



Araştırma Makalesi

## Fairness Reactions to Personnel Selection Methods: A Field Study in the Turkish Sample

### *Personel Seçme Yöntemlerine Karşı Adalet Tepkisi: Türkiye Örneği*

İbrahim Sani Mert<sup>a</sup>, Sait Gürbüz<sup>b</sup>

#### ARTICLE INFO

**Keywords:**  
*Personnel Selection, Personnel Selection Methods, Fairness Reaction*

**Article history:**  
Received 22 May 2018  
Accepted 22 February 2019

#### ABSTRACT

*The current study examines the fairness reactions to 10 personnel selection methods in a sample consists of 240 Turkish university senior students. According to the findings of the study, interviews were the most favorably rated methods among the selection methods, followed by résumés, work-sample tests, honesty tests, and written ability tests. On the contrary, personal contacts, graphology, and personal references were found the least favorable, respectively. Of selection procedures scientific evidence, perceived face validity, and opportunity to perform were the strongest procedural justice dimensions for predicting the process favorability ratings. Findings of the study are compared with the findings of the studies which are using similar methodologies to determine fairness reaction to personnel selection methods in other countries. Also, the impact of demographic factors on process favorability and procedural dimensions were discussed.*

#### MAKALE BİLGİSİ

**Anahtar Kelimeler:**  
*Personel Seçimi, Personel Seçim Yöntemleri, Adalet Tepkisi*

**Tarihler :**  
Geliş 22 Mayıs 2018  
Kabul 22 Şubat 2019

#### ÖZ

*Mevcut çalışmada, 240 üniversite son sınıf öğrenciden oluşan bir örnekleme, 10 personel seçim yöntemine yönelik adalet tepkileri incelenmiştir. Araştırma bulgularına göre, personel seçim yöntemleri arasında en olumlu değerlendirilen yöntemler; özgeçmişler, iş-örnek testleri, dürüstlük testleri ve yazılı yetenek testleridir. Diğer yandan, kişisel bağlantılar, grafoloji ve kişisel referanslar sırasıyla en olumsuz yöntem olarak tespit edilmiştir. Personel seçim prosedürlerinin bilimsel kanıtları, algılanan geçerliliği ve uygulama fırsatı, süreç uygunluk derecelerini tahmin etmek için en güçlü prosedürel adalet boyutlarıdır. Çalışmanın bulguları, diğer ülkelerde personel seçim yöntemlerine adalet tepkisini belirlemek için benzer metodolojileri kullanan çalışmaların bulguları ile karşılaştırılmıştır. Ayrıca, demografik faktörlerin süreç uygunluğu ve prosedürel boyutlara etkisi tartışılmıştır.*

<sup>a</sup> İletişim kurulacak yazar, Prof. Dr., Antalya Bilim Üniversitesi, İşletme Bölümü, Antalya, Türkiye. E-mail: ibrahim.mert@antalya.edu.tr. ORCID: 0000-0002-2850-1865

<sup>b</sup> Prof. Dr., Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi, Ankara, Türkiye. E-mail: sgorbuz\_99@yahoo.com. ORCID: 0000-0001-7817-9141

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Selection, the process of choosing individuals with qualifications needed to fill vacant positions in an organization, is a key responsibility for managers and supervisors in all kind of organizations. Without these fastidious selected and qualified employees, an organization is far less likely to succeed. Hence, utilizing appropriate techniques of personnel selection has been one of the most significant topic in HR staffing. In related literature, many scientific methods have been developed for recruiting and selecting the suitable employee. Research on the validity and practicalibility of selection techniques have yielded significant improvements and gained considerable importance from both human resource professionals and organizations's perspective. On the other hand, applicant reactions and attitudes towards personnel selection techniques have been investigated from perspective of significant 'actor' of the selection process (the applicant) over the last decade. Recently, comprehensive researches conducted in different countries have explored the issue and made substantial strides forward (Steiner & Gilliland, 2001; Philips & Gully, 2002; Moscoso & Salgado, 2004; Nikolaou & Judge, 2007; Anderson & Witullet, 2008; Bertolino & Steiner, 2007).

Applicant reactions to personnel selection methods are important since it is the first interaction between the employer and applicant (Rynes & Connerly, 1993; Marcus, 2003). It has also been known that this interaction also influence hiring decision, applicant's attitudes towards the organization, and subsequent future job performance of accepted candidates into organization (Ryan & Ployhart, 2000; Anderson, 2004; Chapman et al., 2005).

National culture, local labor market, social, legal, and economic factors may influence applicant reactions to personnel selection techniques (Ryan, McFarland, Baron & Page, 1999; Newell & Tansley, 2001). Steiner and Gilliland (2001) claimed that the perception of applicants might vary across nations and cultures. In this context, applicant reactions to 10 common and popular selection methods (interviews, résumés, work samples, biodata, written ability tests, personal references, personality tests, honesty tests, personal contacts and graphology) examined through Steiner and Gilliland's instrument (1996) in US and France (Steiner & Gilliland, 1996), in United States and Singapore (Phillips & Gully, 2002), in Spain and Portugal (Moscoso & Salgado, 2004), Italy (Bertolino & Steiner, 2007), Greece (Nikolaou & Judge, 2007), and in Netherlands (Anderson &

Witvliet, 2008). The above cited studies pointed out that except some minor discrepancies; results concerning fairness perceptions among countries were similar. Although a number of empirical studies on applicant reactions exist for some countries, there is no empirical study on applicant reactions to personnel selection for several other countries such as Canada, some European (e.g., Turkey and Scandinavian countries) and other continents' countries. Hence, international generalizability of applicant reactions to selection techniques still needs to be investigated for different countries that have not been studied and have different cultural and work values.

In this context, the purpose of the current study is threefold:

- First, it is to investigate applicant reactions to 10 popular selection methods by using the same method with Steiner and Gilliland (1996) in Turkey that has somewhat different cultural values as compared to above mentioned countries that have been studied before.
- Second, is to determine whether fairness reactions to selection methods are differentiated by demographic factors (gender, branches, and family incomes of participants).
- Third, is to explore similarities and discrepancies pertain to fairness reactions to different selection methods between Turkey and some of the other countries studied previously.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1. Researches in fairness reactions to selection methods

According to Ryan and Ployhart (2000: 566) applicant reactions can be defined as "attitudes, affect or cognitions an individual might have about the hiring process". The topic has gained considerable interest more recently, just because applicant reactions might be associated with subsequent behavior that has the potential impact on organizations. For instance, Macan, Avedon, Paese and Smith (1994) pointed out that applicants' perceptions concerning selection process influence their intentions to accept or reject offered job and perceived external image and attractiveness of the organization. Also more recently, it has been found that there is a significant relation between positive applicant reaction to selection method and attracting

the new candidates to the organization (Hausknecht, Day & Thomas, 2004).

Because of globalization, firms have spreaded all over the world. In this aspect, local selection methods have to be examined carefully in order to have the local ability to be acquired by organization. There are a few researches in the international aspects, focused to find out the reactions of the candidates using similar research techniques.

To date, whereas studies on fairness reaction to selection methods have been conducted in a number of countries, no literature exists for Turkish samples. Some empirical studies about the reactions to selection methods are;

- USA and France (Steiner & Gilliland, 1996)
- USA and Singapore (Phillips & Gully, 2002)
- Spain and Portugal (Moscoso & Salgado, 2004)
- Italy (Bertolino & Steiner, 2007)
- Greece (Nikolaou & Judge, 2007)
- Netherlands (Anderson & Witvliet, 2008)

In all of these researches, the questionnaire improved by Steiner and Gilliland (1996) was used by translating to local country's language. By doing so, levels of the reactions to 10 selection methods namely, interviews, résumés/CV, work sampling test, biographical information, written ability test, personal references, personality tests, honesty tests, personal contacts and graphology analysis were tried to be determined. It was proven that the results of the researches pertaining eight countries that presented above are generally similar except some small discrepancies.

First of the researches was held by Steiner and Gilliland (1996) on two samples comprising students in France and USA. Candidates were asked to evaluate the most commonly utilized 10 selection methods by answering two questions focused on suitability of the process and seven procedural justice dimensions; scientific evidence, face valid, opportunity to perform, interpersonal treatment/warmth, widely used, respectful to privacy. In the research results, interviews and résumés/CV methods were evaluated positively. Because of common usage in France, graphology was perceived considerably positively.

Similarly, in their research including of 20 firms, Ryan and friends (1999) have found that interviews had been appeared as the most frequently used selection method. It is possible to assert that

interviews are preferred because of their anticipated ability to detect the individuals' important qualities differentiating them.

According to results of meta-analysis conducted by Hausknecht and friends (2004: 669), it was demonstrated that the interviews, work-sample tests, résumés and personal references are perceived more positively than the other selection methods. Personality tests and biographical information (biodata) got average level points, whereas personal contacts, honesty tests and graphology got lower level points.

Moscoso and Saldago (2004) have urged that cultural differences may be effective on process favorability of selection methods. Using the same method with Steiner and Gilliland (1996), researchers have examined Spain and Portugal samples. In this research, in which generally similar findings were found comparing Steiner and Gilliland, interviews, résumés, and work sampling test were evaluated positively, whereas personal contacts, honesty tests, and graphology were evaluated negatively.

In their research held in Greece, Nikolaou and Judge (2007) applied the questionnaire on two different sample; students and employees. In this research, interviews, résumés, and work sampling test were also evaluated as best methods by students and employees. But students were seen to have more positive stance to personality tests than employees.

Anderson and Witvliet (2008) have used the same methods and questionnaire in their research conducted in Netherlands. Like previous researches interviews, résumés, and work sampling test were appeared to be most prominent.

Additionally, the study conducted by Bertolino and Steiner (2007) examined the fairness reactions to 10 personnel selection methods in a sample of Italian students. It pointed out that work sample tests were the most favorably rated method among the selection methods, followed by résumés, written ability tests, interviews and personal references. By contrast, it was also found that graphology was perceived negatively.

Despite its low validity, résumés is used in many countries and got an above-the-average point. On the other hand, personal references got average points in most countries (Steiner & Gilliland, 1996). The issues raised from this review of literature demonstrate that there is substantially strong argument for common fairness reactions to selection methods. Given this stance, it initially seems that there are clear similarities on fairness

reactions to selection methods between countries that have already studied. But to increase the generalizability of this conclusion, it needs some further evidence from unstudied countries like Turkey that has a different cultural features compared with other studied countries.

## 2.2. Fairness Reaction to Selection Methods

Basically, three methods are used in theoretic explanation of fairness perceptions or reaction of the candidates to selection methods. First of these is "social validity" approach (Klingner & Schuler, 2004). According to this approach, acceptance of selection process is related to four factors:

- Information given to candidates about organization
- Participation of candidate to selection process
- The transparency of the procedure
- Feedback given to candidate after selection process

Although it has been used by some researchers (eg. Rynes and Connerly, 1993; Macan et al., 1994), social validity model has not been a widely used model. Another approach, generated by Anderson and his friends (2001), investigates the studies focusing on the reactions of candidates about social and organizational psychology, namely "general model". In this method, fairness reactions of the candidate are related to four factors:

- The fact that the method is more job relevant
- The fact that the method is less personally intrusive
- The procedural justice anticipation of candidate
- The fact that candidate has the chance to meet with negotiator

In this model fairness reaction of the candidates is statistically meaningful with whether the candidate accept the job or not (Anderson, 2003), image of the organization between other candidates (Bauer et al., 2001) and work performance of the candidate after selection (Ryan & Ployhart, 2000). Moreover, the perception of the candidate during the selection process may cause him/her to advice to other candidates to apply for the job. Again in this process, a possible negative perception occurred in candidates may create a behavior of not to use that organization's products and services (Hausknecht et al., 2004).

Finally, the approach improved by Gilliland (1993) based on "the organizational equity theory" is the

most utilized model. In his study, Gilliland (1993) tried to explain candidates' reactions by focusing to procedural justice that is using equity theory. This approach was improved further by Steiner and Gilliland (1996) and it was seen that the reactions aggregated in two dimensions; process favorability and procedural justice reaction. Procedural justice dimension consist of seven sub-elements: scientific evidence; logical, face valid approach; opportunity to perform; employer's right; respectful of privacy; interpersonal warmth, widely used (Steiner & Gilliland, 1996: 134).

The seven-element procedural justice questionnaire which was improved based on this approach has been used in various international researches (Phillips & Gully, 2002; Moscoso & Salgado, 2004; 2007; 2008). Due to common usage in international researches, it can be inferred that this approach is applicable to make comparison between countries. Hence, in this study, the same questionnaire is also used to make comparisons to previous studies.

## 2.3. Social Cultural Tendency of Turkey

Although fairness reaction to selection methods are similar across the previously studied countries, it has been frequently claimed that cultural factors may impact fairness reaction. For this reason, currently, it appears that national culture remains a questionable area in fairness reaction to selection methods. In this context, social cultural tendency of Turkey will be overviewed.

The organizations in work life in Turkey, generally consist of public organizations and private sector firms mostly owned by families. In executive boards of the private firms are generally the members from the family and these are responsible for relations with government (Kabasakal & Bodur, 1998). The organizations in Turkey generally appears to be the ones in which central decision making, strong leadership and limited delegation of powers are commonly observed (Ronen, 1986). In their study, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) have denoted that Turkey has the most rigid organizational hierarchy among the 38 countries. It is known that Turkish managers have paternalistic attitudes to their subordinates. According to studies, Turkish social culture was founded high in power distance, uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, and femininity (Hofstede, 1984; Gürbüz & Bingöl, 2007).

Erez (1994) stated that social culture is one of most important issues that determine the effect of managerial acts to employees' behaviors. Similarly, Aycan, Kanungo, and Sinha (1999) has urged that social culture effects managerial acts stating that

social ethics has a mediator role for relations within the organization.

Moscoso and Salgado (2004) stated that cultural differences between countries may affect the selection methods for candidates. There is no study in Turkey pertaining to this subject. Hence, this research may contribute to fill this gap. Moreover, it may shed light into similarities and/or the discrepancies of fairness reaction to selection methods of culturally different countries.

### 3. METHOD

#### 3.1. Sample

The sample of the study consists of 240 senior university students majoring in business administration (25%), finance (25%), econometrics (25%), and economics (25%) from three state universities in Ankara. The reason to pick this sample is that this group will shortly join the work life and also provides comparable sample with previously studied countries. The sample consisted of equal number of male (50%) and female (50%) undergraduates, with the mean age of 21.7 years (SD: 1.68).

#### 3.2. Measurement and procedure

In order to evaluate students' attitudes towards personnel selection methods, the questionnaire developed by Steiner and Gilliland (1996), and widely used by the previous researchers (Moscoso & Salgado, 2004, Nikolaou & Judge, 2007; Anderson & Witvliet, 2008) was applied. The questionnaire has been adapted to Turkish by researchers. During adaptation, the method of Brislin, Lonner and Thorndike (1973) was used. Adaptation process consisted of five steps accordingly: 1) forward translation, 2) assessment of forward translation, 3) backward translation, 4) assessment of backward translation and 5) meeting with professionals.

The questionnaires gathered as a paper copy on voluntary basis at the end of their classes. Participants were asked to answer the social - demographical questions and the statements about the fairness and suitability of ten personnel selection method following the guidelines of Steiner and Gilliland (1996).

The questionnaire covered a short explanation 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), as shown in Table 1.

First, students were asked to indicate whether they had been evaluated by each selection method by a prospective employer previously. Next, it is asked to the participants to anticipate a job they were likely to apply for after graduation, and subsequently consider each selection method depending on this job. There were two questions in order to evaluate process favorability for each one of the selection methods:

- (1) How would you rate the effectiveness of this method for identifying the qualified people for the job you indicated?
- (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 the questions by using seven-point Likert-type scales (1 represents "least favorable", 7 represents "most favorable"). Reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of the measure was .739.

In the last step, participants gave answers to seven questions by assessing the procedural dimensions of each method. The respondents used seven-point Likert-type scales (1 indicates "totally disagree", 7 indicates "totally agree"). The items regarding the participants' perceptions were: (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. Cronbach's alpha coefficient for this scale was .874.

### 4. FINDINGS

#### 4.1. Participants' experience of selection methods

As mentioned previously, the first question of the questionnaire was whether an employer had evaluated participants by each selection method, up to that time. Responses showed that interview was the most widely used method. According to results, the percentage of the evaluation the selection methods are 54.2% for interviews, 53.3% for résumés/CVs, 26.3% for work-sample tests, 29.2% for biographical information, 30.8% for written ability tests, 33.3% for personal references, 32.5%

**Table 1:** Selection methods and short descriptions as presented in the questionnaire

No.	Selection method	Description
1	Interviews	Face-to-face interactions in which employers ask you a variety of questions about your background and qualifications
2	Résumés	A written description of information on all of your professional experiences, your education, etc.
3	Work-sample tests	Tests in which you actually perform a part of the job so that your success in doing that part of the job can be determined
4	Biographical information	Forms requesting very specific information about your work experience, education, and skills, they often include questions about your hobbies, interests, and past accomplishments. The questions are frequently in multiple-choice format where you check the appropriate answer
5	Written ability tests	Paper-and-pencil tests that evaluate your intelligence on your reasoning, verbal, or mathematical skill
6	Personal references	In this method, you must request letters of reference or provide the names of your prior employers so that the employer can obtain information about your suitability for the job
7	Personality tests	Paper-and-pencil tests that ask you questions about your opinions and past experiences to assess your personality traits
8	Honesty tests	Tests that ask you about your thoughts on theft and experiences related to your personal honesty
9	Personal contacts	Knowing someone influential in the company whose connections can help you get the job
10	Graphology	The analysis of aspects of your handwriting, including style and form, to determine personal characteristics

for personality tests, 15.8% for honesty tests, 30.8% for personal contacts, and 1.3% for graphology. The participants' level of experiences with 10 selection methods suggest that the participants in the current study were generally quite experienced as job applicants. On the other hand, certain methods such as interviews, résumés, personal references were more commonly encountered.

#### 4.2. Process favorability

In this subtitle process favorability findings of the current study will be examined. Initially, the favorability ratings of the Turkish sample explained secondly, the effect of demographic factors on favorability ratings explored, and thirdly, the comparison of favorability ratings between Turkey and some studied countries examined.

The means and standard deviations for favorability ratings of the sample for each of the selection methods can be seen in Table 2. As far as the current study concerned, the most favorable methods were interviews, résumés, work-sample tests, and honesty tests. Written ability tests, personality tests, and biographical information favorably rated respectfully. Personal contacts, graphology, and personal references received the lowest ratings.

Mean comparisons were carried out to explore whether any demographic factor has (gender, family income, and field of specialization) influences

on process favorability of the different selection methods. Although, no significant differences observed for students' major type, gender predicted statistically significant results in process favorability for two of the 10 selection methods and for family income for one. More specifically, female students ( $M=4.92$ ,  $SD=1.5$ ) tend to perceive personal references [ $t(238)=-2.12$ ,  $p<.05$ ] more positively than males ( $M=4.45$ ,  $SD=1.8$ ), while male students ( $M=2.97$ ,  $SD=1.9$ ) tend to perceive personal contacts [ $t(238)=1.88$ ,  $p<.05$ ] more positively than females ( $M=2.53$ ,  $SD=1.7$ ). And the students whose families' income are mid-level ( $M=5.16$ ,  $SD=1.5$ ) perceive personal references [ $F(3, 236)=3.4$ ,  $p<.05$ ] more positively than those whose family incomes are relatively high ( $M=4.25$ ,  $SD=1.8$ ).

Additionally, means and standard deviations of favorability ratings for each of the selection methods in Turkish sample, along with the previous studies are depicted in Table 2 (Nikolaou & Judge, 2007; Anderson & Witvliet, 2008; Bertolino & Steiner, 2007).

Using Steiner and Gilliland's student sample as the most appropriate as the comparison group for this study, it is computed Cohen's  $d$  (Cohen, 1977) to determine effect size differences between Turkey and these four countries (US, Greek, Netherlands, and Italian). Cohen's  $d$  for 10 selection methods for each pair (Turkey and each other countries) are shown in Table 3.

In the case of interviews, résumés, biographical information, written ability tests, personality tests, honesty tests, and graphology, the Turkish sample rated significantly higher than US, Greece, Netherlands, and Italian samples. For the work-sample tests, personal references and personal contacts methods, effect size differences are negligibly small (that is 0 to .3 in accordance with Cohen's rule-of-thumb), except the work-sample tests and personal references for Greece sample. In these exceptions, the methods of work-sample tests and personal references in which Turkish sample rated substantially higher than Greece sample.

#### 4.3. Procedural dimensions

In this subtitle, following the previous subtitle's methodology, process dimensions ratings of the Turkish sample, the effect of demographic factors, and the comparison of procedural dimensions' ratings between Turkey and other countries were examined.

Table 4 presents means process dimensions ratings of participants for selection methods. The first dimension analysed is scientific evidence (the method is based on solid scientific research). In this dimension, honesty tests and work-sample tests received the highest ratings while personal contacts and graphology received the lowest ratings, respectively. With regard to face validity (the approach is logical for identifying qualified candidates), interviews, work-sample tests, and

résumés were rated more positively, and personal contacts and graphology were perceived more negatively. For the dimension of opportunity to perform (the method will detect the individuals' important qualities differentiating them from others), interviews, work-sample tests, and résumés received highest ratings, on the other hand, personal contacts and graphology were perceived as the least favored methods providing the worst opportunity for applicants to perform. Concerning employer's right dimension (employers have the right to obtain information from applicants by using the method), personal contacts and honesty tests received the highest ratings, while résumés and biographical information received the lowest ratings. The next dimension analysed was respectful of privacy (the method invades personal privacy). According to the findings, the highest rated methods were interviews, work-sample tests, and résumés, while the lowest rated methods were personal contacts and graphology, respectively. For the dimension of interpersonal warmth (the selection instrument is interpersonal and warm), résumés, interviews, and work-sample tests are rated more positively, and personal contacts and graphology are perceived more negatively. The last analysed dimension is widely use. In this dimension, interviews, résumés, and written ability tests are perceived as the most widely used methods while, graphology and honesty tests are perceived as the least widely used ones, respectively. (See Table 4)

**Table 2:** Mean process favorability ratings for selection methods by country

Selection method	Turkey <sup>a</sup>		US <sup>b</sup>		Greece <sup>c</sup>		Nether- lands <sup>b</sup>		Italy <sup>d</sup>	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Interviews	6.17	1.08	5.39	1.26	5.22	1.08	5.08	1.11	4.33	1.27
Résumés/CVs	5.76	1.26	5.37	1.19	4.58	1.22	4.68	1.05	4.50	1.30
Work-sample tests	5.35	1.46	5.26	1.49	4.93	1.21	5.10	1.11	5.15	1.29
Biographical information	5.00	1.38	4.59	1.31	4.31	.99	4.24	1.12	3.72	1.35
Written ability tests	5.12	1.43	4.50	1.25	4.52	1.17	4.15	1.35	4.43	1.43
Personal references	4.68	1.71	4.38	1.30	3.77	1.35	4.34	1.25	4.25	1.23
Personality tests	5.06	1.53	3.50	1.30	4.35	1.20	4.42	1.13	3.77	1.36
Honesty tests	5.35	1.68	3.41	1.62	3.93	1.37	3.26	1.43	3.07	1.48
Personal contacts	2.95	1.85	3.29	1.64	3.20	1.46	3.04	1.37	2.99	1.82
Graphology	3.02	1.73	1.95	1.18	2.49	1.29	1.95	1.06	2.27	1.39
N	240		142		121		167		137	

<sup>a</sup>Present study, <sup>b</sup>Adapted from Anderson and Witvliet (2008), <sup>c</sup>Adapted from Nikolaou and Judge (2007) -the student sample-, <sup>d</sup>Adapted from Bertolino and Steiner (2007)

**Table 3:** Cohen's d between Turkey and other countries

Selection method	Turkey-US	Turkey-Greece	Turkey-Netherlands	Turkey-Italy
Interviews	.66	.88	.99	1.56
Résumés/CVs	.32	.95	.93	.98
Work-sample tests	.06	.31	.19	.15
Biographical information	.31	.57	.60	.93
Written ability tests	.46	.46	.69	.48
Personal references	.19	.59	.23	.29
Personality tests	1.1	.52	.45	.89
Honesty tests	1.18	.93	1.34	1.44
Personal contacts	-.19	-.15	-.06	-.02
Graphology	.72	.35	.75	.48

**Table 4:** Mean process dimensions ratings of participants for selection methods

Selection method	Scientific evidence	Face validity	Opportunity to perform	Employer's right	Respectful of privacy	Interpersonal warmth	Widely used
Interviews	4.90	5.73	5.74	3.23	5.42	5.39	6.19
Résumés/CVs	4.99	5.32	5.32	2.86	5.06	5.53	5.96
Work-sample tests	5.33	5.45	5.53	3.06	5.17	5.39	4.90
Biographical information	5.00	4.76	4.82	2.93	4.78	4.98	4.64
Written ability tests	5.12	3.15	5.10	2.95	5.00	5.27	5.13
Personal references	4.68	4.18	4.32	3.39	4.20	4.70	4.80
Personality tests	5.06	4.60	4.91	3.35	4.58	4.82	4.37
Honesty tests	5.35	4.54	4.84	3.66	4.51	4.56	4.03
Personal contacts	2.95	2.85	2.93	4.22	3.29	3.89	4.15
Graphology	3.02	3.03	3.52	3.25	3.38	4.30	3.27

We also focused on the influences of demographic differences in process dimensions. Thus, mean comparisons were carried out to explore gender's influence on process dimensions of the different selection methods. According to the findings, female students ( $M=4.41$ ,  $SD=1.8$ ) tended to perceive face validity of personal references [ $t(238)=-1.97$ ,  $p<.05$ ] more positively than males ( $M=3.94$ ,  $SD=1.9$ ) while male students ( $M=4.77$ ,  $SD=1.7$ ) tended to perceive face validity of honesty tests [ $t(238)=1.98$ ,  $p<.05$ ] more positively than females ( $M=4.32$ ,  $SD=1.8$ ).

Lastly, in Table 5, the mean procedural dimensions ratings of means of six western countries'

respectively, The Netherlands, US, France, Spain, Portugal, and Greece -student sample presented. By comparing Table 5 with Table 4 (mean process dimensions ratings of Turkish sample), it can be seen that the strongest difference between Turkish sample and other countries' existed of employer's right and scientific evidence. Turkish sample tend to perceive employer's right of selection method less positively and tend to perceive scientific evidence of selection method more positively as comparing to the mean of six western countries. Also in case of widely used and interpersonal warmth, Turkish sample tend to perceive slightly more positively than the other countries. (See Table 5)



**Table 5:** Mean procedural dimensions ratings for other countries\*

Selection method	Scientific evidence	Face validity	Opportunity to perform	Employer's right	Respectful of privacy	Interpersonal warmth	Widely used
Interviews	3.82	5.54	5.41	5.83	4.73	4.84	5.19
Résumés/CVs	3.98	5.41	4.80	5.67	4.66	4.45	5.16
Work-sample tests	4.26	5.51	5.56	5.58	4.75	4.84	4.27
Biographical information	3.74	4.37	4.50	4.75	4.41	4.16	3.85
Written ability tests	4.83	4.67	4.76	4.88	4.43	4.06	4.00
Personal references	2.83	4.34	4.26	4.71	4.32	4.29	3.93
Personality tests	4.27	4.37	4.87	4.56	4.18	4.40	3.87
Honesty tests	3.39	3.52	3.82	3.96	3.83	4.00	3.16
Personal contacts	1.86	2.49	2.30	2.91	4.41	4.14	2.82
Graphology	3.18	2.60	2.75	2.96	4.11	3.78	2.21

\* The Netherlands, US, France, Spain, Portugal, and Greece (student sample) Adapted from Anderson and Witvliet (2008); Nikolaou and Judge (2007)

#### 4.4. Procedural Dimensions and Process Favourability

In this subtitle, the findings for relationship between process favorability and process dimensions were explained. Table 6 presents the correlation matrix between process favorability and process dimensions. According to the results of the analyses, weak but statistically significant correlations were found between process favorability and four of the seven dimensions. The strongest correlations were found between process favorability and scientific evidence, with correlations ranging from .21 to .41 (mean=.31, SD=.06). The other correlations that were found are between favorability and face validity (except for biodata), with correlations ranging from .13 to .47 (mean=.29, SD=.09), between favorability and opportunity to perform, with correlations ranging from .14 to .42 (mean=.27, SD=.07), and between favorability and respectful of privacy, with correlations ranging from .17 to .43 (mean=.26, SD=.08), respectively. (See Table 6)

## 5. DISCUSSION

It is widely agreed that selection of employees have pivotal importance to organizations. Therefore, considering subsequent reflection of applicants' fairness reactions to personnel selection methods have gained considerable interest. The researchers, Steiner and Gilliland, initially structured the fairness reactions to personnel selection in an

influential study in 1996, and it has been increasingly studied in the selection literature since then.

Despite the fact that there is a number of empirical studies on applicant reactions exist for some countries, there is not adequate empirical study on applicant reactions to personnel selection for justifying international generalizability of these reactions. Especially, Anderson and Witvliet (2008: 11) emphasized the necessity of studies in different countries with using large-scale sample to increase generalizability.

As an attempt to increase international generalizability of applicants reactions to personnel selection methods by adding one more country to the literature, the first aim of current study was to examine fairness perceptions of personnel selection methods in a Turkish sample. The second aim was to determine the effects of demographic factors on process favorability and procedural dimensions of selection methods. And the third aim was to explore similarities and discrepancies about fairness reactions to 10 selection methods between the Turkey and some of the other countries studied previously. These aims are discussed separately for process favorability and the procedural dimensions in the following subtitles.

**Table 6:** Correlations between process favorability and process dimensions

Selection method	Scientific evidence	Face validity	Opportunity to perform	Employer's right	Respectful of privacy	Interpersonal warmth	Widely used
Interviews	.21**	.25**	.21**	.04	.25**	.27**	.02
Résumés/CVs	.28**	.28**	.23**	-.09	.23**	.04	.25**
Work-sample tests	.33**	.22**	.26**	-.18**	.33**	-.01	.25**
Biographical information	.26**	.13	.22**	.01	.18**	.07	.06
Written ability tests	.28**	.21**	.14*	-.01	.17**	.10	.17*
Personal references	.28**	.31**	.28**	-.05	.17**	.06	.25**
Personality tests	.25**	.27**	.31**	.01	.28**	.21**	.32**
Honesty tests	.38**	.40**	.42**	-.04	.34**	.14*	.24**
Personal contacts	.34**	.34**	.30**	-.17	.29**	.15*	.10
Graphology	.41**	.47**	.29**	-.16*	.43**	.30**	.29**

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

### 5.1. Process favourability

The results of this study show that Turkish students perceive interviews followed by résumés, work-sample tests, honesty tests, and written ability tests highly favorable. These methods are followed by personality tests and biographical information which have slightly negative ratings. On the other hand, personal contacts, graphology, and personal references are the least favorable, respectively.

Concerning the favorability of personnel selection methods, although the Turkish students have similarities with the other studied countries', such as rating the interview, résumés, and work-sample tests higher and personal contacts and graphology lower, in contrast, Turkish students perceive honesty tests considerably more favorable than other countries' sample. Additionally, the Turkish students perceive interviews, résumés, biographical information, written ability tests, personality tests, and graphology more favorably than US and Netherlands (Anderson & Witvliet, 2008), Greece (Nikolaou & Judge, 2007), and Italian (Bertolino & Steiner, 2007) students. But, the degree of the differentiation of these methods was not as high as the honesty tests. This implies that, Turkish students tend to have more favorable perceptions of honesty tests than the other pertaining countries samples. Likewise, as Nikolaou and Judge (2007), in their study comparing the Greek students and employees, found that the strongest difference between students and employees existed for honesty tests, with implies that students demonstrating greater

acceptance to this method. Also, if we compare Turkey with US, Greece, Netherlands, and Italy in terms of student perception of fairness reaction of personnel selection methods, in all of the 10 methods totally, It can be concluded that the Turkey is more comparable with US, Greece, thirdly Netherlands, and Italy respectively. On the other hand, then referring to the Hofstede (1981)'s study, one of the most comprehensive cultural study ever made, it can be seen that this row should have been as Greece, Italy, Netherlands, and US, respectively, for the cultural closeness. It can be said that, for process favorability, Turkish sample has some discrepancies besides similarities with other countries. But at this point, the comparison of findings can not be explained with cultural factors, for process favorability. To explain the differentiations and the similarities with cultural issues, it is necessary to conduct more comprehensive studies on large-size samples in mentioned countries.

As far as the demographic factors concerned, the sample of current study has a bigger size than the samples of similar previous studies. Also this study's sample consists of equal number of male and female participants as well as equal number of participants from four different major types. Reasoning of, is to investigate the effects of demographic factors on fairness reactions is considered as an aim of our study. Hence, this study especially focused the demographic difference in process favorability and process dimensions as Anderson and Witvliet (2008: 11) suggested.

For process favorability, the impact of demographic factors were found limited. Exceptionally, it was found that female students tend to perceive personal references more positively than males and male students tend to perceive personal contacts more positively than females. These findings can be explained by ethical values of male and female students since, ethical values of senior female students were found higher than male students, in Turkey (Mert, 2003). Hence, it can be concluded that female students interpret personal references more ethical than personal contacts.

Also it was found that the students whose families' income are mid-level, tend to perceive personal references more positively than those whose family incomes are high. Generally, university students whose families have a mid-level income tend to have job more than the students whose families have a high-level income. Because of this, they have more chance to have a reference. Conclusively, these students tend to have more positive perception than the ones who have no any job experience before.

### **5.2. Procedural dimensions**

In the present study, like the previous similar studies, students rated each of the selection method by the seven subdimensions of procedural justice as can be seen in Table 4. According to the findings, interviews, résumés, and work-sample tests were generally rated higher than the other methods in five of the seven dimensions. Additionally, they rated slightly high for scientific evidence and considerably low for employer's right. Also, personal contacts and graphology methods were generally rated lower than the other ones. Comparing to pertaining countries, Turkish sample tend to perceive employer's right of selection method less positively and tend to perceive scientific evidence of selection method more positively as compared with the mean of six western countries as depicted in Table 4 and 5. Also in case of widely used and interpersonal warmth, Turkish sample tend to perceive slightly more positively.

By comparing procedural dimensions rating of Turkish sample with each of the six country it can be ranked in terms of closeness to Turkey as; Portugal, Greece, Spain, US, Netherlands, and France, respectively. By following the same procedure in process favorability and referring to the Hofstede (1981)'s study, the ranking of our study and Hofstede's cultural closeness doesn't match. More specifically, in the case that the interpersonal warmth related with individualism dimension of

Hofstede's study, ranking list of this study (US, Netherlands, and France, Portugal, Spain, and Greece) is just the opposite with Hofstede's study. Hence, it can be concluded that the unsimilar part of this study's findings with mentioned six countries for procedural dimensions can not be explained by cultural factors, at least related by Hofstede (1981)'s findings.

Concerning the demographic factors' effect on procedural dimensions, the effect of gender and family incomes were limited and far from being explanatory. On the other hand, the study found more meaningful relationship between procedural dimensions ratings and students major type. However the distinction among the four major types of students in this study is blurred, since these branches has approximately similar lane for the work-life and require almost same cognitive abilities compared with different major types such as medicine, art, sports etc. It is important to point out that despite the closeness in these major types, the differentiation occurs in terms of most of the procedural dimensions. Hence, it provides substantially meaningful support for the idea that fairness reactions to the selection methods are effected by the students' major types.

### **5.3. Relationship between process favourability and procedural dimensions**

The investigation of the relationship between process favorability and the procedural dimensions for each selection method was accepted as a sub-aim of the this study. As far as the procedural dimensions concerned, scientific evidence, perceived face validity, opportunity to perform, and respectful of privacy of selection procedures were the strongest correlates of favorable personnel selection methods, among Turkish students. These findings are almost identical to the findings of Bertolino and Steiner (2007) using Italian sample for face validity and opportunity to perform dimensions, and also identical with Nikolaou and Judge (2007) using the Greece student sample additionally for scientific evidence. However, in terms of scientific evidence and respectful of privacy dimensions, the findings of this study are not comparable with the findings of Bertolino and Steiner (2007). While scientific evidence in this study is at the top of correlation list, it is at the fifth row of the correlation list in Bertolino and Steiner (2007)'s study. Also for Italian sample, respectful of privacy is at the bottom row, but it was at the third row in Turkish sample. Moreover, contrary to Moscoso and Salgado (2004) but comparable to Nikolaou and Judge (2007), respectful of privacy correlates with process favorability.

To conclude, along with the similarities pertains to previously studied countries, the unclear influence of culture and precise effect of some demographic factors on applicants reactions to personnel selection methods is highlighted in Turkish sample by the present study. But still it is need to explore fairness reactions to selection methods in different countries that have different cultural tendencies and work-life features comparing to previously studied countries. Also conducting the studies in large-size samples that have the members from different field of major types will be usefull for precise determination of the effects of major types or any other demographic factors on applicants reactions to personnel selection methods.

### **Acknowledgements**

The authors express special thanks to those who have been instrumental in collecting data for this study, including Murat Atan, Adalet Eren and Özkan Karaaslan.

### **REFERENCES**

- 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, 121-136.
- Anderson, N. (2004). Editorial - The Dark Side of the Moon: Applicant Perspectives, Negative Psychological Effects (NPEs), and Candidate Decision Making in Selection. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12, 1-8.
- Anderson, N & Witvliet, C. (2008). Fairness reactions to personnel selection methods: an international comparison between The Netherlands, the United States, France, Spain, Portugal, and Singapore. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 1, 1-13.
- Anderson, N., Born, M & 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. 413-440.
- Aycan Z., Kanungo, R.N., and Sinha, J.B.P. (1999). Organizational Culture and Human Resource Management: The Model of Cultural Fit. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30, 501-526.
- Bauer, T.N., Truxillo, D.M., Sanchez, R.J., Craig, J.M., Ferrara, P & Campion, M.A. (2001). Applicant Reactions to Selection: Development of the selection procedural justice scale (SPJS). *Personnel Psychology*, 54, 387-419.
- Bertolino, M & Steiner, D. D. (2007). Fairness Reactions to Selection Methods: An Italian study. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 15, 197-205.
- Brislin, R., Lonner, W & Thorndike R. (1973). *Cross-Cultural Research Methods*. New York: John Wiley.
- Chapman, D.S., Uggerslev, K.L., Carroll, S.A., Piasentin, K.A & Jones, D.A. (2005). Applicant Attraction to Organizations and Job Choice: A Meta-Analytic Review of the Correlates of Recruiting Outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 928 - 944.
- Cohen, J. (1977). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. New York: Academic Press.
- Erez, M., (1994). Towards a Model of Cross-cultural I/O Psychology. In, H. C. Triandis, M. D. Dunnette, & L. M. Hough (Eds.) *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition), Vol. 4, (pp. 569-607). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

- Gilliland, S.W. (1993). The Perceived Fairness of Selection Systems: An organizational justice perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 694-734.
- Gürbüz, S & Bingöl, D. (2007). Çeşitli örgüt yöneticilerinin güç mesafesi, belirsizlikten kaçınma, eril-dişil ve bireyci-toplulukçu kültür boyutlarına yönelik eğilimleri üzerine görgül bir araştırma, *Savunma Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6, 68-87.
- Hausknecht, J.P., Day, D.V. & Thomas, S.C. (2004). Applicant Reactions to Selection Procedures: An updated model and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 57, 639-683.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work Related Values*. (Abridged Edition), Newbury Park: Sage Publications
- Hofstede, G. (1981). Do American theories apply abroad? A reply to Goodstein and Hunt. *Organizational Dynamics*, 63-8.
- Kabasakal, H & Bodur, M., (1998). Leadership, values and institutions: the case of Turkey, Paper presented at Western Academy of Management Conference, Boğaziçi, İstanbul.
- Klingner, Y & Schuler, H. (2004). Improving Participants' Evaluations while Maintaining Validity by a Work Sample: Intelligence test hybrid. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12, 120-134.
- Macan, T.H., Avedon, M.J, Paese, M & Smith, D.E. (1994). The effects of applicants' reactions to cognitive ability tests and an assessment center. *Personnel Psychology*, 47, 715 - 738.
- Marcus, B. (1999). Attitudes toward selection methods: A partial replication and extension in a German sample. Unpublished manuscript.
- Marcus, B. (2003). Attitudes toward Personnel Selection Methods: A partial replication and extension in a German sample. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 52, 515-532.
- Mert, İ.S. (2003). The relationship between thinking styles and ethical values: An application on university students, *Unpublished Doctoral Thesis*, Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Moscato, S & Salgado, J.F. (2004). Fairness Reactions to Personnel Selection Techniques in Spain and Portugal. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12, 187-196.
- Newell, S. and Tansley, C. (2001). International uses of selection methods. In, C.L. Cooper and I.T. Robertson (Eds.) *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 21, (pp. 195-213). Chichester Wiley: UK.
- Nikolaou, I & Judge, T.A. (2007). Fairness Reactions to Personnel Selection Techniques in Greece: The role of core self-evaluations. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 15, 206-219.
- Phillips, J.M & Gully, S.M. (2002). Fairness Reactions to Personnel Selection Techniques in Singapore and United States. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 13, 1186-1205.
- Ronen, S., (1986). *Comparative and Multinational Management*, John Wiley And Sons, New York.
- Ryan, A.M., McFarland, L., Baron, H & Page, R. (1999). An International Look at Selection Practices: Nation and culture as explanations for variability in practice. *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 359-391.
- Ryan, S.L & Ployhart, R.E. (2000). Applicants' Perceptions of Selection Procedures and Decisions: A critical review and agenda for the future. *Journal of Management*, 26, 565-606.
- Rynes, S.L. & Connerly, M.L. (1993). Applicants' Perceptions of Selection Procedures. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 7, 261-272.
- Steiner, D.D & Gilliland, S.W. (2001). Procedural Justice in Personnel Selection: International and cross-cultural perspective. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 124-137.
- Steiner, D. D. & Gilliland, S. W. (1996). Fairness Reactions to Personnel Selection Techniques in France and the United States. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(2), 134-141.
- Trompenaars, F & Hampden-Turner, C. (1998). *Riding the Waves of Culture*. Nicholas Brearley, London.