2001). However, although ability tests tend to receive relatively positive ratings, personality tests receive less positive ratings, and honesty tests fare even less well in most countries, despite their high

predictive validity. Across countries, work samples receive quite positive ratings in applicant reactions, most likely due to their high job-relatedness and the opportunity they provide to candidates to demonstrate their skills related to the position-to-be-filled. As a specific type of work sample, the same findings have applied for assessment centres, as well.

3. Theoretical approaches in fairness reactions

A number of theoretical approaches have been developed in an attempt to explain the causes of applicant reactions to various selection methods. One of the first who tried to theoretically explore fairness reactions was Klingner and Schuler (2004), who discussed the notion of 'social validity'. These authors described a four-component model influencing the acceptability of the selection process to candidates, i.e., the information provided to candidates regarding the position and the organization, the degree of the candidates' active involvement in the selection process; the transparency of the process so that they can understand its objective and its relevance to organizational requirements, and finally the provision of acceptable feedback in terms of content and form. A similar approach to Klingner and Schuler was developed by Arvey and Sackett (1993) who claimed that the perceived fairness of the selection process can be influenced by the content of the selection system (e.g., job relatedness), an understanding of the system development process, the administration of the selection process, and the organizational context. Although these two models have not been studied extensively, it is obvious that they have had a significant impact on the way of thinking of other theorists in fairness reactions, such as Gilliland's (1993) research on organizational justice in employee selection. However, Gilliland (1993) notes that these approaches may only be considered as catalogues of possible determinants of fairness reactions without really explaining how such variables are combined to form fairness perceptions.

Another significant approach was developed by Anderson (2001) and his colleagues (Anderson & Ostroff, 1997). They proposed a model of 'socialization impact' – assuming that selection procedures have a socialization impact on future employees through five constituent domains: information provision (i.e., the intentional or unintentional information conveyed to the applicant), preference impact (i.e., the affective reactions of applicants to various selection techniques), expectational impact (i.e., the expectations created by applicants as a result of these selection methods), attitudinal impact (i.e., the influence of selection methods on candidates attitudes and beliefs), and finally behavioural

impact (i.e., the influence of selection methods on post-selection behaviours). Anderson (2001) also suggests that there is a significant individual differences element in explaining these five domains, a proposition which is directly related to the objectives of the current study. Attribution theory may also play a vital role in explaining fairness reactions to selection methods, although it is a relatively new and under-researched area mainly focused so far on selection interview (Anderson *et al.*, 2001).

However, the most significant attempt to interpret fairness reactions originates from organizational justice literature (Imus & Ryan, 2005). Gilliland (1993), in an influential study, applied traditional organizational justice theories to applicant reactions and put special emphasis on the role of procedural (as opposed to distributive) justice. Distributive justice, in the lexicon of employee selection, is related to the outcome of the selection process, whereas the former 'concerns the procedures used to determine who is the most qualified applicant' (Steiner & Gilliland, 2001, p. 127). Gilliland (1993) developed 10 procedural rules grouped in three categories; those components along with their perspective rules are the following: formal characteristics (job relatedness, opportunity to perform, reconsideration opportunity, and consistency), explanation (feedback, selection information, honesty), and interpersonal treatment (interpersonal effectiveness, two-way communication, propriety of questions). It is suggested that the invasiveness of questions and fakeability of responses might also figure in the shaping of procedural justice perceptions. This model was further refined by Bauer, Truxillo, Sanchez, Craig, Ferrara, and Campion (2001), who developed a Selection Procedural Justice Scale (SPJS), which measures perceptions of procedural justice among applicants. Steiner and Gilliland (1996) added that in addition to these procedural dimensions, a selection method may be considered as more acceptable by candidates when it is widely used, since they claim people make an implicit judgment that a widely used technique must be valid (p. 134). Thus, they developed a model of eight procedural justice dimensions which formed the basis of considerable research, especially in cross-cultural settings (Moscoso & Salgado, 2004; Steiner & Gilliland, 1996) and also forms the basis of the current study, as described in the method section.

4. International perspective

Research into differences in applicant reactions across countries stems from the realization that selection practices must be reconsidered in a globalized labour market (Ryan *et al.*, 1999). Bartram (2004) points out that as organizations grow into different national mar-

kets, they consequently need to examine local selection and recruitment practices for insights into how they can best acquire local talent. Accordingly, their local competitors must also consider whether traditionally employed methods of selection are in fact superior to those used abroad. A series of studies, using similar methodologies with the current study, have explored applicant reactions in an international context. The most significant of these studies will be briefly reviewed in the following paragraphs.

Steiner and Gilliland (1996) compared the fairness reactions to various selection methods using two student samples in France and the United States. Participants were asked to rate the favourability of 10 common selection methods (interviews, résumés, work samples, biodata, written ability tests, personal references, personality tests, honesty tests, personal contacts and graphology) on process favourability and seven procedural dimensions (scientific evidence, face validity, interpersonal warmth, opportunity to perform, the employer's right to obtain information, the frequency of use, and respect for privacy). Their results showed that interviews, work sample tests, and résumés were considered positively in both samples. Graphology was received more favourably in France, a result which may be attributed to the extensive use of this method as a selection technique in that country (Ryan *et al.*, 1999). The strongest correlation of fairness reactions for both samples was perceived face validity, whereas the biggest difference among these countries was that the perceived scientific procedure evidence demonstrated stronger correlations with process favourability for the French than the US sample.

Extending these findings, Moscoso and Salgado (2004) argued that cultural differences may moderate the procedural favourability of selection methods. Following the principles and method of Steiner and Gilliland (1996), they also examined differences in fairness reactions in Spain and Portugal (two South-European countries and members of the European Union with many similarities with Greece, the country where the current study has taken place). Moscoso and Salgado (2004) also used two student samples in their study; their results regarding the favourability of the different methods were quite similar – between the two countries under examination and also to the results of Steiner and Gilliland (1996). The most positively appraised methods were interviews, résumés, and work samples and the least favourable were personal contacts, integrity tests and graphology. Face validity and opportunity to perform were the most important dimensions for considering selection methods favourably.

Marcus (2003) carried out a study using a similar methodology in Germany. In line with previous findings, participants rated most favourably interviews, work sample tests, and résumés. The German participants

held a neutral attitude towards most written tests and had relatively negative reactions to personal contacts and graphology. Summarizing across these studies, to date, research on applicant reactions in an international context has found 'a notable similarity' (Moscoso & Salgado, 2004). The current study attempts to address an important limitation of these studies, namely the use of student samples. Although undergraduate students may be considered as potential job hunters in the foreseeable future, Anderson (2003) has criticized their extensive use as substitutes in exploring applicant reactions to selection methods, advising for use of real-life candidates and/or employees.

All of the aforementioned studies call for further research on applicant fairness reactions across culturally diverse countries, which would further validate more general statements concerning this attribute of selection methods. Ryan *et al.* (1999) suggest that research on such issues is specifically lacking in Greece. Greece is culturally similar to countries such as Spain and Portugal, for which applicant fairness reactions have already been studied. However, distinctions can be drawn with regard to historical, religious, and economic background, as well as values and cultural dimensions. For example, on Hofstede's cultural values, whereas overall Greece scores are relatively similar to Portugal and Spain, they are hardly identical. For example, on individualism, Greece's score (35) is relatively close to Portugal (27), but it also is closer to Uruguay (36) than it is to Spain (51). On masculinity, Greece's score (57) is closer to other countries (New Zealand = 58, Hong Kong = 57, India = 56, Argentina = 56, Belgium = 54) than to Portugal (31) or Spain (42). Thus, differences between relatively similar cultures could quite readily be associated with differences in findings, thus advancing our understanding of fairness perceptions and reactions.

5. Personality and fairness reactions

Ryan and Ployhart (2000) suggest that among other determinants of fairness reactions, researchers should also explore the role of individual differences, noting that very few studies have explored candidates' reactions across multiple types of procedures, and even fewer have studied them longitudinally. They suggested that it is time to better explore the possibility that personality might be a source of variance in reactions to selection methods (p. 591). Similarly, Hausknecht *et al.* (2004), in their recent meta-analysis, identified a very small number of studies exploring the relationship between personality dimensions and applicant perceptions. Conscientiousness and neuroticism had a small average correlation with procedural justice, and conscientiousness was also moderately related to test

motivation. Owing to the paucity of research, Hausknecht *et al.* emphasized the importance of future research on the relationship between personality and fairness reactions, as Chan and Schmitt (2004) also advised.

In one of the very few studies on the subject, Viswesvaran and Ones (2004) found that individuals with high emotional stability and extroversion place greater value on selection system development process variables, such as adequacy of job analysis, validity evidence, and involvement of professionals. Extroversion was also positively related to the process of administration, e.g., consistency across applicants, opportunity to review scoring, and confidentiality. Importance placed on selection context (e.g., selection ratio and company history of discrimination) was moderately negatively correlated with both conscientiousness and emotional stability. Nevertheless, the results of this study should be cautiously interpreted due to the small number of individuals completing the personality measure ($N=78$). Self-efficacy and self-esteem have also been shown to correlate with applicant reactions. Taking a considerably different perspective in viewing self-esteem as a dependent variable, Gilliland (1994) explored the potential impact of the selection process on applicants' self-efficacy and self-esteem. He found that self-efficacy was related to 'the interaction of the job relevance of the test and the hire-reject decision such that rejection using job relevant procedures has the greatest negative impact on self-efficacy' (Chan & Schmitt, 2004; p. 17).

Another personality constellation that has recently attracted increased attention in the field of personnel psychology is CSE. CSE is a broad personality construct indicated by four specific traits: (a) self-esteem (i.e., the basic appraisal that people make of their worth), (b) generalized self-efficacy (i.e., a person's global estimate of his/her ability to mobilize the motivation and abilities needed to achieve important outcomes), (c) locus of control [i.e., the degree to which individuals believe that they (rather than the environment or fate) control events in their lives], and (d) neuroticism, which defines the emotional stability of individuals and their tendencies to dwell on the positive or the negative (Judge, Erez, & Bono, 1998; Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997). CSE has been recently explored extensively in organizational contexts, and it is found to correlate with significant work-related outcomes, such as job performance (Judge *et al.*, 1998) and job satisfaction (Judge *et al.*, 1998; Judge, Higgins, & Cable, 2000). CSE entails the appraisals people make of the external world and how these are affected by their desires with respect to these objects and also by the assumptions people hold about themselves, other people, and the world (Judge *et al.*, 1997). As CSE describes the basic conclusions or bottom-line self-evaluations held by individuals, we

expect that it will be positively related with fairness reactions to most selection methods and especially those involving increased interpersonal interaction with the organization's representatives, such as interviews, and those requiring increased self-confidence and self-esteem, such as work samples and psychological testing.

In summary, the current research attempts to address two main objectives. First, to replicate previous findings on fairness reactions to different selection methods in a different cultural context – Greece – and also to extend these findings using an employee sample, probably for the first time. In order to make a comparison between studies and countries, we followed the same methodology as Steiner and Gilliland (1996) and Moscoso and Salgado (2004). Second, we assessed the relationship between respondents' scores on a personality construct – CSE – and fairness reactions to various selection methods. Finally, following Ryan and Ployhart's (2000) recommendations, we explored if the selection process outcome (hired or not) influences participants' fairness reactions to various selection methods.

6. Method

6.1. Sample and procedure

The sample of the current study consists of 339 participants: 158 white collar employees working for various organizations and 181 full-time undergraduate students of various business school majors (e.g., business administration, marketing, information technology, finance). Forty-seven percent of the working individuals and 33% of the students were males. The mean age of the employee sample was 31.6 years ($SD = 6.44$ years) and for the student sample was 20.3 years ($SD = 1.91$ years). On average, the employees had 8 years of experience ($SD = 6.3$ years), with roughly half having a university degree (48.4%). They were employed in white-collar positions such as human resources/training (27.6%), general management/supervisor (22.1%), administrative/secretarial (14.5%), finance (12.4%), or sales/marketing/advertising (9.7%).

The employees received the questionnaire either electronically or as hard copy, along with instructions on how to return the anonymously completed questionnaire. A total of 264 employees were asked to participate, yielding a response rate of 41%. Students participated voluntarily at the end of their classes. Following the guidelines of Steiner and Gilliland (1996), two forms of the questionnaire were used, presenting the selection methods in different order in order to counterbalance any order effects. These two forms were randomly distributed to participants.

6.2. Measures

6.2.1. Fairness reactions measure

We followed the methodology developed by Steiner and Gilliland (1996), and used by Moscoso and Salgado (2004). The questionnaire covered the same 10 selection methods explored in these studies in an attempt to make meaningful comparisons between Greece and these countries. Previous research, exploring the use of these selection methods in Greece (Eleftheriou & Robertson, 1999; Kantas, Kalogera, & Nikolaou, 1997), has identified similar patterns of selection methods' usage with West European and US studies (Ryan *et al.*, 1999), justifying therefore the use of the same selection methods in the current study.

The first page of the questionnaire included a short presentation and description of the 10 selection methods (interviews, résumés, work samples, biodata, written ability tests, personal references, personality tests, honesty tests, personal contacts, and graphology), based on the definitions of Steiner and Gilliland (1996). Employees-participants were asked to indicate whether they had been evaluated by each selection method by a prospective employer in the past. Responses indicated, as expected, that the most widely used method is interview (96%) followed by résumés (93%), written ability tests (59%), personal references (51%), personality tests (40%), personal contacts (40%), biodata (39%), work samples (20%), honesty tests (9.5%), and graphology (1%).¹

Subsequently, the student participants were asked to think of a job they were likely to apply for after graduation, write the job in a blank space provided and subsequently consider each selection method in light of that job. Employees were asked to do the same for the most recent job opening for which they had applied. Afterwards, process favourability (i.e., preference for each method) for each one of the selection methods was assessed with two questions: (1) how would you rate the effectiveness of this method for identifying qualifying people for the job you indicated?; and (2) if you did not get the job based on this selection method, what would you think about the fairness of this procedure? Participants responded using seven-point Likert-type scales (1 indicated least favourable and 7 indicated most favourable). The α coefficient for the two-item process favourability measure across both samples and selection methods was .78. During the statistical analyses we used the average of these questions for each selection method, in order to elicit the mean process favourability for each selection method.

In the following sections, participants responded to seven questions assessing procedural dimensions of each method. The items dealt with the participants' perceptions that (1) the method is based on solid scientific research, (2) the approach is logical for

identifying qualified candidates for the job in question (face validity), (3) the method will detect the individuals' important qualities differentiating them from others (opportunity to perform), (4) the selection instrument is impersonal and cold, (5) employers have the right to obtain information from applicants by using the method, (6) the method invades personal privacy, and (7) the method is appropriate because it is widely used. Participants responded using seven-point Likert-type scales (1 indicated totally disagree and 7 indicated totally agree). Items 4 and 6 (impersonal-cold instrument and invading personal privacy) were reversed in order to correspond to the positive meaning of the remaining items. These items then represented interpersonal warmth and respect for privacy. At the end of this section, 85% of the working individuals indicated that they were finally selected in the position they had earlier noted and 15% said that they were not.

6.2.2. CSE

CSE was measured with the scale developed by Judge, Erez, Bono, and Thoresen (2003). The CSE scale is a 12-item questionnaire, which is meant to assess the intersection of the four core traits: self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and neuroticism. Example items of the scale include: 'I am confident I get the success I deserve in life', 'When I try I generally succeed', and 'I am capable of coping with most of my problems'. The α coefficient for CSE total score for the current study was .80 (employee sample $\alpha = .78$; student sample $\alpha = .80$).

7. Results

Table 1 shows means and standard deviations for favourability ratings for each of the selection methods, along with the respective means from the Steiner and Gilliland (1996) and Moscoso and Salgado (2004) studies. For the employee sample, the most favourable ratings were for interviews, résumés, and work samples. Written ability tests, biodata, personal references, and personality tests were the next procedures most favourably rated. Personal contacts, honesty tests, and graphology received the lowest ratings. Compared with the student sample, there were a few differences, some of which were also statistically significant. Interviews, work samples, and résumés received the highest ratings, among students. However, written ability tests and personality tests received also quite high positive ratings. Biodata, honesty tests, and personal references were the next procedures most favourably rated and personal contacts and graphology received the lowest ratings.

It is also worth comparing the process favourability ratings between employees and students, as the current

Table 1. Mean process favourability ratings for selection methods by country

Selection method	Greece						Steiner and Gilliland (1996)		Moscoso and Salgado (2004)			
	Combined sample		Employees		Students		USA (mean)	France (mean)	Spain (mean)	Portugal (mean)		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	<i>F</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>				
Interviews	5.32	1.20	5.43	1.31	5.22	1.08	2.69	.18	5.39	4.56	4.99	5.35
Résumés	4.73	1.25	4.90	1.25	4.58	1.22	13.73**	.26	5.37	4.54	4.90	5.18
Work sample	4.80	1.39	4.63	1.57	4.93	1.21	2.62	.22	5.26	5.26	4.93	4.90
Biodata	4.23	1.18	4.11	1.38	4.31	.99	.19	.17	4.59	3.91	3.90	3.99
Written ability tests	4.34	1.32	4.12	1.44	4.52	1.17	7.90**	.31	4.50	4.21	4.15	4.13
Personal references	3.86	1.39	3.96	1.44	3.77	1.35	.34	.14	4.38	4.12	3.54	3.94
Personality tests	4.17	1.37	3.94	1.51	4.35	1.20	13.12**	.30	3.50	3.96	4.05	4.13
Honesty tests	3.52	1.47	3.00	1.41	3.93	1.37	37.23**	.67	3.41	2.54	3.22	3.85
Personal contacts	3.35	1.58	3.51	1.70	3.20	1.46	.10	.20	3.29	2.92	2.22	2.80
Graphology	2.30	1.28	2.04	1.21	2.49	1.29	12.10**	.36	1.95	3.23	2.09	2.89
	<i>N</i> = 339	<i>N</i> = 158	<i>N</i> = 121				<i>N</i> = 142	<i>N</i> = 117	<i>N</i> = 125	<i>N</i> = 104		

Notes: ** $p < .01$. Data for the US and French samples from Table 3, p. 137, in Steiner and Gilliland (1996). Copyright 1996 by the American Psychological Association. Adapted with permission; data for the Spanish and Portuguese samples from Table 1, p. 190, in Moscoso and Salgado (2004). Copyright 2004 by Blackwell Publishing. Adapted with permission.

study is probably the first using the methodology of Steiner and Gilliland (1996) in an employee sample. We found significant differences in five of the 10 selection methods. Employees tend to rate résumés more favourably compared with students, but students tend to rate higher written ability, personality and honesty tests but also graphology. Following Moscoso and Salgado's (2004) guidelines, we also decided to investigate the effect sizes of these differences using Cohen's *d*. In most cases, the differences were small to moderate ($.26 \leq d \leq .67$) with honesty tests demonstrating the largest differences between employees and students. A correlation coefficient of the means process favourability ratings between the employees' and the students' samples was very substantial ($r = .91, p < .00$). Generally speaking, with the possible exception of honesty tests, Greek students and employees tended to rate similarly the different selection methods in terms of their process favourability.

Mean comparisons were carried out in order to explore any gender influences on process favourability of the different selection methods. We found statistically significant results in process favourability for two of the 10 selection methods. More specifically, working females tend to perceive interviewing [$t = -2.25$ (154), $p < .05$] and written ability testing [$t = -2.05$, (151), $p < .05$] more positively than males and the same applied for female students regarding the acceptability of interviewing [$t = -2.05$ (179), $p < .05$] and graphology [$t = -2.14$ (179), $p < .05$].

Subsequently, we explored the similarities and differences between students and employees in the procedural dimensions of the selection methods. Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations and the results of the ANOVAs using the status of the participants as grouping variable and the 10 process dimensions, as dependent variables.

As far as the scientific evidence is concerned, personal contacts received the lowest ratings in both samples along with personal references and graphology. Written ability tests received in both samples the highest rankings. In the employee sample, next-most positively rated were personality tests, interviews, and work samples; in the student sample, after abilities tests, most favourably rated were work samples, personality tests, and interviews. A high correlation exists between employees' and students' rankings ($r = .98, p < .01$), although there are two statistically significant differences, with the employees ranking the scientific evidence of work samples and honesty tests lower than students. For the dimension of employer's rights, for both samples, interviews, résumés, and work samples are rated more positively, and graphology and personal contacts are perceived most negatively. Despite a high agreement between the two samples ($r = .92, p < .01$), employees tend to rate résumés, personal references, and personal contacts higher than students, and rate honesty tests lower than students. With regard to opportunity to perform, graphology, personal contacts, and personal references received the lowest rankings in

Table 2. Mean process dimensions ratings for student and employee samples for selection methods

Selection method	Scientific evidence	Employer's right	Opportunity to perform	Interpersonal warmth	Logical, face valid approach	Respectful of privacy	Widely used
Interviews							
Employees	4.65	6.26	5.78	6.16	5.60	4.90*	5.87
Students	4.93	6.13	5.65	5.91	5.44	4.50	5.81
Résumés							
Employees	4.23	5.82**	4.92	3.83**	5.15*	5.23	5.76**
Students	4.50	5.28	4.51	2.76	4.86	5.35	5.34
Work sample							
Employees	4.61**	5.67	5.58	4.61	5.39	5.43	4.78
Students	5.15	5.67	5.70	4.71	5.64	5.49	4.87
Biodata							
Employees	4.34	5.11	4.63	4.09**	4.60	4.46	4.58
Students	4.44	5.02	4.59	3.55	4.75	4.64	4.66
Written ability tests							
Employees	5.10	4.82	4.99**	3.38**	4.74	4.63	4.41
Students	5.35	4.92	5.49	4.06	4.98	4.73	4.35
Personal references							
Employees	2.91	4.54*	3.47	4.82*	3.68	4.60	4.34
Students	2.98	4.10	3.50	4.42	3.40	4.66	4.09
Personality tests							
Employees	4.77	4.40	4.38**	3.55**	4.21	3.86	3.95
Students	5.04	4.70	5.09	4.28	4.62	3.47	4.22
Honesty tests							
Employees	3.91**	3.65**	3.39**	3.27**	3.29**	3.44	3.07**
Students	4.60	4.39	4.33	4.10	4.18	3.31	3.62
Personal contacts							
Employees	2.42	3.93**	2.83	4.95	2.81	4.57	3.56
Students	2.30	3.23	2.74	4.68	2.50	4.42	3.33
Graphology							
Employees	2.90*	2.98	2.43	2.63	2.38	4.29	2.12
Students	3.38	2.71	2.72	2.71	2.63	4.44	2.28
Correlations between Greek employees' and students' samples across the 10 methods							
	.98**	.92**	.93**	.81**	.94**	.95**	.97**

Notes: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

both samples, whereas employees perceived interviews, work samples, and written ability tests most favourably; and for the students, work samples, interviews, and written ability tests were the methods providing the best opportunity for job applicants to perform. A high agreement exists between the two samples ($r = .93, p < .01$), although students tend to rate psychometric tests more positively than employees (i.e., written ability, personality, and honesty tests). The fourth dimension analysed is interpersonal warmth. Both samples agreed upon the warmest and the most impersonal method, respectively, namely graphology and interviews. Employees considered personal references and personal contacts as very warm methods as well, whereas students rated positively work samples and personal contacts. Apart from graphology, students considered résumés and biodata as impersonal, whereas employees found the same for honesty tests and written ability tests. Relatively to the other procedural dimensions, here the lower agreement between the two samples was somewhat lower ($r = .81, p < .01$), with the most statistically significant

differences between them. Employees considered as warmer than students the methods of résumés, biodata, and personal references, whereas students considered as warmer than employees the methods of psychometric tests (i.e., written ability, personality, and honesty tests). As far as face validity is concerned, employees considered interviews, work samples, and written ability tests as the most face valid approaches, whereas students thought the same for work samples, interviews, and written ability tests. Employees deemed graphology, personal contacts, and honesty tests as the least face valid methods, although students have slightly different rankings, evaluating negatively in this dimension personal contacts, graphology, and personal references. Overall, the two samples agreed on their rankings ($r = .94, p < .01$), with only two statistically significant differences, in the case of résumés and honesty tests. For the sixth dimension of respectful of privacy, both samples agreed that honesty, personality tests, and graphology invade personal privacy, whereas work samples and résumés were considered as methods respecting job applicants' personal privacy. The two

Table 3. Correlations between Greek, Spanish, Portuguese, US, and French student samples across the 10 methods on process favourability and procedural dimensions

	Greece/Spain	Greece/Portugal	Greece/United States	Greece/France
Process favourability	.96**	.92**	.90**	.73*
Scientific evidence	.89**	.91**	.79**	.60
Employer's right	.96**	.93**	.85**	.74*
Opportunity to perform	.96**	.91**	.85**	.73*
Interpersonal warmth	.87**	.67*	.58	.59
Logical, face valid approach	.90**	.83**	.84**	.80**
Respectful of privacy	.77*	.78**	.85**	.79**
Widely used	.95**	.91**	.96**	.81**
Mean correlation	.72	.86	.83	.72

Notes: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

samples agreed on their rankings ($r = .95$, $p < .01$), with only one statistically significant difference; in the evaluation of the interview, with students consider this method as more invasive than employees. Finally, for the last dimension of the use prevalence, both samples agreed that interviews, résumés, and work samples are the most extensively used and that graphology, personal contacts, and honesty tests are the least used. A high agreement exists between the two samples ($r = .97$, $p < .01$), with minor differences in résumés and honesty tests.

It is also interesting to compare these results with Steiner and Gilliland's (1996) and Moscoso and Salgado's (2004) findings. As far as the favourability ratings of the selection methods are concerned, we can see from Table 1 that interviews, résumés, and work samples are the most favourably appraised selection methods, whereas honesty tests, personal contacts, and graphology are the least favourably appraised, across all five countries. Following the guidelines provided by Moscoso and Salgado (2004), we examined the correlations of the favourability and procedural dimensions across the methods between Greece and the four countries, including only the student sample of the current study for comparability reasons, using the means provided by Steiner and Gilliland (1996) and Moscoso and Salgado (2004).

When we examine the correlations across countries, we can see that the highest mean correlation is between Greece and Portugal, suggesting a high degree of similarity between the two countries. The correlations between the two countries range from .77 to .96. Likewise, a high correlation exists between Greece and the United States, although there was one non-significant correlation regarding interpersonal warmth. The comparison between Greece and Spain also demonstrated a high degree of similarity, with all the correlations being statistically significant, although the overall mean correlation was slightly smaller than the correlation found between Greece and Portugal and between Greece and the United States. Finally, the last column

shows the correlation between Greece and France. Again, with the exception of interpersonal warmth, there is a relatively high degree of similarity between the two countries. An examination across dimensions reveals the largest similarities for prevalence of use, face validity, process favourability, employer's rights, and opportunity to perform. Similarly to Moscoso and Salgado (2004), interpersonal warmth appeared to be the most problematic dimension, with two non-significant correlations and relatively small effect sizes. Finally, there were also small differences in the dimensions of scientific evidence and respectful of privacy. With respect to the former, the correlation between the Greek and the French samples were non-significant and with respect to the latter, the correlations were of moderate magnitude (Table 3).

It is also worth exploring the relationship between process favourability and the procedural dimensions of the 10 selection methods across the two samples. The correlation matrix presented in Table 4 shows that in four of the seven dimensions, we found statistically significant correlations between the two samples across all 10 selection methods. The strongest correlations were found between favourability and face validity, with the correlations ranging from .39 to .64 for employees and from .41 to .65 for students. Similarly strong were also the correlations between favourability and opportunity to perform, with correlations ranging from .33 to .64 for employees and from .25 to .60 for students. Weaker, but still statistically significant, were the correlations between favourability and scientific evidence and frequency of use. Furthermore, a number of differences exist between the two samples. For example, significant correlations exist between favourability and the employer's right for résumés and biodata for the student sample, but not the employee sample. Employer's right was positively correlated with the remaining methods in both samples. As far as interpersonal warmth is concerned, it is positively correlated with process favourability in the case of résumés, written ability tests, and personal references in the

Table 4. Correlations between process favourability and procedural dimensions for each method across the two samples

Selection method	Scientific evidence	Employer's right	Opportunity to perform	Interpersonal warmth	Logical, face valid approach	Respectful of privacy	Widely used
Interviews							
Employees	.45**	.22**	.53**	.23**	.53**	.08	.43**
Students	.44**	.35**	.53**	.36**	.59**	.18*	.39**
Résumés							
Employees	.34**	.10	.33**	.19*	.43**	-.03	.31**
Students	.23**	.41**	.44**	.09	.57**	.10	.45**
Work sample							
Employees	.37**	.21*	.48**	.25**	.54**	-.16*	.36**
Students	.43**	.41**	.47**	.21**	.53**	.00	.38**
Biodata							
Employees	.39**	.15	.39**	.12	.39**	-.19*	.32**
Students	.31**	.37**	.25**	.11	.46**	.19*	.38**
Written ability tests							
Employees	.49**	.28**	.48**	.30**	.63**	.06	.52**
Students	.47**	.54**	.46**	.10	.60**	.04	.40**
Personal references							
Employees	.36**	.29**	.54**	.22**	.54**	.13	.28**
Students	.42**	.48**	.48**	.11	.57**	.16*	.43**
Personality tests							
Employees	.42**	.29**	.47**	.36**	.63**	.04	.48**
Students	.36**	.38**	.41**	.28**	.41**	.20**	.27**
Honesty tests							
Employees	.40**	.30**	.53**	.29**	.61**	.00	.51**
Students	.48**	.48**	.60**	.19*	.65**	.11	.42**
Personal contacts							
Employees	.37**	.31**	.48**	.18**	.53**	.01	.40**
Students	.35**	.44**	.54**	.23**	.57**	.16*	.42**
Graphology							
Employees	.49**	.39**	.64**	.27**	.64**	-.22**	.50**
Students	.54**	.48**	.50**	.35**	.64**	-.20**	.47**

Notes: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

employee but not in the student sample. Non-significant correlations were identified for biodata in both samples. Finally, the weakest correlations are found in the case of respectful of privacy. It is positively correlated with favourability for interviews, personal references, personality tests, and personal contacts for employees but not for students. Non-significant correlations were identified for résumés, written ability, and honesty tests in both samples.

Subsequently, we explored our hypothesis regarding the relationship between CSE and fairness reactions. Similarly to the mean process favourability scale, we averaged the procedural dimensions ratings across the 10 selection methods. The internal consistency reliabilities of the procedural dimensions across the 10 methods ranged from .61 for résumés to .80 for honesty tests. The results revealed that CSE is significantly correlated only with the process favourability of interviews ($r = .21, p < .01$) and résumés ($r = .18, p < .05$) for the employee sample but no statistically significant correlations were identified in the student sample. The correlation between interviews' process favourability and the CSE was also statistically significant when we tested it with the whole sample ($r = .14,$

$p < .01$), and the same applied for the correlation between personal references' process favourability and CSE ($r = .12, p < .05$). The case is quite similar when we examine the correlations between procedural dimensions across selection methods and CSE. In the employee sample, only interview was correlated with CSE ($r = .19, p < .05$) and in the student sample personal contacts correlated with CSE ($r = .19, p < .05$). When we examined the entire sample, CSE was correlated with the procedural dimensions of interviews ($r = .14, p < .01$), résumés ($r = .11, p < .05$), and personal contacts ($r = .16, p < .01$). These results indicate that the role of individual differences, as captured by the CSE, has a limited impact on employees' and students' process favourability and procedural dimensions of the different selection methods.

We also explored the influence of the selection process outcome on participants' fairness reactions in the employee sample. The results indicated that employees' fairness reactions remained largely unaffected by the selection outcome, with only few minor exceptions reaching statistically significant levels. Employees who were rejected indicated that they considered higher than those hired as an employer's right to use

biodata as a means for obtaining information from applicants [$t(137) = -2.68, p < .01$], but lower the respect of privacy for written ability tests [$t(140) = 2.14, p < .05$] and the prevalence of use for personal references [$t(135) = 2.31, p < .05$].

Finally, following Anderson's (2003) and Moscoso and Salgado (2004) suggestions, we also explored if there are any differences in fairness perceptions between human resource professionals ($N = 40$) and other working individuals ($N = 105$) of our employee sample, without identifying any statistically significant differences.

8. Discussion

The current study attempted to respond to a number of issues related to applicants' fairness reactions. It is intended to be both a replication of the Steiner and Gilliland (1996) and Moscoso and Salgado (2004) studies evaluating students' fairness reactions, but also to be an extension of these studies exploring the topic in another European country but most importantly with an employee sample along with the use of a student sample. Further, in an attempt to explore the role of individual differences on fairness reactions, we incorporated in our study the newly established construct of CSE.

The first objective of the study was to investigate whether Greek students and employees demonstrate similar preferences towards the different selection methods, as in other countries. Although there were a few minor differences between students and employees, the favourability ratings were quite similar. Interviews, résumés, and work samples received the most positive ratings, followed by written ability tests, personality tests, and personal references. Biodata, honesty tests, personal contacts, and graphology received the lowest ratings. Employees rated résumés more positively than did students but the latter held more positive evaluations for all three types of psychometric tests and graphology. The strongest difference existed for honesty tests, with students demonstrating greater acceptance of this method, a result that may be attributed to the origin of the student sample (i.e., undergraduate business students). These results are almost identical to the findings obtained by Steiner and Gilliland (1996) using French and American samples and Moscoso and Salgado (2004) with Spanish and Portuguese samples and the findings of Hausknecht *et al.*'s (2004) meta-analysis. They are also comparable with findings obtained in other countries, using similar methodologies (for an extended review of international fairness reactions, see Steiner & Gilliland, 2001).

Our second objective was to explore the role of procedural dimensions of the 10 selection methods, along with the differences between students and em-

ployees on these dimensions. Based on the results reported in Table 2, and the mean correlations reported, we can see that although one-third of the differences are statistically significant, both samples categorize the selection methods on the procedural dimensions quite similarly. The findings suggest that on the dimensions of scientific evidence, respectful of privacy, face validity, and prevalence of use, the two samples demonstrate the largest agreement with minor differences for honesty testing, résumés, interviews, work samples, and graphology. Most differences are identified in the dimension of interpersonal warmth, where employees rated differently than students six of the 10 selection methods and also in the dimension of employer's right with statistically significant differences in four of the 10 selection methods. A few differences – but high agreement in ratings between samples – were also identified in the opportunity to perform procedural dimension.

Subsequently, we compared the perceptions of our student sample with the perceptions of the American, French, Spanish, and Portuguese samples (Moscoso & Salgado, 2004; Steiner & Gilliland, 1996) regarding the favourability and procedural dimensions of the 10 methods. The largest agreement was identified with the Portuguese and the American samples, followed by the Spanish and French samples. Although the similarity with the American samples is not surprising due to the significant influence of the American human resources literature and practise on Greek as well as European HR practises, the high degree of similarity with the Portuguese compared with the Spanish and the French samples was somewhat unexpected, taking into consideration the fact that Portugal, Spain, and Greece may be grouped in the South European cluster, bearing relatively similar national-cultural characteristics.

Finally, our last objective exploring fairness reactions in Greece was the investigation of the relationship between process favourability and the procedural dimensions for each method across the two samples. Face validity was identified as the strongest correlate with process favourability between the two samples across all 10 selection methods, followed by opportunity to perform, scientific evidence, and frequency of use. Our results regarding these dimensions are almost identical with the results obtained by Moscoso and Salgado (2004), only in our study all correlations are statistically significant across all 10 methods in both samples, suggesting that process favourability is strongly related to these procedural dimensions. There is also a correlation between process favourability and employer's right with two exceptions for the employee sample – regarding résumés and biodata. However, contrary to Moscoso and Salgado (2004), interpersonal warmth and respectful of privacy correlated with process favourability with a few exceptions, suggesting that process

favourability is also moderately correlated with these two procedural dimensions in Greece.

Our second main research question explored the role of individual differences on fairness reactions, as captured by the CSE construct. The results revealed that CSE is weakly correlated with the process favourability of interviews and résumés only for the employee sample, but no statistically significant correlations were identified in the student sample. The procedural dimensions of interviews and personal contacts for employees and students respectively were also weakly correlated with CSE. These findings imply that the role of self-evaluations on fairness reactions, especially of interview as a selection method, is worth exploring further. Job applicants with a positive self-image approach selection interview more favourably and consider it as a fair method to discriminate successful candidates. In a similar line of research, Tay, Ang, and van Dyne (2006) explored the role of interviewing self-efficacy on interview success and they found that it fully mediates the effects of distal individual characteristics, such as extroversion and conscientiousness, on interview success.

Our results have several practical implications for organizations and human resource professionals interested in applicants' reactions towards selection methods. For example, this is the first study exploring fairness reactions in Greece and most importantly replicating and extending previous findings from other countries with an employee sample. Greek organizations or multinational companies operating in Greece should avoid methods such as personal contacts and graphology, as candidates consider them as less appropriate methods to use in selection. Despite the fact that graphology is rarely used in Greece, personal contacts are quite extensively used as a selection method, mainly from traditionally managed Greek organizations. On the other hand, companies would generate positive reactions from using interviews, résumés, work samples, written ability tests, and personality tests as selection tools; with the exception of résumés, these devices also are good predictors of work performance. From a practical point of view it is also worth noting that Greek students are more positive towards all kinds of psychometric tests than Greek employees, a significant result especially in relation to integrity tests, which also demonstrate high criterion related validity (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). Another practical implication is that, despite previous suggestions (Ryan & Ployhart, 2000), the selection outcome does not seem to influence applicants' fairness reactions, at least in Greece, and the same applies for the minimal effect of individual differences, as captured by the CSE construct, implying that organizations can implement their personnel selection systems, independently of the effect of these factors. More recently, Anderson and

Goltsi (2006), exploring the newly established construct of Negative Psychological Effects of selection methods, came up with similar findings. They failed to identify any links between the outcome of an assessment centre procedure and the levels of rejected applicants' self-esteem, psychological well-being, positive affect, and career exploration behaviour as a result of being unsuccessful at this assessment centre (Anderson & Goltsi, 2006).

From a research standpoint, the current study attempted to address a significant limitation of previous studies, such as the use of student samples. Our findings suggest that earlier results are generalizable to employment settings, as the employees of our sample provided quite similar favourability ratings with students. Further, a significant research issue still to be dealt with in a more elaborate way is the role of individual differences in fairness reactions. The current study explored CSE as a relevant personality constellation but only identified moderate effects, especially in relation to interview. Ryan and Ployhart (2000) suggest that openness to experience, which is not part of the CSE construct, might also affect applicants' perceptions of more novel and innovative selection procedures and also that individual differences should be explored longitudinally, which is also one of the limitations of the current study, along with the lack of any pre-test measures or any actual post-selection 'outcome' variables, of actual behaviour. However, the main intention of the current study was to address the limitations of previous, similar studies – mainly those of Steiner and Gilliland (1996) and Moscoso and Salgado (2004).

In conclusion, the current study, carried out in a collectivistic culture such as Greece, demonstrated that cross-cultural differences related to fairness reactions are very small between countries, even when we assess employees' as opposed to students' attitudes. Further, the role of individual differences on these reactions is relatively weak, implying that organizations should concentrate on the appropriate use of the most valid and acceptable selection methods.

Acknowledgement

The authors wish to thank Sofia Hatzi for her assistance in data collection.

Note

1. Similarly to Steiner and Gilliland (1996), we conducted analyses adding experience with the selection method as a covariate, which produced non-significant effects for experience and did not affect the results of the study. Therefore, experience with the selection method was not included in the subsequent analyses.

References

- Anderson, N. (2001) Towards a Theory of Socialization Impact: Selection as pre-entry socialization. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, **9**, 1 and 2, 84–91.
- Anderson, N. (2003) Applicant and Recruiter Reactions to New Technology in Selection: A critical review and agenda for future research. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, **11**, 2–3, 121–136.
- Anderson, N. and Goltzi, V. (2006) Negative Psychological Effects of Selection Methods: Construct formulation and an empirical investigation into an assessment center. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, **14**, 3, 236–255.
- Anderson, N. and Ostroff, C. (1997) Selection as Socialization. In: Anderson, N. and Herriot, P. (eds), *International Handbook of Selection and Assessment*. Chichester, UK: Wiley, pp. 413–440.
- Anderson, N., Born, M. and Cunningham-Snell, N. (2001) Recruitment and Selection: Applicant perspectives and outcomes. In: Anderson, N., Ones, D., Sinangil, H. and Viswesvaran, C. (eds), *Handbook of Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 200–218.
- Arvey, R.D. and Sackett, P.R. (1993) Fairness in Selection: Current developments and perspective. In: Schmitt, N. and Borman, W. (eds), *Personnel Selection in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, pp. 171–202.
- Bartram, D. (2004) Assessment in Organisations. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, **53**, 2, 237–259.
- Bauer, T.N., Truxillo, D.M., Sanchez, R.J., Craig, J.M., Ferrara, P. and Campion, M.A. (2001) Applicant Reactions to Selection: Development of the selection procedural justice scale (SPJS). *Personnel Psychology*, **54**, 2, 387–419.
- Chan, D. and Schmitt, N. (2004) An Agenda for Future Research on Applicant Reactions to Selection Procedures: A construct-oriented approach. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, **12**, 1–2, 9–23.
- Dodd, W.E. (1977) Attitudes towards Assessment Center Programs. In: Moses, J.L. and Byham, W.C. (eds), *Applying the Assessment Center Programs*. New York: Pergamon Press, pp. 161–183.
- Eleftheriou, A. and Robertson, I.T. (1999) A Survey of Management Selection Practices in Greece. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, **7**, 4, 203–208.
- Gilliland, S.W. (1993) The Perceived Fairness of Selection Systems: An organizational justice perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, **18**, 4, 694.
- Gilliland, S.W. (1994) Effects of Procedural and Distributive Justice on Reactions to a Selection System. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **79**, 691–701.
- Hausknecht, J.P., Day, D.V. and Thomas, S.C. (2004) Applicant Reactions to Selection Procedures: An updated model and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, **57**, 3, 639–683.
- Imus, A.L. and Ryan, A.M. (2005) Relevance and Rigor in Research on the Applicant's Perspective: In pursuit of pragmatic science. In: Evers, A., Anderson, N. and Voskuil, O. (eds), *Handbook of Personnel Selection*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 291–305.
- Judge, T.A., Erez, A. and Bono, J.E. (1998) The Power of Being Positive: The relation between positive self-concept and job performance. *Human Performance*, **11**, 167–188.
- Judge, T.A., Erez, A., Bono, J.E. and Thoresen, C.J. (2003) The Core Self-Evaluations Scale: Development of a measure. *Personnel Psychology*, **56**, 303–331.
- Judge, T.A., Higgins, C.A. and Cable, D.M. (2000) The Employment Interview: A review of recent research and recommendations for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, **10**, 4, 383.
- Judge, T.A., Locke, E.A. and Durham, C.C. (1997) The Dispositional Causes of Job Satisfaction: A core evaluations approach. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, **19**, 151–188.
- Kantas, A., Kalogera, S. and Nikolaou, I. (1997) Recruitment and Selection: Managerial practices and perceptions in the Greek private sector. In: Pepermans, R., Buelens, A., Vinkenbarg, C.J. and Jansen, P.G.W. (eds), *Managerial Behaviour and Practices: European research issues*. Leuven: ACCO, pp. 81–90.
- Klingner, Y. and Schuler, H. (2004) Improving Participants' Evaluations while Maintaining Validity by a Work Sample: Intelligence test hybrid. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, **12**, 1–2, 120–134.
- Macan, T., Avedon, M., Paese, M. and Smith, D. (1994) The Effects of Job Applicants' Reactions to Cognitive Ability Tests and an Assessment Center. *Personnel Psychology*, **47**, 715–738.
- Marcus, B. (2003) Attitudes toward Personnel Selection Methods: A partial replication and extension in a German sample. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, **52**, 4, 515–532.
- Moscato, S. and Salgado, J.F. (2004) Fairness Reactions to Personnel Selection Techniques in Spain and Portugal. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, **12**, 1–2, 187–196.
- Ryan, A.M. and Ployhart, R.E. (2000) Applicants' Perceptions of Selection Procedures and Decisions: A critical review and agenda for the future. *Journal of Management*, **26**, 3, 565–606.
- Ryan, A.M., McFarland, L., Baron, H. and Page, R. (1999) An International Look at Selection Practices: Nation and culture as explanations for variability in practice. *Personnel Psychology*, **52**, 2, 359–391.
- Rynes, S.L. and Connerley, M.L. (1993) Applicant Reactions to Alternative Selection Procedures. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, **7**, 3, 261.
- Schmidt, F.L. and Hunter, J.E. (1998) The Validity and Utility of Selection Methods in Personnel Psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, **124**, 262–274.
- Schmit, M.J. and Ryan, A.M. (1992) Test-Taking Dispositions: A missing link? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **77**, 5, 629–637.
- Schmitt, N. and Coyle, B.W. (1976) Applicant Decisions in the Employment Interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **61**, 184–192.
- Steiner, D.D. and Gilliland, S.W. (1996) Fairness Reactions to Personnel Selection Techniques in France and the United States. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **81**, 2, 134–141.
- Steiner, D.D. and Gilliland, S.W. (2001) Procedural Justice in Personnel Selection: International and cross-cultural perspectives. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, **9**, 1 and 2, 124–137.

Tay, C., Ang, S. and Van Dyne, L. (2006) Personality, Biographical Characteristics, and Job Interview Success: A longitudinal study of the mediating effects of interviewing self-efficacy and the moderating effects of internal locus of causality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **91**, 2, 446–454.

Viswesvaran, C. and Ones, D.S. (2004) Importance of Perceived Personnel Selection System Fairness Determinants: Relations with demographic, personality, and job characteristics. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, **12**, 1–2, 172–186.