INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.
Fairness in recruitment: Applying a framework of organizational justice to recruitment perceptions

Eskew, Don Edward, Ph.D.
The Ohio State University, 1993
To My Parents and My Family
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I express sincere appreciation to Dr. Jerald Greenberg for his guidance throughout this research. Without his support this research could not have been completed. Special thanks go to my other committee members, Rob Heneman and Howard Klein, who provided valuable suggestions and comments. A special thanks goes to Dr. Marcia Miceli, who gave sound advice about the dissertation process and provided support throughout that process. Finally, I am indebted to Don H. Eskew, Donna Eskew, Matt Lane, and Chuck Hickman for their kindness and compassion.
VITA

December 16, 1959  ...............  Born - Enid, Oklahoma

1982  ...........................  B. S., Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

1987  ...........................  M. A., The University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas

1988-Present  .................  Graduate Associate, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

PUBLICATIONS


FIELDS OF STUDY

Labor and Human Resources
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**DEDICATION** ........................................... ii

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS** ...................................... iii

**VITA** .................................................. iv

**LIST OF TABLES** ....................................... vii

**LIST OF FIGURES** ...................................... viii

**INTRODUCTION** ......................................... 1

## CHAPTER

### I. INTRODUCTION ........................................ 1

- Background: Recruitment and Organizational Justice .......... 4
- Organizational Justice .......... 6
  - A Taxonomy of Justice Classes .... 7
  - Systemic Justice .......... 7
- Configural Justice .......... 15
- Informational Justice .......... 17
- Interpersonal Justice .......... 21
- Statement of Hypotheses .......... 23
- Systemic Justice .......... 23
- Configural Justice .......... 27
- Informational Justice .......... 28
- Interpersonal Justice .......... 32

### II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY ............................... 35

- Subjects ......................... 35
- Procedure ......................... 36
- Rejection of a Job Versus Being Rejected for a Job ................. 36
- Measures - Questionnaire ................ 37
  - Job Relatedness ..................... 37
  - Process Control ..................... 38
  - Explanation of Procedures ............. 39
  - Interpersonal Treatment During the Recruitment Process ........ 39
- Time Waiting for an Outcome .......... 40
- Procedural Fairness .......... 41
- Distributive Fairness .......... 41
III. RESULTS .......................................................... 49

Overview of Analysis ........................................... 49
Descriptive Data ................................................. 54
Tests of Hypotheses ............................................. 55
Hypothesis 1 ....................................................... 56
Hypothesis 2 ....................................................... 65
Hypothesis 3 ....................................................... 68
Hypothesis 4 ....................................................... 69
Hypothesis 5 ....................................................... 72
Hypothesis 6 ....................................................... 76
Summary ............................................................ 78
Fairness and Repeat Recruitment ......................... 79
The Overall Model ............................................... 83
Control Variables ............................................... 89
Common Method Variance ..................................... 97

IV. DISCUSSION .......................................................... 106

Support for Proposed Model .............................. 106
Being Rejected for a Job Versus Rejecting a Job Offer ... 108
Importance to Recruitment Research .................. 113
Importance to Organizational Justice Research ........ 120
Implications for Recruitment and Organizational Justice . 124
Recruitment ....................................................... 124
Organizational Justice ........................................ 126
Study Limitations ............................................... 127
Conclusion .......................................................... 129

LIST OF REFERENCES .................................................. 131

APPENDIX ........................................................... 138

Questionnaire ...................................................... 139
Interview Questions ............................................ 152
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected for a Job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected a Job Offer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Categorization of Open-Ended Questions,</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected From a Job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Categorization of Open-Ended Questions,</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected a Job Offer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interview Results, Rejected From a Job</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Interview Results, Rejected a Job Offer</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis,</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness and Repeat Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Direct and Indirect Effects, Rejected for a Job</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Direct and Indirect Effects, Rejected a Job Offer</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis,</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Who Were Rejected From a Job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis,</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Who Rejected a Job Offer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. T-Tests Between Groups and Test of Moderator</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Factor Analysis, Rejected for a Job</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Factor Analysis, Rejected a Job Offer</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURES</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A Taxonomy of Justice Classes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A Prediction Model for Organizational Justice and Recruitment</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Path Analysis Results, Rejected for a Job</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Path Analysis Results, Rejected a Job Offer</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

When seeking a job, a job applicant is influenced by a variety of factors during the recruitment process: recruiters from the organization, the interview and the recruiter's behavior during the interview, employment tests, on-site visits, and follow-up contacts after each phase of recruitment (Rynes, Bretz, & Gerhart, 1991; Rynes, Heneman, & Schwab, 1980). From the job applicants' perspective, being selected for a job is an evaluative, decision-making exercise where organizations evaluate applicants' qualifications, social skills, and overall fit to the job and where applicants evaluate organizations in terms of their employment and personal needs. The recruitment process is key in influencing the applicant evaluation of the organizational representatives they meet and the organization itself (Rynes et al., 1991).

As a decision-making exercise, the recruitment and selection literature has largely focused on issues important to the organization and how an organization evaluates and makes a final employment decision about the applicant (Harn & Thornton, 1985; Rynes, 1989). How
applicants view and react to this decision-making process is investigated less frequently. When applicant reactions are sought it is primarily from the context of the interview. Here, applicants are asked to evaluate job attributes (Rynes & Miller, 1983; Zedeck, 1977), their trust in the interviewer (Fisher, Ilgen, & Hoyer, 1979), perceived recruiter warmth or empathy (Alderfer & McCord, 1970; Rynes & Miller, 1983; Taylor & Bergman, 1987), overall recruiter personableness (Downs, 1969; Harris & Fink, 1987; Keenan, 1978), and recruiter age (Gordon, Rozelle, & Baxter, 1988; Rogers & Sincoff, 1978).

Recently, Rynes (1991) has called for researchers to provide more theoretical frameworks to the study of recruitment practices. What is definitely needed is a thorough examination of how applicants react to the process of recruitment. There is a large body of research and theoretical underpinnings concerning reactions to decision-making that is applicable to the recruitment process as seen by job applicants. Reactions to a decision-making process in the area of procedural justice has shown satisfaction with a decision and the perceived fairness of a decision depends not only on the outcome that was received, but also on how the decision was determined (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Greenberg, 1987; Lind & Tyler, 1988). How an individual who received a decisional outcome was personally treated during and after the decision-making
process has also been linked to perceptions concerning fairness of an outcome (Bies & Moag, 1986; Greenberg, 1991).

When applicants evaluate companies during their job search, the evaluation of the decision-making process may influence perceptions of the recruiters and/or the organizations. From an applicant's perspective, perceptions of how fair the procedures of the decision-making process are and how fairly they have been personally treated could have consequences for how the applicant views the company, the job, and the decision to accept or reject a job offer. Rynes, Heneman, and Schwab (1980) have voiced this same idea, stating: "...the nature of the particular evaluative procedures used to assess the applicant may also have important (albeit frequently unrecognized) consequences for the way the applicant views the organization" (p. 531, emphasis in original). Where these procedures will likely to become evident is through the recruitment of applicants.

If evaluative procedures are viewed negatively, or as unfair, applicants may view the decision-making process as unfair and may be less likely to consider the organization as a desirable place for employment. A problem for organizations may not only be in the way they are generally viewed by applicants (a good business reputation, for example), but in how their actions are connected to the
process of making a decision. Applicants could be lost because of unfavorable perceptions.

The purpose of this dissertation is to determine how applicants determine the fairness of the recruitment process. Specifically, it will be determined how a selection decision is evaluated in terms of fairness. This will be done through the concepts of organizational justice. Specifically, a new framework concerning organizational justice will be examined and integrated into the recruitment context.

Background: Recruitment and Organizational Justice

As addressed in the literature, recruitment activities encompass nearly any exercise, company representative, or action that may strengthen or weaken an applicant's resolve to accept employment in an organization. Recruitment research normally focuses on one or two aspects of recruitment, such as how applicants react to employment testing (Lumsden, 1967), how the subject matter of the interview affects applicants' reactions to recruitment (Taylor & Sniezek, 1984), how the interviewer affects applicants' perceptions of the job and the company (Rynes & Miller, 1983), and/or how applicants react to actions that occur after the interview, such as follow-up contacts with applicants (Arvey, Gordon, Massengill, & Mussio, 1975).

The recruitment literature has placed emphasis on the interview as the likeliest influence upon applicant
perceptions. While topics covered during the interview have been examined (Downs, 1969; Matarazzo, Wiens, Jackson, & Manaugh, 1970; Taylor & Sniezek, 1984), recruitment through the interview has focused on how the interviewer (or recruiter) has influenced applicants' perceptions about the job, the company, and the recruiter him/herself (Harn & Thornton, 1985; Harris & Fink, 1987; Liden & Parsons, 1986; Powell, 1984, 1991; Rogers & Sincoff, 1978; Rynes & Miller, 1983; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976; Taylor & Bergman, 1987; Young & Heneman, 1986).

This research has shown that applicant perceptions are influenced in varying degrees by recruiter characteristics and actions. However, it should be realized that the interview is one aspect of the recruitment process that an applicant may experience. This dissertation defines recruitment as all exercises, individuals, and actions presented by the company that might influence applicant perceptions, which would preclude the focus upon one recruitment event. As such, the interview is still an important part of recruitment, but other elements would be important as well. This is even more significant when considering that organizations use recruitment activities to gather information about applicants and use that information to make employment decisions. How that information is gathered and used through recruitment may be very salient to applicants and may in itself influence how
applicants view the organization. Organizational justice, which will place the elements of recruitment in the light of a decision-making process, can be used to explore possible recruitment effects on applicants.

Organizational Justice

Research in the area of organizational justice suggests that the decisions made, the procedures used in making those decisions, the explanation of how a decision is made, and the interpersonal treatment used by the decision-maker will have an effect on an individual's attitudes about the fairness of and satisfaction with a company sponsored activity (Bies & Moag, 1986; Bies & Shapiro, 1987; Folger & Greenberg, 1985; Greenberg & Folger, 1983). Work concerning organizational justice has basically focused on three concerns: distributive justice, procedural justice, and the social aspects of justice, termed "interactional" justice.

Recently, Greenberg (1992) has presented a "Taxonomy of Justice Classes" to examine and explain procedural, distributive, and the social aspects of justice (see Figure 1). This work, while presented as a way to better incorporate the social aspects of justice with other justice concepts, is an excellent presentation of organizational justice in general and provides a basis for the examination of all justice issues that could affect organizational decision-making. Because of this, the
investigation of possible justice effects on the recruitment process will be based on Greenberg's taxonomy. To tie this framework into the recruitment process, it is necessary to examine each of Greenberg's categories in depth.

A Taxonomy of Justice Classes

Greenberg (1992, pp. 6-7) has proposed that organizational justice can be placed in a two by two taxonomy, with the independent dimensions consisting of "categories of justice" and "focal determinants." Categories of justice are concerned with the fairness of how decisions are made concerning outcomes (procedural justice), or the fairness of the outcomes themselves (distributive justice). Focal determinants are concerned with the context in which the decision is made (structural determinants) and how outcome recipients are treated during and after the decision-making process (social determinants). These dimensions create cells which represent four focal representations of organizational justice: Systemic justice, configural justice, informational justice, and interpersonal justice (see Figure 1). Each of these cells will now be examined, with emphasis on organizational justice work and recruitment research that could be tied to each component.

Systemic Justice. Systemic justice is concerned with the procedures used to make a decision that is implemented
through organizational, or structural mechanisms. This categorization is the most well-researched area of Greenberg's taxonomy, and is generally referred to in the literature as "procedural justice." Procedural justice refers to "the perceived fairness of the procedures used in making decisions" (Folger & Greenberg, 1985, p. 143). A consistent finding in this line of research is that people who receive an outcome from a fair procedure consider that outcome as more fair than an outcome produced by an unfair procedure (Folger & Greenberg, 1985; Lind & Tyler, 1988).

A key contributor to determining how people evaluated procedural fairness was Leventhal (1976, 1980; Leventhal, Karuza, & Fry, 1980). Perceiving procedural justice as a neglected aspect of reward allocation, Leventhal (1976, 1980) conceptualized the notion that various procedural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Determinants</th>
<th>Procedural</th>
<th>Distributive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Systemic</td>
<td>Configural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

elements are used to form evaluations of fairness. Seven different procedural elements were identified: Selection of decision-making agents, setting ground rules, gathering information, decision structure, appeals, safeguards, and change mechanisms. Each represents a procedural aspect considered in evaluating the fairness of allocations.

Leventhal, Karuza, and Fry (1980) postulated that the information gathered for each one of the seven procedural elements (when available) is used to evaluate the fairness of the procedure itself. The fairness of the procedures may be evaluated according to six procedural rules: Allocation procedures should be consistent, there should be no bias in the allocation process, decisions should be accurate, there must exist opportunities to correct or modify decisions, the allocation process must represent the concerns of all recipients, and allocations must be based on moral and ethical standards.

Research has supported many of Leventhal's conceptualizations. The criterions of consistency (Barrett-Howard & Tyler, 1986; Greenberg, 1986) and accuracy of information (Greenberg, 1987) have been shown to be important determinants of procedural fairness. In a study looking at managerial fairness, Sheppard and Lewicki (1987) found support for six of Leventhal's principles of fairness. In addition, the authors found other broad concepts used in perceiving fairness, but concepts that are
specific to organizations: blaming or giving credit, work assignment, and managing within the organization.

These results demonstrate that individuals do evaluate elements of procedures to determine overall fairness in a decision-making process, and that procedural fairness is a definite concern to outcome recipients. Research concerning recruitment, however, provides few clues concerning applicants' perceptions and criterions of procedural fairness.

Fairness has been looked at in the interview, one component of recruitment. The selection literature has focused on the interview as being fair or unfair from the perspective of legal versus illegal hiring practices (Arvey, 1979; Campion & Arvey, 1989) and from the perspective of the organization, not the applicants it tries to attract (Campion & Arvey, 1989). Such research examines recruiter evidence of sex discrimination (Heilman, 1984), age discrimination (Cleveland, Festa, & Montgomery, 1988), and race discrimination (Mullins, 1982).

How applicants view the procedures used in making a job offer decision, or what elements of fairness are important to applicants, has not been discussed or tested in the recruitment and selection literature. There is some evidence, however, that applicants may evaluate their search process in terms of the elements of fairness previously discussed.
Concerning the interview, research has shown that applicants look disfavorably on recruiters asking for information that constitutes an invasion of privacy (Fusilier & Hoyer, 1980; Schein, 1977), a factor that could fit under Leventhal's notion of moral and ethical standards. Survey research (Downs, 1969; Hilgert & Eason, 1968; Thronson & Thomas, 1968) has indicated that applicants prefer interview content that stresses individual qualifications for the job. If applicants perceive their job related qualification information as necessary for an informed, accurate decision, this research would fit with Leventhal's elements of accuracy and bias.

Some forms of employment testing or screening may also be related to ideas from Leventhal. Applicants seem to prefer tests that are highly job relevant (Lumsden, 1967), which could fit under Leventhal's description of accuracy. Moral and ethical concerns may also fit with the way pre-employment tests are given, especially if the organization provides no explanation or reasoning for why or how the tests were used in determining applicant acceptability or how they fit with prediction of job success (Schmitt & Klimoski, 1991). An example of this line of reasoning is the debate on drug testing (Chadwick-Jones, Nicholson, & Brown, 1982; Murphy, Thornton, & Reynolds, 1990).

Although small, there is some evidence that applicants have perceptions that would coincide with Leventhal's
predictions. Recruitment research suggests that applicants prefer procedures that look for job related information that can be used to make an informed decision concerning job success. What is needed is an attempt to determine if applicants do evaluate the procedures used to make an employment decision and if these job related elements are important in making those evaluations. Related to this is a question of how much an applicant can influence the procedures used in the decision-making process. In the procedural justice literature, this question is addressed through the concepts of process control (Greenberg & Folger, 1983).

In looking at a dispute-resolution process where a third party makes a final decision, Thibaut and Walker (1975) proposed that recipients of a decision may have various degrees of two types of control: decision control, where any participant in a decision-making process may determine an outcome, and process control, which is control over the information to be used in making a decision. While Thibaut and Walker (1975, 1978) placed more emphasis on decision control (Tyler, 1989), subsequent research has shown that process control is often more important than decision control (Lind, Lissak, & Conlon, 1983; Tyler, 1989).

A key element in process control is the concept of "voice" and its effects on perceived procedural fairness
(Greenberg, 1990; Lind & Tyler, 1988). When an individual has voice in the decision-making process, that individual has the opportunity to express his/her opinion about the process. During an interview, for example, the applicant may provide examples of exemplary past behavior, point out strong qualifications, or simply flatter the recruiter, all in trying to impact the final decision (Gilmore & Ferris, 1989).

Experimental findings concerning voice are grounded in legal research. In a laboratory experiment that investigated judicial decision-making, subjects consistently revealed stronger preferences for the adversary system (a legal system like that used in the United State and the United Kingdom) than for the inquisitorial system (a legal system like that used in Continental Europe) of judicial process (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Other studies done in legal environments found that satisfaction with guilty or not guilty verdicts is greater among defendants who have some voice in their own defense (such as presentation of evidence) than among those who have no voice (LaTour, 1978; Lind, Kurtz, Musante, Walker, & Thibaut, 1980; Walker, LaTour, Lind, & Thibaut, 1974).

These same findings have been obtained in other contexts, as well. Tyler, Rasinski, and Spodick (1985) demonstrated that procedures giving people a voice in a resource allocation process were seen as more fair and led
to more positive ratings of the allocation decision-makers than were procedures in which voice could not be applied. In a military performance appraisal study, Lissak (1983) found that soldiers who were given the opportunity to contribute input into their evaluations responded to the performance evaluation procedure more positively than those who had little input. In general, when someone has voice into the decision-making process, that person perceives the procedure that leads to a decision as more fair than someone who does not have that voice, regardless of the final outcome of that decision (for a review, see Greenberg & Folger, 1983).

What is clear about voice is it does impact perceptions of procedural fairness in a variety of settings. During their contact with an organization applicants will have several opportunities for voice. In probably no other setting would voice be as important as in the interview process. As mentioned, the interview is a two-way interaction process where input from the applicant is a necessary occurrence. Because the interview is a place where applicants can directly impress and influence recruiters through what they say, it is surprising that the recruitment literature has not focused more on applicants' perceived process control recruitment information. Ideas and research on this issue that can be related to the
procedural justice concepts of voice and process control are sparse.

**Configural Justice.** Configural justice is concerned with the outcomes a decision recipient receives through organizational, or structural, means. This is generally termed "distributive justice" in the literature. Distributive justice is concerned with the outcomes of distributive decisions (Homans, 1961). The emphasis is on how organizational resources are allocated among personnel and on employees' reactions to those allocations. In a job search context, distributive justice concerns would be with how applicants react to receiving a positive outcome (receiving a job offer) or a negative outcome (rejection for the job) from organizational decision-makers.

In the context of the study of organizational justice as a whole, distributive justice is usually looked at in connection with procedural justice concerns. For example, Greenberg (1987) found that the fairness of procedures is particularly important when outcomes are low. Individuals receiving highly positive outcomes may not have a particular concern over the procedures used to give those outcomes.

Research in organizational justice has also tried to separate procedural fairness from distributive fairness. In an organizational study concerned with establishing determinants of perceived fairness of performance
evaluations, Greenberg (1986) found that managers were not only concerned with their performance ratings and raises or promotions based on those ratings (distributive factors), but also with providing input to the process, the ability to challenge a rating, the rater's knowledge of a subordinate's work, and consistency in applying performance standards (procedural factors). Folger and Konovsky (1989) argued that higher order issues such as trust in and commitment to a supervisor will exacerbate needs for procedural fairness, regardless of distributive concerns. Folger and Bies (1989) stated that procedural fairness in organizations is a managerial responsibility akin to allocating fair outcomes. The thrust of the work in organizational justice is with establishing the idea that while distributive fairness is important to individuals, recognition of the determinants in making decisions is just as important.

In the recruitment literature, little is known about how applicants react to the primary outcome of receiving or not receiving a job offer. This is primarily due to the organizational point of view this research is based on, and, when applicants' perceptions are examined, the emphasis is on the discovery of reactions to organizational representatives active in the process.

How applicants react to this outcome may be important for several reasons. Research in the systemic category of
organizational justice has highlighted the importance of fair procedures when negative outcomes are given (Greenberg, 1990; Lind & Tyler, 1988). When a negative outcome is given, that outcome is seen as more acceptable when fair procedures are used rather than unfair procedures. Also, the personal and psychological nature of being turned down for a job may call into question how that decision was made, to try to shift failure from an internal to an external explanation for the outcome. A last reason why reactions to an outcome may be important is based on the communication the applicant may make with other individuals. Applicants may talk with other applicants (Rynes et al., 1991), expressing their positive or negative reactions. If experiences attached to the outcome are negative, this could be strong enough to deter other applicants from considering a particular organization. Reactions to a particular outcome of recruitment would be useful to discover.

**Informational Justice.** Informational justice is "...using procedures that demonstrate regard for people's concerns" (Greenberg, 1992, p. 8). This is a social aspect of justice with the emphasis on giving adequate and believable information about how decisions were made, or procedural concerns. Informational justice is also concerned with how people are treated, but treatment is
framed in terms of the courtesy and respect the decision-maker shows by informing the decision recipient of how the decision is made.

There is research which demonstrates this definition of informational justice. Bies and Shapiro (1987, 1988) found that reasonable justifications given for decisional outcomes led to higher perceptions of fairness than when no such justifications were given. Bies and Moag (1986) found that reasonable justifications for recruitment decisions, along with the presentation of honest information concerning the decision enhanced perceptions of fairness. Greenberg (1991) found that employees rated performance appraisal fairness higher when written descriptions of how appraisal were made were included in the appraisal over when such descriptions were not included.

Another determinant of informational justice that might be important, but is not specified by Greenberg, is showing courtesy in the way information is gathered to enact those procedures. According to Greenberg (1992), informational justice is concerned with the social aspects of procedural factors. One element Leventhal (1976, 1980) considered particularly important in terms of procedures was the gathering of information. Also, Leventhal, Karuza, and Fry (1980) believed that accuracy of decisions and allocations based on moral and ethical standards were rules used to evaluate procedural elements. How an individual is
treated through these procedural components may play a part in determining fairness perceptions.

During the interview, for example, applicants will focus on making a good impression and enhancing their chances for a favorable outcome. One of the main ways they will be able to evaluate their performance is through interviewers' actions. In essence, treatment by interviewers' will become one of the major means in which applicants estimate how they are being judged.

Organizational justice research can help to support this contention. Individuals expect to receive the truth during any communication (Bies & Moag, 1986), and they expect a decision-maker to properly enact the rules needed to arrive at a satisfactory decision (Lind & Lissak, 1985). In part, these are evaluated by how decision recipients are treated. From an organizational point of view, employees evaluate fairness from the courtesy and respect they receive from decision-makers (Folger & Bies, 1989). From this courtesy and civility shown by the decision-maker, decision recipients make judgments concerning fairness of the entire process (Folger & Bies, 1989). For example, Bies (1986) found that job applicants treated discourteously during an interview (sexist comments made, questions of marital status) had significantly lower evaluations of the recruitment process than applicants who were treated courteously.
In the recruitment literature, there is ample evidence that the way an applicant is interpersonally treated, while search process is occurring (not after an outcome is given), affects that applicant's views of the recruiter, job, and organization. At the initial college campus interview stage, Taylor and Bergman (1987) found that applicants who perceived greater empathy from their recruiters reported higher company attractiveness and a greater probability of job offer acceptance. Harris and Fink (1987) looked at the personableness and aggressiveness of interviewers; applicants with a personable interviewer had higher regard for the company, a higher expectancy of a job offer, and a greater intention of accepting a job offer than applicants who met with an aggressive interviewer. More aggressive interviewers were associated with lower job attractiveness. In Rynes and Miller's (1983) first study, perceptions of interviewers were more favorable and perceptions of the company were more favorable when a recruiter was friendly rather than unfriendly. Powell (1991) showed that if an applicant had positive feelings towards the interviewer they were likely to have a high expectation of receiving a job offer and a high likelihood of accepting a job offer from that company.

It is reasonable to conclude that how information concerning the enactment of procedures is communicated and the way information is gathered is important to perceptions
of the recruitment process. But what is also necessary for the completion of this organizational justice framework is an inspection of how a decision recipient is treated after an outcome is given.

**Interpersonal Justice.** Interpersonal justice is "...showing concern for individuals regarding the distributive outcomes they receive" (Greenberg, 1992, p. 8). The emphasis here is on distributive justice, with social determinants of fairness being an overall showing of concern over the outcome.

Interpersonal justice can be seen through past research, as well. Bies (1986) found that job applicants saw being rejected for a job as more fair when the company showed concern over its decision. Showing concern over outcomes has also been found to affect citizens' perceptions of police and legal courts in Chicago (Tyler, 1988). In this classification, there is evidence that how a person is treated after a decision is made will affect their perceptions of fairness.

The most applicable example of interpersonal justice in the recruitment process is through the examination of how (or if) the recruiter or organization uses follow-up contacts after initial interviews or job-site visits (Rynes et al., 1980). Follow-ups are an expression of the evaluation of certain recruitment events and are used to inform applicants about their relative performance during
the recruitment process. Research has shown that the longer an applicant has to wait to hear from a company about second interviews or additional testing, the less likely the applicant is to actually come to the interview or testing (Arvey, Gordon, Massengill, & Mussio, 1975). Rynes et al. (1991) found that applicants, especially males with a high grade point average and a relatively successful job search, reacted very negatively to delays in feedback from the organization. Bies (1986) showed that applicants judged recruiting behaviors as more fair when they received quick feedback about job chances. This was the case regardless of whether the candidate got a job or not. Applicants also view long delays as signals of rejection for the job (Arvey et al., 1975; Lumsden, 1967; Rynes et al., 1991).

These cases demonstrate that being treated well after a decision is made is important to applicants. Individuals not treated well by the organization usually have a lower estimation of the recruiter, the job, and the company. Evaluations of interpersonal treatment may be affecting how the applicant views the organization's recruitment process and their chances for success. After reviewing the literature on recruiter characteristics, Rynes (1986) states: "Apparently, unfriendly or disinterested recruiter behavior is interpreted as a signal that a job offer is not likely to be forthcoming" (p. 20). If an applicant feels
that this is unfair, perceptions of unfairness may affect their evaluations of the recruitment process.

**Statement of Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses are concerned with the antecedents of justice in the recruitment context. From the literature review, and built into the following hypotheses, are questions concerning fairness in the recruitment process. Also, hypotheses are presented in terms of the different configurations of Greenberg's (1992) taxonomy.

**Systemic Justice**

Research concerning the structural characteristics of procedural justice has identified individuals' ideas about fairness in performance appraisal contexts (Greenberg, 1986), in day-to-day managerial operations (Sheppard & Lewicki, 1987), and in compensation systems (Folger & Konovsky, 1989). However, little information exists regarding this type of fairness in the context of recruitment activities.

As mentioned previously, Leventhal (1980; Leventhal, Karuza, & Fry, 1980) postulated that there were several procedural elements that decision-recipients would evaluate to determine procedural fairness. For example, two determinants found to be particularly important in procedural fairness are neutrality of the decision-maker
and consistency of the decision-maker (Folger & Bies, 1989; Greenberg, 1986, 1987; Tyler & Bies, 1990). What is needed are circumstances that occur during recruitment that could influence applicants' perceptions of procedural fairness.

Applicants do have impressions about what should occur during the recruitment process (Rynes et al., 1980), which could lead to an assumption of bias, inconsistency, or other signals of unfairness in the way decisions are made. Most importantly, applicants seem to prefer interviews that focus on relevant characteristics of the job, such as qualifications and job characteristics (Downs, 1969; Matarazzo, Wiens, Jackson, & Mamaugh, 1970; Taylor & Sniezek, 1984; Thronson & Thomas, 1968). If the job and its qualifications are not discussed, or questions arise that are not applicable to the job, inconsistencies and bias may be perceived.

This issue of job relatedness relates to the concepts of bias, inconsistency, moral and ethical concerns, and expectations of what should occur during the recruitment process. During the recruitment process applicants may be asked many types of questions that are deemed non-job related, such as whether they are married or not, what they do in their personal lives, or other issues that may be seen as information that is not relevant to the job in question, or an invasion of privacy (Ganster, 1979). Evidence suggests that, even today, recruiters ask
applicants questions that are irrelevant to the position advertised (Rynes et al., 1991).

Research has shown that applicants are concerned about the acquisition of non-job related information (Rosenbaum, 1973). Applicants in particular look disfavorably on recruiters asking for information that constitutes an invasion of privacy (Fusilier & Hoyer, 1980; Schein, 1977). Bies (1986) found that interviewers who asked applicants non-job related questions about marital status or who made irrelevant racist comments were seen as more unfair than interviewers who made no such comments. Applications that ask for non-job related information and pre-employment testing may also be considered unethical in some cases (Schmitt & Klimoski, 1991). Any asked for information that is extremely personal in nature or irrelevant for the job may be seen as unethical.

**Hypothesis 1:** The more applicants believe that the recruitment process used job related information to make a final selection decision, the more those applicants will believe that the recruitment process was procedurally fair.

Another aspect of systemic justice concerns voice in the decision-making process. As mentioned earlier, voice is a very important part of perceiving procedural justice (Greenberg & Folger, 1983) and is considered a way to present information to a decision-maker before a final decision is made (Tyler, 1989). At first glance, this would not seem to be a problem in such recruitment phases
as the interview or job-site visits: These are two-way interactions where input from the applicant is not only expected but required. But, voice is usually the only mechanism applicants have to guide their perceptions of the selection process, especially during an interview. Furthermore, there may be different perceptions made by applicants about voice allowed during the recruitment process, which in turn could affect perceptions of justice.

If the job or the qualifications necessary for the job are not discussed to the applicant's satisfaction, applicants may believe they did not receive adequate voice. As mentioned, applicants prefer interviews where the job and its qualifications are discussed (Downs, 1969; Matarrazo et al., 1970; Taylor & Sniezek, 1984; Thronson & Thomas, 1968). Applicants also seem to resent interviews where the discussion is domineered by the interviewer (Downs, 1969; Glueck, 1973; Lumsden, 1967). If the interviewer dominates discussion the opportunity for voice may not exist. Lack of voice could lead to low evaluations of fairness. This was shown by Bies and Shapiro (1988).

In a lab study by these authors, graduate business students were either given voice during an interview or no voice, or, more specifically, a chance to influence the decision-maker's final allocation. Perceptions of fairness were significantly higher when subjects were given voice. Finally, applicants may evaluate recruitment unfavorably if
recruiters persist in speaking of things that are not relevant to the applicant or to the interview (Powell, 1991). This may be seen as an opportunity where important input could be used, but wasted by the interviewer.

In any case, the applicant must view the opportunity for voice as having some type of way to present information to the decision-maker before a final decision is made. If applicants believe that they had the opportunity to use voice in a manner that could increase their chances for success they will more than likely view the recruitment process and the outcome from that process as fair.

**Hypothesis 2**: The more applicants believe that they had the opportunity to influence the final job decision through voice in the recruitment process, the more they will perceive the organization's recruitment process as procedurally fair.

**Configural Justice**

Configural justice is concerned with distributive justice, or the outcomes a decision recipient receives through structural means. Nothing is known from a recruitment perspective about how applicants react to the job offer decision made about them. It is, of course, logical to conclude that applicants who receive a job offer will be satisfied with that outcome and applicants that are rejected will be dissatisfied. However, from the research in organizational justice, a negative outcome is seen as more acceptable when fair procedures are used rather than
unfair procedures (Greenberg, 1987; Greenberg, 1990; Lind & Tyler, 1988).

The recruitment process provides a way to examine how applicants react to a fair process that provides a negative outcome. While job characteristics, geographic location, and salary will influence applicant perceptions about the job (Rynes & Miller, Study 2, 1983; Taylor & Bergman, 1987) and influence choice to some degree, perceptions of fairness may also be of importance. This may especially be the case if organizational attributes are related to the fairness of the recruitment process.

Because of the lack of information concerning outcomes in recruitment, and because the findings of configural justice have not been found in the recruitment context, the following replicative hypothesis is made:

**Hypothesis 3:** For applicants who are rejected for a job, the more applicants believe that the recruitment process was procedurally fair, the more those applicants will believe that this negative outcome of the recruitment process was fair.

**Informational Justice**

As suggested earlier, applicants will have certain ideas about interview content, behavior, and personal conduct (Liden & Parsons, 1989; Matarazzo et al., 1970; Tullar, 1989). However, it is not known how detailed recruiters are about explaining how applicants will be evaluated for a final decision.
According to Greenberg (1992), one of the most important ways to enhance informational justice is through the use of social accounts. Social accounts are the provision of information concerning how a decision is to be made (Bies, 1987). Social accounts in recruitment would consist of organizational representatives explaining to the applicant what information will be used to make a decision, how the decision process works, and how the final decision will be determined.

There is some research to demonstrate how much recruiters explain the decision process to applicants. Keenan and Wedderburn (1980) and Taylor and Sniezek (1984) examined topical content in the interview and found that college campus applicants reported extracurricular activities, organizational and job attributes, and academic aspects of university life as frequent interview topics. How the applicant was to be evaluated was not mentioned. Also, it is not known how information is given concerning evaluation of tests, on-site visits, or any other recruitment activity. Bies and Moag (1986) did find that MBA job applicants considered job decisions as more fair when truthful information concerning the decision was given. Hanigan (1987) has suggested that an interviewer who places a high priority on recruitment will give more candid information concerning the company's interview decision processes.
There is also research that presents the providing of information as important to perceptions of fairness in other contexts. In a two lab studies concerning an interview and budget allocation, Bies and Shapiro (1988) found that providing an explanation for a decision that provided a negative outcome led to higher perceptions of fairness than when no explanation was given. Performance appraisals have been perceived to be more fair when written explanations were given on an appraisal than when such written explanations were not given (Greenberg, 1991).

It is possible to hypothesize from these findings that giving adequate information concerning how a decision will be made will affect perceptions of fairness. If reasonable and adequate explanations are given the applicant may view the process in a more favorable light than when no such explanations are given.

Hypothesis 4: The more applicants believe that they were given explanations concerning how an interview decision will be made, the more they will perceive the recruitment process as procedurally fair.

In addition to the type of information given concerning how decisions are to be made, I have made the contention that how the applicant is personally treated while information is collected may influence perceptions of fairness. Not only may the adequacy of information be evaluated, as Greenberg (1992) suggests, but how that
information is collected may give applicants an idea about fairness.

The recruitment literature provides some support for this. Taylor and Bergman (1987) reported that at the initial interview stage of recruitment, applicants who felt they received a high level of empathy from the interviewer positively predicted attraction to the company. Harris and Fink (1987) found that applicants with a personable recruiter had a higher expectancy of a job offer and a higher regard for the job than applicants who met with an aggressive recruiter. Rynes and Miller (1983, Study 1) found that when job attributes were not talked about, applicants with a friendly recruiter had more positive attitudes about how the company treats its employees and would be more willing to accept a second interview than applicants with an unfriendly recruiter. In a study concerning seasonal workers, Liden and Parsons (1984) found that applicants with a personable recruiter would be more likely to recommend a friend to the job and that personable recruiters positively influenced applicants' attitudes towards the company. Powell (1991) showed that if applicants had positive feelings towards the interviewer they were likely to have a high ratings of the advertised job. In all cases, how applicants were treated during the interview communicated enough about the company to look favorably upon the organization or that organization's job.
With this in mind, interpersonal treatment should be related to the procedural factors inherent in this categorization of informational justice.

**Hypothesis 5:** The more applicants believe that they were treated well interpersonally during the recruitment process, the more they will perceive the recruitment process as procedurally fair.

**Interpersonal Justice**

Interpersonal justice is expressed by showing concern for the decision recipient's outcome. Receiving information concerning an outcome in the context of recruitment would come in the form of learning whether the applicant has received a job offer.

A survey of major corporations found that the majority of negative job outcome decisions arrives by way of letter (Rynes & Boudreau, 1986). Writings in practitioner publications indicates that these communications are uniform in nature with a perfunctory acknowledgment of interest and dismissal (Aamodt & Peggans, 1988). Research shows that this may alter perceptions of fairness. Tyler (1988) found that Chicago citizens had higher perceptions of fairness of police and courts when they were shown courtesy and civility regarding negative outcomes. Bies (1986) reported that applicants to jobs who received negative outcomes felt the process was more fair when company representatives showed an interest in the applicants' feelings. For a negative outcome, at least,
how one is treated after the decision is made is likely to influence perceptions of fairness.

There is good indication that applicants will view treatment after receiving a negative outcome as important. Crucial for perceptions of fairness is timely feedback (Folger & Bies, 1989) and follow-ups. Applicants view long delays as signals of rejection for the job (Arvey et al., 1975; Lumsden, 1967). Rynes et al. (1991) found that applicants, especially males with a high grade point average and a relatively successful job search, reacted very negatively to delays in feedback from the organization. Bies (1986) showed that applicants judged recruiting behaviors as more fair when they received quick feedback about job chances. This is especially important in the context of configural justice, where a negative distributive outcome may heighten awareness of fairness issues.

**Hypothesis 6:** For those applicants who were rejected from a job, the longer an applicant has to wait for an interview decision, the more unfair the applicant will view that negative outcome received from the recruitment process.

What has been created through these hypotheses is a model to test organizational justice. This model is presented in Figure 2. If the predictions made here are correct, the paths in Figure 2 should be significant, while paths between categories of variables not shown should be
nonsignificant. It was decided to test this model through the use of path analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Predictor Variables for Procedural Fairness</th>
<th>Main Predictor Variables for Distributive Fairness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Relatedness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of Procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Treatment During Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Fairness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Waiting For an Outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: A Prediction Model for Organizational Justice and Recruitment
CHAPTER II
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Subjects

This study used college placement centers as the primary source of applicant information. All subjects in this study were job applicants at a large midwestern university. Placement centers were run by colleges within the university. From the four largest placement centers on campus the investigator acquired a listing of all seniors who were going through the recruitment process that year at the university. Participants were contacted through mail and asked to complete a survey dealing with the recruitment process they have just finished. A total of 914 surveys were mailed. Participants were represented by four academic departments, or colleges: Business, liberal arts and sciences, engineering, and agriculture. A breakdown of the number of surveys sent to each category was as follows: 550 (60%) were sent to business majors; 53 (6%) were sent to liberal arts and sciences majors; 49 (5%) were sent to agriculture majors; and 262 (29%) were sent to engineering majors.
Procedure

The seniors were contacted through mail and asked to participate through an introductory statement. Subjects were assured that their names would not be used in the final results in any way. They were also told some information concerning the study, they were assured that they did not have to participate, and were given the opportunity to receive the results of the experiment with complete explanations of the goals and findings of the study. After reading the introduction, participants were be asked to fill out a questionnaire (see Appendix). Included with the survey was a stamped envelope using first-class mail (Armstrong & Lusk, 1987) addressed to the investigator. They were asked to mail the survey to the investigator after completion.

Rejection of a Job Versus Being Rejected for a Job

All participants were asked to think of a job that they were rejected from and a job that they had rejected for employment. The same questions were asked for both cases. It was reasoned that these two cases would provide contrasting opinions concerning recruitment practices used by companies. Since job applicants may turn down company offers because of ways in which they were treated during recruitment (Rynes, 1991; Rynes et al., 1980), looking at rejection of offers provides a good test of whether organizational justice factors play a part in that
rejection. Conversely, reactions from being rejected from a job can provide insight into the way these applicants were treated, and if procedures used to make a decision influenced perceived fairness of a negative outcome. This separation would also provide the opportunity to further examine perceptions of fairness after a negative outcome, something that has been studied quite extensively in other contexts (Greenberg, 1986; Lind & Tyler, 1988). Finally, this separation would provide the opportunity to examine fairness perceptions when positive outcomes are received. Little is known about what fairness reactions are when a positive outcome is given and how they compare to the more well-know fairness evaluations of negative outcomes. Participants were not asked about the recruitment practices for any job they might have accepted because of a tendency to re-emphasize the wiseness of their job choice (Soelberg, 1967; Vroom, 1966).

Measures-Questionnaire

All questions of primary interest (explained below) on the questionnaire but two were on a Likert-type scale, with ranges from 1 (indicating disagreement with a statement) to 7 (indicating agreement with the statement).

Job Relatedness

Three questions were designed for this dissertation concerning job relatedness. Questions dealing with job relatedness best reflect the aspects of consistency,
accuracy, ethicality, and other ideas of Leventhal's (Leventhal, Karuza, & Fry, 1980) procedural justice elements and rules. These questions were: "Organizational representatives asked me about issues that I could not connect to the job"; "Organizational representative asked me questions that were personal or that made me uncomfortable"; and "Organizational representatives focused on finding information that directly related to how well I would do on the job." The first two questions were reversed scored.

**Process Control**

Questions here were designed to measure voice in the recruitment process. Questions were based on Tyler's (1989) operationalization of process control in terms of how much subjects had the chance to present their problems or "side of the story" to decision-makers: "During the selection process with this company, I had the opportunity to speak with company representatives concerning why I might be right for the job"; and "During the interview I had with this company, the interviewer gave me ample opportunity to provide information about myself that could have influenced the company's job offer decision."

Coefficient alpha for these two questions for Tyler (1989) was .72. To make this construct stronger, another question asked whether participants had the opportunity to provide input that they thought was important to influencing the
interview process: "During the recruitment process with this company, I had the opportunity to persuade member(s) of the organization by fully presenting my position about my qualifications for the job."

**Explanation of Procedures**

Questions concerning explanation of procedures were consistent with Greenberg's taxonomy conceptualization and tested whether the giving of explanations concerning how a decision is made effected perceptions of fairness. Two questions adapted from Konovsky and Cropanzano (1991) were used: "During the recruitment process, company representatives provided a reasonable explanation for how a final interview decision would be made"; and "During the recruitment process, the company gave adequate reasons for how a job offer decision was to be made." Konovsky and Cropanzano (1991) found an internal consistency estimate of .91 for similar questions. These questions were adapted from this source because this study was looking more at a continuous process that led to outcomes, not where outcomes were based on a one-time process.

**Interpersonal Treatment During the Recruitment Process**

Questions were concerned with interpersonal justice in the sense that they reflected recruiter behavior during the recruitment process. Given the amount of research which shows that interpersonal behavior affects perceptions of justice (Bies, 1986; Bies & Moag, 1986) and applicant
perceptions (Harris & Fink, 1987; Powell, 1991; Rynes & Miller, 1983; Taylor & Bergman, 1987), it was reasonable to examine whether interpersonal treatment during the interview affected overall perceptions of fairness. Questions were designed for this dissertation, and were based primarily on Folger and Bies' (1989) conceptualization of interpersonal treatment and justice perceptions, and Harris and Fink (1987), Powell (1991), Rynes and Miller (1983), and Taylor and Bergman (1987) findings: "Organizational representatives were courteous to me during the recruitment process"; "Organizational representatives were friendly to me during the recruitment process"; "Organizational representatives were considerate of my feelings during the recruitment process."

**Time Waiting for an Outcome**

Two questions tested time waiting for an outcome and the subsequent effects on outcome fairness. One question concerned delays in feedback from the recruitment process. This is based on Rynes et al. (1980) notion that follow-ups play a large role in whether recruitment will be seen as positive or negative, and on Rynes et al. (1991) findings in support of this. One question was based on Rynes' et al. (1991): "After my last contact with this company, this company was late in getting back to me concerning the news that I was rejected/accepted for this job"; and another was designed for this dissertation: "How long did you have to
wait to here from this company after the final recruitment phase?" to be answered in number of weeks (1 week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks, 5 weeks, 6 weeks, or 7+ weeks).

Procedural Fairness

Procedural justice questions were based on Tyler (1989) and Konovsky and Cropanzano (1991) questions concerning procedural fairness: "The recruitment process at this company was fair"; and "This company uses fair procedures to conduct their recruitment process." The internal consistency measure for items similar to this in both the Konovsky and Cropanzano (1991) study and Tyler (1989) study was .90. These questions were adapted from these sources because these studies were looking more at continuous processes that led to outcomes, not where outcomes were based on a one-time process. This was more consistent with the purpose of this dissertation.

Distributive Fairness

Several questions asked about the fairness of the outcome. As with procedural fairness questions, questions were based on Tyler's (1989) and Konovsky and Cropanzano's (1991) questions concerning outcome fairness: "In my situation, the outcome (receiving a job offer) of this recruitment process was fair"; and "Applicants get the outcome (receiving a job offer or not) they deserve as a result of this recruitment process." Coefficient alphas for similar questions in the Tyler (1989) study was .88,
and .70 for the Konovsky and Cropanzano study. Once again, these questions were adapted from these sources because these studies were looking more at continuous processes that led to outcomes.

**Rejection/Rejecting a Job**

By the nature of the questionnaire they respond to, applicants indicated whether they have rejected a job or are have been rejected from a job. In addition, one question of interest was asked that could be compared on a rejected from a job/ rejected job offer basis. This question was: "If this company were to contact me again about possible employment, I would go through the recruitment process with them again." This question was for exploratory purposes. It was thought that, regardless of being rejected or rejecting a job offer, the more fair procedures and distributions were evaluated the more willing applicants would be to repeat recruitment with the same company at some future date. However, it was also thought that those who were turned down for employment would be less likely to seek employment again from the same company than those who turned down the offer of a job.

**Control Variables**

In addition, several questions were answered that measured control variables. These questions were represented by inquiries about salary, geographic location, work experience, and number of interviews. These were used
as controls for several reasons. Salary and geographic location may be important factors in the selection of a job, overshadowing any other aspect of the job or recruitment that might influence decisions. For example, perceptions of fairness may be particularly sensitive in the case of high salary offers, or in cases where living in a particular geographic location are of prime importance to the job candidate.

Work experience and interview experience has been shown by Rynes et al. (1991) as possible factors which could lessen the effects of recruitment factors. For example, having a great deal of interviews may make applicants more aware of discrepancies in interview performance, and of the different styles of interviewers. This, in turn, may make applicants more aware of unfair activities that occur. Rynes and Miller (1983) have suggested, and Rynes et al. (1991) have provided some support, that job candidates with more work experience may look differently at the mechanisms of the recruitment process, focusing more on job-related factors and being less influenced by interviewer or other recruitment actions. All of these variables must be controlled to get a truer idea of the variance explained by fairness perceptions alone.
Open-Ended Question

One open-ended question was placed on the questionnaire. This question asked about the recruitment process in general and was used to gather any information that might be missed by the Likert-type scales. It was also used to determine, through a slightly different method, if the results obtained through these scales were consistent with more thoughtful remarks. As with Bies and Shapiro (1987), and more recently, Rynes et al. (1991), the use of open ended questions could provide the study with results that can validate or add to the specific, numerical scales. In addition, one way to search for common method variance is to use different methods of collecting data on the same questionnaire (Schmitt & Klimoski, 1991).

In this study, one open-ended question was asked for both being rejected for a job and for the rejection of a job offer. In both instances, the question asked "In general, how did you feel about the recruitment process (use of resumes, interviews, on-site visits, tests, etc.) used by this company? Did they do anything that angered you? That pleased you? Be as specific as you can."

The principal investigator and three graduate students (blind to the study's intent, but trained in a coding process) content analyzed the written statements. Specifically, each sentence that was written was coded into one of five categories: Job relatedness, voice, explanation
of procedures, interpersonal treatment, and time waiting for an outcome. If a sentence could not be determined to fit into a category it was identified by a question mark. A subject was said to have mentioned a certain category only if there was complete agreement between the four coders on a particular statement. In addition, the investigator and 3 undergraduate students going through the current recruitment process at the university categorized each sentence as a positive or a negative remark about that category. These undergraduates were selected because they were familiar with the process of recruitment and had experienced similar feelings as subjects in the study. If there was disagreement on whether a statement was positive or negative, the statement was discussed until agreement was made.

For each subject who made a comment that was coded and categorized, a check of that subject's questionnaire responses for the same category was made. This was to determine if the written comments provided by subjects were reflective of their questionnaire item responses. If subjects gave positive remarks on the open-ended question, then they should have shown more favorable questionnaire item responses for that category than subjects who gave negative remarks. In addition, for each subject who made a comment that was coded and categorized, a check of that subject's questionnaire responses for procedural and
distributive fairness was made. Subjects who gave positive remarks on the open-ended question should have had more favorable procedural and distributive fairness questionnaire ratings than subjects who made negative remarks.

Subject Interviews

In addition to the surveys, interviews were conducted with different subjects were completed. Before the survey was sent to potential subjects, a random subsample of 50 applicants was selected from the total sample provided by the placement centers on campus. This subsample of 50 applicants was not sent the survey questionnaire. Instead, they were called by phone and asked to participate in a study concerning recruitment. The only incentive offered was the promise of results of the study. The use of self-report measures through surveys heightens the possibility of common method variance (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). To combat this possibility, this subsample of job applicants was interviewed by the investigator concerning recruitment practices they have experienced. Using interviews in correspondence with surveys is one way to eventually explore the possibility of common method variance (Schmitt & Klimoski, 1991), and using interviews to discover recruitment reactions has been done effectively (Rynes et al., 1991). These subjects were asked the same basic questions that are on the survey questionnaire (see
Appendix, "Interview Questions"). The same precautions of anonymity were assured.

Subjects were interviewed at their convenience on campus. Subjects were asked if their conversation with the investigator could be tape recorded. Of the 24 interviewees, 4 did not want to be tape recorded. The interviews that were recorded were transcribed. One graduate student (blind to the intent of the study) conducted the taped interviews. For the 4 individuals who were not tape recorded, both the graduate student blind to the study and the principle investigator took detailed notes of the interview, with the graduate student conducting the interview. Immediately after these interviews, notes were compared and written. Total agreement of statements had to be made to be included in the description of comments. All subjects were asked to think of a job that they wanted, went through the recruitment process for the attainment of that job, but were turned down. They were then asked 8 questions concerning their experiences. In addition, subjects were asked to think of a job that they wanted, that they went through the recruitment process for the attainment of that job, were offered the job, but they as applicants had turned down. If they had had that experience, they were once again asked 8 questions concerning their experience.
The questions asked in the interview were designed to reflect the questions asked on the survey instrument. Each subject was asked about the job-relatedness of questions the company asked during recruitment, the opportunity for voice, the explanation of procedures, interpersonal treatment, time spent waiting for an outcome, evaluations of procedural fairness, and evaluations of distributive fairness (see Tables 11, 12 and the Appendix for the questions asked during the interviews). Each subject was first asked a yes or no question, which was followed by inquiries that required more thought and detail. For both being rejected for a job and rejecting a job offer, the same 8 questions were asked.

The primary purpose of the interviews was to obtain recruitment and fairness information from a different data gathering technique to compare with the results of the survey questionnaire. A subsidiary purpose of the interviews was to discover richer information concerning the topics of this study. It was hoped that the interviews would provide information that would support the results from the survey, and that would give more detailed information that could not be provided by the questionnaire.
CHAPTER III
RESULTS

Overview of Analyses

For this dissertation, three methods were used to collect data: Survey questions, an open-ended question contained on the survey, and interviews with job applicants. The Likert-type scaled questions on the questionnaire were the primary source of data to test the hypotheses. The open-ended question and the interviews were used to support the questionnaire ratings and to explore the possibility that common method variance may have influenced the questionnaire item results.

Path analysis was used to discover whether the predicted model in Figure 2 fit the data collected. Several assumptions must be met to be assured that path analysis is providing reliable measurement. To test these assumptions, reliability of measures, intercorrelations between variables, and correlations among variable residuals must be examined (Billings & Wroten, 1978; Heise, 1969). There must be acceptable reliability, reasonably low intercorrelations between the variables of interests,
and relatively low correlations between residuals to have faith in the results.

Tables 1 and 2 show the alpha coefficients for the primary variables in this study. For both rejection for a job and rejecting a job offer, these coefficients were reasonably high (alphas ranged from .64 to .93). In addition, correlations ranged from -.17 to .69 (median r = .22), which revealed no evidence of extreme multicollinearity (i.e., r's > .80; Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990). Finally, Durbin-Watson d-statistics for each dependent variable in the model were computed to test for correlations between residuals. For Durbin-Watson statistics, the closer the statistic is to 2.00, the more there is evidence that correlations between residuals are not correlated (Dillon & Goldstein, 1984). For this sample, calculation of the Durbin-Watson statistics indicated that correlations between residuals was not a problem (x = 2.06, range = 1.86 to 2.20).

To test whether the paths predicted in the model were significant, procedures recommended by Pedhauzer (1982) were used. For the model, each antecedent variable was regressed on the variable that followed it in the model through ordinary least square regression. For this model, job relatedness, voice, interpersonal treatment, and explanation of procedures, and time waiting for an outcome was first regressed on procedural fairness. Then job
relatedness, voice, interpersonal treatment, explanation of procedures, time waiting for an outcome, and procedural fairness was regressed on distributive fairness. This was done to acquire path coefficients for both the predicted and the nonpredicted paths in this model. A goodness of fit measure (the Q statistic, Pedhauzer, 1982) was estimated for each model studied. This statistic estimates how well the model specified actually fits the data acquired.
Table 1
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations
Rejected For a Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of Interviews</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work Experience</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Geographic Location</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Salary Importance</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job Relatedness</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>(.68)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Voice Treatment</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Explanation Fairness</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Personal Fairness</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Time Waiting Fairness</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Procedural Fairness</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Distributive Fairness</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>(.76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .001  
(Numbers in parentheses are coefficient alphas.)

N = 244

Note: For all variables except time waiting, the higher the mean score, the more favorable the response. For time waiting, the higher the mean score, the more unfavorable the response.
Table 2
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations
Rejected a Job Offer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work Experience</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Geographic Location</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Salary Importance</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job Relatedness</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Voice</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Explanation</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.29**(.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Personal</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.55**(.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Time Waiting</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.20**(.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Procedural</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.59**(.47**(.69**(.29**(.93))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Distributive</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.43**(.57**(.30**(.68**(.76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01
** p < .001
(Numbers in parentheses are coefficient alphas.)
N = 110
Note: For all variables except time waiting, the higher the mean score, the more favorable the response. For time waiting, the higher the mean score, the more unfavorable the response.
Standardized beta coefficients were used to represent path coefficients. Cohen and Cohen (1983) suggest two situations in which standardized coefficients are appropriate to use. One situation is where comparison between the magnitude of effects from different causes is desired. The other situation fits the circumstances of this dissertation: When scales are arbitrary and unfamiliar. Because scales in this study were Likert-type rating scales and because a one point change in the variables of interest may not be readily interpretable, standardized coefficients were used.

Descriptive data

Of the 914 applicants identified by the placement centers on campus, 244 (26%) sent back survey results. Although the overall response rate was low, the return rate by academic major was consistent with the percentages of mailed surveys to each major. As stated previously, the potential total sample of 914 respondents was made up of 60% business majors, 29% engineering majors, 6% liberal arts and sciences majors, and 5% agriculture majors. The response rate by major reflected these percentages. Of the 244 subjects who responded, 56% (n=137) were business majors, 29% (n=70) were engineering majors, 9% (n=22) were in the college of liberal arts and sciences, and 6% (n=15) were from agriculture. The percentage breakdown by major for those who responded reflects the breakdown of all
individuals that were sent questionnaires. The mean number of interviews these applicants had completed was 2.89. Of the 244 subjects that sent back questionnaires, all 244 had been rejected for a job during their job search. Of the 244 applicants, 110 had rejected an offer of employment.

Of the 50 people contacted for interviews, 24 (48%) agreed to participate. Of the 24, 10 were female and 14 were male. The average age of these participants was 23 years. As with the mailed survey, these subjects represented the colleges of business (n=11, 46%), agriculture (n=4, 17%), engineering (n=5, 21%), and liberal arts and sciences (n=4, 17%). The percentage breakdown of these majors are reflective of the corresponding percentages of the total sample.

Tests of Hypotheses

The main tests of the hypotheses were performed through correlations and the path analysis. Table 1 reports the means, standard deviations, and correlations for data pertaining to being rejected for a job. Figure 3 reports the results of the path analysis for being rejected for a job data. Table 2 and Figure 4 provides results for those who rejected a job offer. Information from the open-ended question and the interviews are also presented to offer support/non-support to each hypothesis.
Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 predicted that the more applicants believe that job related information was gathered during the recruitment process, the more applicants will believe that the recruitment process was procedurally fair. This was supported. Job relatedness was positively correlated to procedural fairness ($r = .26, p < .001$), and the standardized regression coefficient for job relatedness and procedural fairness was negative (beta = .09, $p < .05$). This same support was found for turning down a job offer. For this data, both the correlation ($r = .40, p < .001$) and the regression coefficient (beta = .26, $p < .001$) were positive and significant. When applicants believe that job related information is gathered during the recruitment process, the more procedurally fair they view the process.

Tables 3 and 4 provide evidence that subjects responded the same way on the open-ended question as they did on the questionnaire scales. For job relatedness, those who gave positive remarks on the open-ended question had more favorable questionnaire item responses than those who gave negative remarks.
Figure 3. Path Analysis Results, Rejected for a Job.

* p < .05
** p < .01
***p < .001

Note: Numbers represent standardized regression coefficients.

Note: Solid lines indicate the paths predicted. Dotted lines indicate paths not predicted.
Figure 4. Path Analysis Results, Rejected a Job Offer.

* p < .01
** p < .001

Note: Numbers represent standardized regression coefficients.

Note: Solid lines indicate the paths predicted. Dotted lines indicate paths not predicted.
### Table 3
Categorization of Open-ended Questions Rejected From A Job (N = 138)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of People That Mentioned Category</th>
<th>Number of Positive Remarks</th>
<th>Number of Negative Remarks</th>
<th>Questionnaire Mean for Those Who Made Positive/Negative Remarks Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Relatedness</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Treatment</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of Procedures</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Waiting For An Outcome</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Fairness Questionnaire Mean</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Fairness Questionnaire Mean</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Number of People</td>
<td>Number of Positive/ Negative Remarks</td>
<td>Questionnaire Mean</td>
<td>Number of People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Relatedness</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Treatment</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of Procedures</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Waiting For An Outcome</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Fairness Questionnaire Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Fairness Questionnaire Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview data concerning job relatedness provided mixed support for results gathered from the survey scale items and the survey open-ended questions (see Tables 5 and 6). As predicted, the majority of applicants who stated that they received no non-job related questions also said recruitment procedures and the recruitment outcome were fair. When subjects believed that they received only job related questions, they provided little comment.

For those applicants who said they were asked only job related questions during the recruitment process, there was no majority of subjects that evaluated procedures and outcome as either fair or unfair. To fit the survey data, the majority of participants would have evaluated the procedures and outcome as fair. Because of this, it was necessary to closely examine the comments made by those who believed the recruitment procedures and outcome were fair, and compare them to those who evaluated the recruitment procedures and outcome as unfair.

For those who rated the procedures and outcome as fair, job related questions were connected in some way to the organization, or seemed to be accepted as a matter of routine. The following four examples express this view:

They ask questions that were non-job related, but they were indirect. More so a question of, it was a listing of hobbies, of things that I like to do. But I think the way it was presented was more so a scenario of something that went on politically in the organization. And it was more so to see how I would respond. I think that's somewhat typical because they're looking for, sometimes, personal traits.
The only one I thought was funny was he (the interviewer) asked me what kind of dog I would be. It made me feel like he was looking to see if I was aggressive. What kind of dog would I come up with, like would I say I was a pit bull? He asked me if I was married. I just thought it was routine. He asked me if I drank. This job was for grading food, and I thought, well, they're like, hey, you know, if your drunk or on drugs, or whatever, this stuff can get adulterated and you can kill a bunch of people.

She (the interviewer) asked me to describe myself in three words or less. I thought that was odd, but, I just assumed she asked everybody that.

Yeah, he (the interviewer) asked me about interests, like outside interests. It didn't bother me.

In contrast, non-job related questions for those who rated the procedures and outcome as unfair took on a more personal tone:

(From a female applicant.) When I came to the first interview, it was with the head person in the company. Instead of asking any questions about myself, he ask me how I could convince his fifteen year old son to get the kind of grades I was getting in college. I felt he was being sexist. It was like, "Honey, how can I make my son do better?", you know. So I was pretty offended.

Did I have any knowledge of stealing? Did I know of any stealing on the jobs I had had? Friends or whatever. Would I turn a friend in? It made me feel like they were playing me like I might be dishonest or something. How are union people compared to "regular" people? Unions were terrible to them.

They asked certain things about my personal feelings about alcohol and cigarettes, and things like that in the environment of the business. It made me feel a little bit uncomfortable because I smoke. I felt like I wasn't living up to their expectations, I had one strike against me already.

Near the end of recruitment, I was asked whether or not the company came before my family or personal life. And I thought my family and personal life came before the company. I was told on no uncertain terms the company came before personal life.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Unfair</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Unfair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you receive a personal interview?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe that you had the opportunity to influence the recruitment decision that was made about you?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did an organizational representative explain to you how a final recruitment decision would be made?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did this organization treat you well personally during this process?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was this company late in getting back to you after the last phase of recruitment?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, would you say that the procedures used to make a selection decision about you were fair?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you believe that the outcome you received from this recruitment process was fair?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6
**Interview Results**
**Rejected A Job Offer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Number Who Answered</th>
<th>Number Who Said Procedures Were Fair</th>
<th>Number Who Said Procedures Were Unfair</th>
<th>Number Who Said Outcome Was Fair</th>
<th>Number Who Said Outcome Was Unfair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the recruitment process with this company, did an organizational representative ask you any questions that you felt were non-job related?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think you had the opportunity to influence the recruitment decision that was made about you?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did an organizational representative explain to you how a final recruitment decision would be made?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did this organization treat you well personally during this process?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was this company late in getting back to you after the last phase of recruitment?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, would you say that the procedures used to make a selection decision about you were fair?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe that the outcome you received from this recruitment process was fair?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the interview data, it appears that it is not whether non-job related questions are asked during recruitment that is important, but what type of non-job related questions that are asked. Questions that are very personal, that may show some bias, or that blatantly ask for beliefs that may be contrary to organizational values could be looked at with skepticism. In contrast, questions that applicants believe are common, or questions that could communicate work effort may be more acceptable.

Hypothesis 2

Strong support was found for Hypothesis 2. For both cases of being rejected for a job and rejecting a job offer, the more voice one believed they had in influencing a job decision, the more procedurally fair they judged the process. For applicants who described being rejected for a job, the correlation between voice and procedural fairness was .62 (p < .001), and the regression coefficient was .32 (p < .001). For rejecting a job offer, the correlation (r = .59, p < .001) and regression coefficient (beta = .28, p < .001) were again positive and significant.

As with job-relatedness, examination of the open-ended question from Tables 3 and 4 support these questionnaire results. For voice, those who gave positive remarks on the open-ended question had more favorable questionnaire item responses than those who gave negative remarks. For those who were rejected from a job, 6 out of 32 participants made
positive remarks, while 26 made negative remarks. The mean questionnaire response for voice for those who made positive remarks was 4.33, while the mean response for voice for those who made negative remarks was 3.61. For those who rejected a job offer the results were similar. For this data, 2 out of 7 participants made positive remarks, while 5 made negative remarks. The mean questionnaire response for voice for those who made positive remarks was 6.34, while the mean response for voice for those who made negative remarks was 4.33.

Analysis of the answers to interview questions revealed that voice was very important to all subjects. Applicants desired to have an influence on the recruitment process, and were dissatisfied when they did not get this influence. Tables 5 and 6 show that the majority of applicants who received voice evaluated the procedures and the outcome of the recruitment process as fair. In contrast, the majority of applicants who did not receive voice judged the procedures and outcome as unfair. For those who believed they did not have voice, there were feelings that the recruiter had "premade" up his/her mind concerning that person, or in terms of what type of person they were seeking. The following are examples of this reasoning, made by three subjects who were rejected for a job and said the recruitment procedures and recruitment outcome (being rejected for a job) were unfair:
I don't think I influenced them at all. It was a very short interview, something like ten to twenty minutes. So, I felt I didn't have any time to speak, and I felt she (the interviewer) had premade her decision. I would just liked to have more time for more interpersonal reaction.

On the second interview, he (the interviewer) asked me generally just a few questions. It was like five minutes, the whole thing was over. When I walked out, it was right after that, I could just tell, I could see it in his face, the man made his decision. He just said, thank you for your time, blah, blah, blah, goodbye. But he wouldn't let me express my background and all that. So, I didn't feel like I had an opportunity to influence this man's decision.

I think they had in their mind a predetermined profile of what they wanted. And it was if you met a certain amount of qualifications, you showed a certain acumen during the interview, and if you looked the part, based on that, if you met all of those three criteria, you were smart enough.

In general, those who did believe they had an opportunity to influence the decision made about them were satisfied with the process and the outcome they received. From examination of the answers provided by subjects, having influence meant explaining something about themselves and responding to many questions put forth by the company representative:

I believe I did have influence, so much as they gave me a lot of time to explain my strong points and weak points and things like that and what I could do.

They gave me the opportunity to show myself. That gave me confidence. He (the interviewer) gave me the opportunity to talk about anything.

Yes, I had influence. It was a personalized interview. He took time with me. I wasn't waiting with fifty or sixty other people. I actually got to go in and really talk to him (the interviewer), to tell him about myself.
I was able to demonstrate my skills, on computers and things like that that I knew. I was able to talk about my past work and things like that. Then they (company representatives from two different interviews) asked me questions pertaining to the sort of thing they do in the office and I was able to answer that. So, it was pretty much, he let me explain everything in detail.

One major difference appeared between those who were rejected for a job and those who rejected a job offer. For those who rejected a job offer, no applicant stated that he/she did not have an opportunity to influence the decision made about them. This is logical, since receiving a job offer would likely be connected to some influence on the part of the successful applicant. In terms of voice and the recruitment process, then, evaluations of influence and subsequent judgments of fairness may only be critical when an applicant fails to receive a job offer.

**Hypothesis 3**

Hypothesis 3 was a replication of previous organizational justice research. It has been shown that individuals who rate procedures as fair will also rate the outcomes from those procedures as fair, even if the outcome is negative. These results provide support for this finding. For those people who were rejected for a job, the correlation between procedural fairness and distribute fairness was positive ($r = .63, p < .001$). Path analysis revealed this same result ($beta = .48, p < .001$). If procedures were considered fair, then the outcome was
considered fair, even if that outcome was not in the applicants' favor.

Interview results concerning procedural and distributive fairness support the predictions of this study. When applicants believed the recruitment procedures were fair, they also believed the outcome they received from the recruitment process was fair. For being rejected for a job, there was perfect agreement (see Table 5). Of the twenty-four applicants that provided data concerning being rejected for a job, fourteen stated that the procedures and the outcome of recruitment were fair, while ten stated that the procedures and outcome were unfair. For rejecting a job offer, there was a slight difference (see Table 6). Of the ten subjects that provided data, eight believed the procedures were fair, but nine believed the recruitment outcome was fair.

**Hypothesis 4**

It was hypothesized that the more applicants were given explanations concerning how a recruitment decision was made, the more they would believe that the recruitment process was procedurally fair. This hypothesis was supported for both the data pertaining to being rejected from a job ($r = .41, p < .001; \beta = .14, p < .01$) and for rejecting a job offer ($r = .47, p < .001; \beta = .17, p < .05$). The more people believed that they were given explanations for how a final
decision was to be made, the more they believed that the procedures were fair.

Examination of the open-ended question from Tables 3 and 4 again support these questionnaire results. For explanation of procedures, those who gave positive remarks on the open-ended question had more favorable questionnaire item responses than those who gave negative remarks. For those who were rejected from a job, 4 out of 20 participants made positive remarks, while 16 made negative remarks. The explanation of procedures mean questionnaire response for those who made positive remarks was 4.13, while the mean response for voice for those who made negative remarks was 2.78. For those who rejected a job offer the results were similar. For this data, 3 out of 8 participants made positive remarks, while 5 made negative remarks. The mean questionnaire response for explanations for those who made positive remarks was 5.50, while the mean response for explanations for those who made negative remarks was 4.00.

From interview data, the majority of applicants who believed they received an explanation on how a final recruitment decision was to be made about them stated that the procedures and outcome of recruitment were fair (see Tables 5 and 6). For these applicants, explanations were seen to convey rudimentary elements of the recruitment
process. Subjects indicated that an explanation of how a
decision was to be made was brief and not detailed:

It (the explanation) was very brief. They said that
they would review my interview, they would give it to
someone higher up and things like that, and would
review it in two weeks.

The lady that was interviewing me told me that she
would make the first decision, or narrow it down to
two or three, then, it would then go to a committee.
And they would make the final decision.

I had to take tests and things like that. They told
me they would send my scores back to their home
office. They would go over all of the interviews and
everything, and then get back to me.

They basically told me what the standards (of
selection) were, that they had to take to a board,
that it was up to the board then, and that's how they
were going to handle the situation.

These explanations seem basic and uncomplicated.

However, they contain a large amount of detail when
compared to applicants' comments when company
representatives gave no explanations for how a decision was
to be made. In particular, an organizational
representative telling an applicant that they will contact
the applicant was not enough to be termed an explanation:

He (the interviewer) never said, we'll let you know by
this or this date. I had three interviews, and he
just said he'd give me a call sometime.

All they said was that they would let me know if I got
an offer or not.

The only thing they really said was that they had
other applications in.

They just said that the end of it, you'll be hearing
from us in two weeks, whether you get it (the job
offer) or not.
They pretty much said that they would get back to me. That was about it. That they would be in touch with me. It was very vague. It wasn't to the point or anything like that.

As with voice, there was a difference between judgments of fairness between being rejected for a job and rejecting a job offer. When rejected for a job, the majority of those who said they received no explanation evaluated procedures and outcome as unfair, although by a small margin (eight applicants to six). When rejecting a job offer, the majority of applicants who received no explanation evaluated procedures and outcome as fair (three applicants to one). Receiving a job offer may overshadow evaluations of how much explanation was given. The importance of the explanations of how a decision is to be made may matter more when one does not receive a job offer from a company.

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 focused on interpersonal treatment. This hypothesis received very strong support. For those who were rejected from a job, the correlation between interpersonal treatment and procedural fairness was positive and significant ($r = .69$, $p < .001$). The path between these two variables was also positive (beta = .42, $p < .001$). When an offer was rejected, both the correlation ($r = .69$, $p < .001$) and regression coefficient (beta = .41, $p < .001$) showed a strong association. Clearly, interpersonal treatment is important to judgments
of procedural fairness. When applicants were treated well, they viewed procedures as fair.

For interpersonal treatment, those who gave positive remarks on the open-ended question had more favorable questionnaire item responses than those who gave negative remarks (see Tables 3 and 4). For those who were rejected from a job, 14 out of 45 participants made positive remarks, while 31 made negative remarks. The mean questionnaire response for interpersonal treatment for those who made positive remarks was 5.88, while the mean response for interpersonal treatment for those who made negative remarks was 4.26. For those who rejected a job offer the results were similar. For this data, 10 out of 25 participants made positive remarks, while 15 made negative remarks. The mean questionnaire response for interpersonal treatment for those who made positive remarks was 5.70, while the mean response for interpersonal treatment for those who made negative remarks was 4.13.

The interview results for interpersonal treatment provided a strong trend. In concordance with the survey questions and the open-ended question on the survey, applicants are sensitive to how they are treated during the recruitment process. The majority of applicants who said they were treated well interpersonally evaluated the procedures and outcome of recruitment as fair. In contrast, the majority of applicants who were not treated
well rated procedures and outcome as unfair. For those who were treated well, only short descriptions of that treatment were given. Comments from the following five subjects who rated the procedures and the outcome of recruitment as fair were typical:

It was all very fine. No missteps, you know, where I felt I was uncomfortable. They were friendly, you know.

Fine, they were very nice to me.

She (the interviewer) was very nice. Comfortable, easy to talk to.

They treated me very well. Friendly, nice, courteous. No problems.

They were very nice. She (the interviewer) made sure I had a good time on the visit, nice lunch, nice this, nice that.

Statements by subjects who stated they were not treated well interpersonally show a marked contrast (these subjects evaluated procedures and outcome as unfair):

I was just another applicant. They really didn't care one way or another. I felt that way through all three interviews.

It was a very bad experience. The guy (the interviewer) seemed disinterested, rude. I mean, the interview was very slam, bam. It was very poorly done.

Well, this one particular representative did not treat me well. It was just a very perfunctory type of thing. She was not a very friendly sort of person, she sat me down and just read (interview questions). I did not feel like I was very participative. I was just there for her.

I thought the way they handled the interview was rude. He'd look up and stuff and look down, like he was trying to come up with something to say. And he was eating one of those Little Debbie peanut butter bars
while he was talking. I was dressed up in a suit, trying to look nice, and trying to present myself nice, and he was just sitting there on the desk eating, like, what the hell? I'll just talk to you the way I want to talk to you and that's it.

Clearly, applicants are very aware of how they have been treated during the recruitment process. Interpersonal treatment may be a very important factor in the determination of fairness for not only those who are rejected for a job, but for those who evaluate whether they will work for the company that has extended an offer. One interview in particular showed that poor interpersonal treatment could be detrimental to an organization's recruitment success. This interview was with an applicant who turned down a job offer. He was the only subject who received an offer, but evaluated the procedures and outcome of the recruitment process as unfair. When asked about the recruitment process used by the company that recruited him, he stated:

It was very poor. If they want anybody else, they should have a better process in how they talk to someone. Respect is what it's all about. If people don't respect you, you're not going anywhere. And they showed me no respect whatsoever.

When asked if he thought the recruitment outcome he received (receiving a job offer) was fair, he responded:

Unfair. The questions were unfair, their attitude was unfair. The people could have cared less who I was. I turned down the job because I will not work for somebody who has no respect for their people.
Hypothesis 6

Finally, Hypothesis 6 addressed time waiting for an outcome. For those who were rejected for a job, it was hypothesized that the longer an applicant had to wait to hear if they were rejected, the more unfair they would consider the outcome. This was partially supported. The correlation between time waiting and distributive fairness was negative and significant ($r = -0.19, p < .001$).

However, path analysis revealed no significant association ($\beta = -0.09, \text{ NS}$).

An examination of the nonpredicted paths reveals that time waiting for an outcome may be associated more with procedural fairness than with distributive fairness. For data pertaining to being rejected for a job, the correlation between time waiting for an outcome and procedural fairness was significant ($r = -0.17, p < .01$), as was the path coefficient ($\beta = -0.10, p < .05$). This was the same for data pertaining to rejecting a job offer ($r = 0.69, p < .001; \beta = -0.18, p < .01$). This suggests that applicants in this sample associated the time it took to receive a response as reflective of the process of recruitment, not on the ultimate outcome obtained from that process.

For time waiting for an outcome, the pattern of results was the same as with the other variables of interest. Those who gave positive remarks on the open-
ended question had more favorable questionnaire item responses than those who gave negative remarks. For those who were rejected from a job, 3 out of 21 participants made positive remarks, while 18 made negative remarks. The mean questionnaire response for time waiting for an outcome for those who made positive remarks was 5.50, while the mean response for time waiting for an outcome for those who made negative remarks was 2.28. For those who rejected a job offer the results were similar. For this data, 2 out of 5 participants made positive remarks, while 3 made negative remarks. The mean questionnaire response for time waiting for an outcome for those who made positive remarks was 6.00, while the mean response for voice for those who made negative remarks was 2.33.

In the interviews, the majority of applicants who stated they did not have to wait a long period of time for an outcome evaluated the procedures and outcome of recruitment as fair. Few, if any, comments were made for these subjects who believed the company contacted them quickly after the last phase of recruitment. The majority of applicants who believed they had to wait too long for the company to respond judged the procedures and outcome to be unfair. When companies were late in responding, subjects expressed anger and discontent. The following comments were made by applicants who believed the company took too long in communicating a final decision:
They let me know later than they said. They said they
would have a final decision in seven weeks, but it was
later than that. That really made me mad, because you
were under constant pressure to know, and then when it
got so late and they hinted so often that you didn't
have to worry about it, you just assumed that there
was nothing to worry about. But what if you didn't
get it? That left you with no time to go back and
make any changes.

They were very late. Almost six weeks. At the
particular time, I had hedged a lot of hopes on it. I
felt very disappointed and very cheated. I had taken
another job, a low paying job, which was to be
absolutely temporary until school was out. Virtually
overnight I had to find out that I wasn't so lucky.

I found out I didn't get the job through someone else,
not from the company. That made me angry. I thought
that was pretty bad. I didn't even get a letter, I
had to call to verify what someone told me.

I think they wanted to increase their applicant pool.
And, in doing so, when they arrived at a decision,
they didn't respond. You know, I didn't receive a
letter or a phone call, I had to call them to follow-
up on what was actually happening. And then, that's
when they sent me a letter, after my phone call. It
was inexcusable.

As with other recruitment research (Rynes et al.,
1992), waiting for a recruitment decision angers
applicants. The applicants in this study reacted
negatively to waiting long periods of time to hear from the
company. In terms of fairness, individuals were more
likely to evaluate procedures and the outcome they received
as fair when organizations contacted them quickly rather
than late.

Summary

Taken together, the results from the questionnaire
items, the open-ended question on the questionnaire, and
the interviews provided support for all but one of the hypotheses. Job relatedness, voice, explanation of procedures, and interpersonal treatment are important predictors of procedural fairness. As has been shown in previous research, procedural fairness in the context of recruitment is strongly and positively related to subsequent evaluations of distributive fairness. Contrary to what was predicted, time waiting for an outcome is not predictive of distributive fairness. Instead, it appears that time waiting for an outcome may be related to perceptions of procedural fairness.

Fairness and Repeat Recruitment

In addition to the hypotheses tested, one question concerning repeat recruitment was included in the questionnaire: "If this company were to contact me again about possible employment, I would go through the recruitment process with them again." This question was asked to determine if perceptions of fairness were associated with an indicator of recruitment satisfaction.

Results indicated that both procedural and distributive fairness significantly predicted evaluations of repeat recruitment. For those who were rejected for a job, procedural fairness was positively and significantly correlated with repeat recruitment \( (r = .48, p < .001) \). Distributive fairness and repeat recruitment were also positively correlated \( (r = .37, p < .001) \). Similar results
were obtained for those who rejected a job offer. For this group, procedural fairness was positively and significantly correlated with repeat recruitment ($r = .49$, $p < .001$). Distributive fairness and repeat recruitment were again positively correlated ($r = .44$, $p < .001$).

To further test this relationship a set of hierarchical regressions were run with repeat recruitment used as the dependent variable. Since many things can influence an applicant's estimation of applying to the same company in the future, five control variables were entered into the equation first. These were: The number of interviews applicants had been through during the recruitment process, the number of job offers the applicant had received before recruitment with this company, the amount of work experience the applicant possessed, the importance of geographic location to the applicant, and the applicant's perceived importance of the salary offered. These variables have all been suggested in previous research as important in recruitment research. Because procedural fairness was seen by this study as a predictor of distributive fairness, this variable was entered next. Distributive fairness was the last variable entered. The results of this analysis for both groups is presented in Table 7.

For those who were rejected for a job (Table 7a), number of job offers (change in $R$ square = .07, $p < .001$)
and procedural fairness (change in R square = .22, \( p < .001 \)) were the only variables that significantly explained variance for repeat recruitment. No other control variable, nor distributive fairness, explained significant proportions of variance. For those who rejected a job offer, the results were slightly different. For this group, the number of interviews an applicant had was positively related to repeat recruitment (change in R square = .04, \( p < .05 \)), but the bulk of variance explained again came from procedural fairness (change in R square = .21, \( p < .001 \)) (see Table 7b). All other control variables and distributive fairness did not explain a significant proportion of variance.
Table 7
Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses
Fairness and Repeat Recruitment

(A) Data Pertaining to Being Rejected For a Job
Dependent Variable: Repeat Recruitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Entered on Step:</th>
<th>B (^a)</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
<th>F (^c)</th>
<th>(R^2) Adjusted</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Number of Interviews</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Number of Job Offers</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>17.68***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>8.87***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Work Experience Location</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>6.05***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Geographic Location</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>4.75**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Importance of Salary</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>4.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Procedural Fairness</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>55.73***</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>13.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Distributive Fairness</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>11.88***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) Standardized beta weights.
\(b\) Change in R square.
\(c\) This F statistic refers to the change in R attributable to each step.

* \(p < .05\) ** \(p < .01\) *** \(p < .001\)

(B) Data Pertaining to Rejecting a Job Offer
Dependent Variable: Repeat Recruitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Entered on Step:</th>
<th>B (^a)</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
<th>F (^c)</th>
<th>(R^2) Adjusted</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Number of Interviews</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>4.12*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>4.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Number of Job Offers</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>3.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Work Experience Location</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Geographic Location</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Importance of Salary</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Procedural Fairness</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>27.55***</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>6.18***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Distributive Fairness</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>5.72***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) Standardized beta weights.
\(b\) Change in R square.
\(c\) This F statistic refers to the change in R attributable to each step.

* \(p < .05\) ** \(p < .01\) *** \(p < .001\)
This analysis suggests that there is a positive relationship between procedural fairness and repeat recruitment. When the recruitment process was evaluated by applicants as procedurally fair there was a subsequent higher reported possibility of repeat recruitment. Although there was a significant positive correlation between distributive fairness and repeat recruitment, regression analysis revealed that there was little association between these two variables once procedural fairness had been entered into the equation. This indicates that if repeat recruitment evaluations are based on fairness, they will be made from procedural, not distributive, estimations.

The Overall Model

Figures 3 and 4 show the path analyses results for data pertaining to being rejected for a job and for rejecting a job offer. These analyses were run primarily to test hypotheses, but can be used to reveal an estimation of the framework proposed by Greenberg (1992). As can be seen, these analyses generally support the propositions made by Greenberg concerning systemic justice, interpersonal justice, informational justice, and configural justice as they were defined and measured for this dissertation.

For a better understanding of how variables related to each other, the correlations between predictor and
criterion variables were decomposed to study the direct and indirect effects to each dependent variable (see Tables 8 and 9). The hypothesized model did a very good job of explaining the predicted paths. For both cases of being rejected for a job and rejecting a job offer, five of the six predicted direct relationships were significant. Also, four of the five nonpredicted paths were nonsignificant. However, to get a truer estimation of how the antecedent variables effected the criterion variables, the decomposition of total effects into direct and indirect effects were performed.

Table 8 provides the total, direct, and indirect effects of the predictor variables for data pertaining to being rejected for a job. Procedural fairness was the first criterion variable in the model, hypothesized to be effected by job relatedness, voice, explanation of procedures, and interpersonal treatment. The direct effects of these latter variables on procedural fairness were all significant, and explained 59% of the variance. Interpersonal treatment had the strongest effect (.42), followed by voice (.32), explanation of procedures (.14), and job relatedness (-.09). Interpersonal treatment and voice seemed to be major influences on applicants' ultimate evaluations of procedural fairness.
Table 8
Direct and Indirect Effects
Rejected For a Job

(A) Procedural Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent Variables</th>
<th>Total Effects</th>
<th>Direct Effects</th>
<th>Indirect Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Relatedness</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Treatment</td>
<td>.69***</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.42***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R²  = .59***

(B) Distributive Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent Variables</th>
<th>Total Effects</th>
<th>Direct Effects</th>
<th>Indirect Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Fairness</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.48***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Waiting</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Relatedness</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Treatment</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R²  = .41***

* p < .05
** p < .01
***p < .001
Table 9
Direct and Indirect Effects
Rejected a Job Offer

(A) Procedural Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent Variables</th>
<th>Total Effects</th>
<th>Direct Effects</th>
<th>Indirect Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Relatedness</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Treatment</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) Distributive Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent Variables</th>
<th>Total Effects</th>
<th>Direct Effects</th>
<th>Indirect Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Waiting</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Relatedness</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Treatment</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01
**p < .001
For distributive fairness, the direct path between procedural fairness and distributive fairness was significant, while that of time waiting for an outcome was not. Also included were the direct paths from job relatedness, voice, explanation of procedures, and interpersonal treatment to distributive fairness. None of these coefficients were significant. What is important to note are the indirect effects of these variables. In all cases, these indirect effects were larger than their direct effects. This highlights the importance of the relationship between procedural fairness and distributive fairness. While judgments of job relatedness, voice, explanations, and interpersonal treatment may affect perceptions of distributive fairness, these perceptions are primarily accounted for by the link these variables have to procedural fairness.

Table 9 provides the total, direct, and indirect effects of the predictor variables for data pertaining to rejecting a job offer. This data is similar to those shown in Table 8. Interpersonal treatment is the strongest predictor of procedural fairness, and the total effects of job relatedness, voice, explanations, and interpersonal treatment on distributive fairness are mainly through procedural fairness.

However, it may be that the data collected for those who were rejected from a job may fit the proposed model
better than data collected for those who rejected a job offer. Each model was tested for goodness of fit using the Q statistic. This statistic is an overall index of how the data fits the proposed model. Pedhauzer (1982) suggests that an index of .9 or above is an indication of a good fit between model and data. For those who were rejected from a job, the Q index was .913, indicating a good fit. However, for data pertaining to rejecting a job offer, the Q index was only .627. This suggests that the model specifications are more appropriate for data pertaining to those who were rejected from a job.

In summary, a comparison of path coefficients revealed that the framework suggested by Greenberg (1992) when discussing procedural and distributive fairness is generally supported by the data obtained here. Interpersonal treatment is the strongest predictor of procedural fairness in this model. The relationship between procedural fairness and distributive fairness is a very strong and important one. The other variables in the model seem to effect distribute fairness through procedural fairness, not through direct effects. However, while data from both recruitment groups provided support for the model, the goodness of fit measures indicate that a more appropriate test of the model suggested by Greenberg would be of those who receive a negative outcome.
Control Variables

While the variables included in the model explain the variance in procedural and distributive fairness quite well, the recruitment literature suggests that other variables could account for the judgments made in this study. In particular, two studies (Rynes & Miller, 1983; Taylor & Bergman, 1987) have suggested that the number of interviews completed, the number of job offers one receives, the amount of work experience an applicant has, geographic location of the job, and salary could account for significant variance in a recruitment dependent variable. To investigate whether these variables were explaining significant levels of variance in the main criterion variables, a series of hierarchical regressions were completed.

For each situation in which data was collected (being rejected for a job and rejecting a job offer), both procedural fairness and distributive fairness were examined as dependent variables. The order of the hierarchical regression were as follows for procedural fairness: number of interviews, number of job offers, work experience, geographic location of the job, and importance of salary. These were then followed by the four antecedent variables as they were predicted in the path analysis (in order of effect size): interpersonal treatment, voice, explanation of procedures, and job relatedness. The same order of
control variables were used for distributive fairness: number of interviews, number of job offers, work experience, geographic location of the job, and importance of salary. These were then followed by the two antecedents predicted to effect distributive fairness (in order of effect size): procedural fairness and time waiting for an outcome.

Table 10 shows the results of the hierarchical regressions for data from those who were rejected from a job. Number of job offers (change in R square = .08, \( p < .001 \)) and importance of salary (change in R square = .08, \( p < .001 \)) were the only control variables to add a significant amount of variance in the explanation of procedural fairness ratings. Betas indicated that procedures were viewed as less fair when one had more job offers and procedures were viewed as more fair when salary was considered important. However, even after the effects of the control variables, interpersonal treatment, voice, and explanation of procedures added a significant amount of variance to the total regression equations. Job relatedness did not. Table 11 reports the effects of control variables on procedural fairness for data pertaining to rejecting a job offer. For this data, each of the predictor variables added a significant amount of variance after control variables had entered the regression equation.
Controls were also examined for distributive fairness ratings (see Tables 10 and 11). For being rejected for a job, number of job offers (change in R square = .06, p < .001) and importance of salary did add a significant amount of variance (change in R square = .08, p < .001). As with procedural fairness, outcomes were viewed as less fair when one had more job offers. Procedural fairness ratings still added a large and significant change in variance explained after the control variables. Time waiting for an outcome, however, did not. Finally, for those who rejected a job offer, number of job offers and procedural fairness judgments added a significant amount of variance to distributive fairness.
Table 10
Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses
Those Who Were Rejected From a Job

(A) Dependent Variable: Procedural Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Entered on Step:</th>
<th>B^a</th>
<th>R^2b</th>
<th>F^c</th>
<th>Change in R^2</th>
<th>Adjusted R^2</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Number of Interviews</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Number of Job Offers</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>22.36***</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>11.93***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Work Experience</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>7.92***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Geographic Location</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>6.02***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Importance of Salary</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>21.59***</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>9.55***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Interpersonal Treatment</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>164.08***</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>40.76***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Voice</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>36.82***</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>45.48***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Explanation</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>8.25*</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>42.05***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Job Relatedness</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>37.98***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) Dependent Variable: Distributive Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Entered on Step:</th>
<th>B^a</th>
<th>R^2b</th>
<th>F^c</th>
<th>Change in R^2</th>
<th>Adjusted R^2</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Number of Interviews</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Number of Job Offers</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>15.91***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>8.05***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Work Experience</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>5.88***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Geographic Location</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>4.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Importance of Salary</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>21.65***</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>8.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Procedural Fairness</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>112.41***</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>28.74***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Time Waiting For an Outcome</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>25.11***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Standardized beta weights.
b  Change in R square.
c  This F statistic refers to the change in R attributable to each step.
* p < .01
** p < .01
***p < .001
Table 11
Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses
Those Who Rejected Job Offer

(A) Dependent Variable: Procedural Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Entered on Step:</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R² Adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Number of Interviews</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>4.75*</td>
<td>.04 .03 4.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Number of Job Offers</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.07 .05 3.96*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Work Experience</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07 .04 2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Geographic Location</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.07 .04 2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Importance of Salary</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.09 .05 2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Interpersonal Treatment</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>83.08***</td>
<td>.49 .47 17.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Voice</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>15.24***</td>
<td>.56 .54 18.90***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Explanation</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>7.87**</td>
<td>.59 .56 18.64***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Job Relatedness</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>11.09**</td>
<td>.63 .60 19.45***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) Dependent Variable: Distributive Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Entered on Step:</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R² Adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Number of Interviews</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.02 .01 1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Number of Job Offers</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>10.23**</td>
<td>.10 .08 6.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Work Experience</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.10 .08 4.04**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Geographic Location</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10 .07 3.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Importance of Salary</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>4.25*</td>
<td>.14 .10 3.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Procedural Fairness</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>76.49***</td>
<td>.51 .48 17.53***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Time Waiting For an Outcome</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.42 .48 15.32***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Standardized beta weights.
b Change in R square.
c This F statistic refers to the change in R attributable
to each step.
* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
To summarize, it was found that the most important predictors of the path analysis explained the most variance in both procedural fairness and distributive fairness. This was the case even after controlling for number of interviews, number of job offers, work experience, importance of geographic location, and importance of salary. Procedural fairness judgments were greatly affected by all but one of the antecedent variables identified in this model. Distributive fairness judgments depend a great deal on procedural fairness, but not on time waiting for an outcome.

Being Rejected for a Job Vs. Rejecting a Job Offer

The previous presentation of results has focused on the examination of hypotheses and the overall match between the data and the model. The goodness of fit information suggested that the proposed model is more appropriate for data pertaining to those who had been rejected for a job. With this in mind, an examination of the difference between data pertaining to those who were rejected for a job and those who rejected a job offer was conducted.

For each major variable, t-tests were run for questionnaire items. These results are reported in Table 12(a). Significant differences were obtained for six out of the eight variables of interest. Those who rejected a job offer gave significantly more favorable ratings of voice, explanation of procedures, the time it took to
receive an outcome, procedural fairness, and distributive fairness. There were no differences for job relatedness and interpersonal treatment.

Of interest is the significant difference found for repeat recruitment. As shown previously, when applicants from both groups evaluated procedures as fair, they were more likely to state that they would again go through the recruitment process with the same company. But, the test of differences between groups revealed that those who were rejected for a job were more willing to recruit with the same company than those who rejected a job offer. This was the case even though evaluations of voice, explanations, time waiting for an outcome, procedural fairness and distributive fairness were less favorable for those who were rejected for a job than for those who rejected a job offer. This suggests that being rejected for a job or rejecting a job offer may moderate the relationship between procedural fairness and repeat recruitment.
Table 12
T-Tests Between Groups and Test of Moderator

(A) T-Tests Between Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean For Those Rejected</th>
<th>Mean For Those Who Rejected A Job Offer</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Relatedness</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>-4.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>-5.71*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Treatment</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Waiting for An Outcome</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>5.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Fairness</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>-4.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Fairness</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>-9.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat Recruitment</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>4.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) Test of Moderator Variable: Being Rejected Vs. Rejecting Offer as Moderator (Group)
Independent Variable: Procedural Fairness
Dependent Variable: Repeat Recruitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Entered on Step:</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R² Adjusted</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Procedural Fairness (PF)</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>70.00*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>70.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Group</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>62.07*</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>45.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) PF X Group</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>41.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .001

(a) Standardized beta weights.
(b) Change in R square.
(c) This F statistic refers to the change in R attributable to each step.
To test this possibility, a hierarchical regression was run with repeat recruitment as the dependent variable, procedural fairness as the independent variable, and group membership (rejected for a job versus rejected a job offer) as the moderator. If the outcome received is moderating the fairness - repeat recruitment relationship, the interaction between procedural fairness and group should be significant. This was not the case. Table 12(b) replicates the findings that fairness predicts repeat recruitment, and the result that being rejected for a job versus rejecting a job offer predicts repeat recruitment. However, the interaction of moderator and independent variable was not significant.

Common Method Variance

The data collected for this study were from self-report data. One inherent problem with self-report data is the chance for common method variance (Campbell and Fiske, 1959). Because of this possibility, three techniques were used to address whether common method variance existed in this data. These techniques were Harman's (1967) one-factor test, an open-ended question included on the questionnaire, and interviews with applicants that went through the recruitment process.

One method that may be used to check for common method variance is the Harman (1967) one-factor test. For this test, all variables are entered into a factor analysis. If
one factor appears, and if the majority of the variance between the dependent and the independent variables is accounted for by this factor, there is evidence for common method variance. Two factor analyses - one for data pertaining to being rejected for a job and one for rejecting a job offer - were run with every variable that made up the predictor and criterion variables in this study.

For this analysis, the 17 variables of interest from the questionnaire were entered into the factor analysis. These variables represented job relatedness (3 questions), voice (3 questions), interpersonal treatment (3 questions), explanation of procedures (2 questions), time waiting for an outcome (2 questions), procedural fairness (2 questions), and distributive fairness (2 questions). These 7 categories of variables made up the predictors and criterions of interest.

Table 13 shows the results of this factor analysis for data pertaining to being rejected for a job. There were a total of 5 factors, which explained 72.2% of the variance. However, Factor 1 included the questions for voice, interpersonal treatment, and procedural fairness, and accounted for 37.6% of the variance. Job relatedness, explanation of procedures, time waiting for an outcome, and distributive fairness all loaded on separate factors. This analysis shows some evidence for common method variance.
Table 13  
Factor Analysis  
Rejected For a Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Factor</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice (2)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice (3)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Treatment (2)</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Treatment (3)</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice (1)</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Treatment (1)</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Fairness (2)</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Fairness (1)</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrib. Fairness (1)</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrib. Fairness (2)</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Relatedness (1)</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Relatedness (2)</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Relatedness (3)</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation (1)</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation (2)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Waiting (2)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Waiting (1)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance Explained</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers represent rotated factors.

Note: Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of the question from that variable category in order of the way presented on the questionnaire.
Table 14  
Factor Analysis  
Rejected a Job Offer  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Treatment (2)</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Treatment (1)</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Treatment (3)</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Fairness (2)</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrib. Fairness (1)</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Fairness (1)</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrib. Fairness (2)</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice (3)</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice (1)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice (2)</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Relatedness (3)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Relatedness (2)</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Relatedness (1)</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Waiting (2)</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Waiting (1)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation (1)</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation (2)</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalue  | 6.73   | 1.92   | 1.61   | 1.31   | 1.01   |
Variance Explained | 39.6% | 11.3% | 9.5% | 7.7% | 6.0% |

Numbers represent rotated factors.

Note: Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of the question from that variable category in order of the way presented on the questionnaire.
Even though there were 5 factors, a large amount of variance is explained by one factor. In addition, the questions that made up a criterion variable (procedural fairness) loaded on the same factor as questions representing two predictor variables (interpersonal treatment and voice).

For data pertaining to rejecting a job offer, the same 17 variables were entered into the factor analysis. Table 14 shows the results for these data. Again, 5 factors emerged, which explained 74% of the data. The first factor explained 39.6% of the variance, and included items for procedural fairness, interpersonal treatment, and distributive fairness. As with being rejected for a job, this points to a problem with common method variance.

While these analyses show some evidence for common method variance, evidence against this problem were obtained from the open-ended question on the questionnaire and the interviews. Results from these two methods have been given with each hypothesis. However, the results from the open-ended question and the interviews need to be reviewed to examine the prevalence of common method variance.

Of the 244 subjects who provided data concerning being rejected for a job, 138 answered the open-ended question. Table 3 presents data for those who were rejected for a job. This table shows the number of people who mentioned
each category at least once when answering the open-ended question, and whether that comment was positive or negative. Interpersonal treatment was the most mentioned category, followed by voice, job relatedness, time waiting for an outcome, and explanation of procedures. The majority of all comments were negative.

Table 3 provides evidence that subjects responded the same way on the open-ended question as they did on the questionnaire scales. For every category (job relatedness, voice, interpersonal treatment, explanation of procedures, and time waiting for an outcome), those who gave positive remarks on the open-ended question had more favorable questionnaire item responses than those who gave negative remarks. In addition, more favorable questionnaire evaluations of fairness were made by those who gave positive remarks on the open-ended question. The questionnaire item responses for procedural fairness were more favorable for those who made positive remarks ($x = 4.89$) than for those who made negative remarks ($x = 3.83$). This pattern was the same for distributive fairness: The questionnaire item responses for distributive fairness were more favorable for those who made positive remarks ($x = 4.13$) than for those who made negative remarks ($x = 3.26$).

Of the 110 subjects who provided data concerning rejecting a job offer, 52 answered the open-ended question. Table 4 gives the categorical results of these data. As
with data that pertained to being rejected from a job, these results show that interpersonal treatment was mentioned the most. This was followed by job relatedness, explanation of procedures, voice, and time waiting for an outcome. There were more negative remarks made than positive.

Table 4 also follows the results obtained for being rejected for a job. For each category, more favorable questionnaire responses were given for those who responded positively on the open-ended question. For those who responded positively on the open-ended question, procedural fairness questionnaire evaluations were more favorable (5.84) than for those who responded negatively (x = 3.93). This, again, was the pattern for distributive fairness: For those who responded positively on the open-ended question, distributive fairness questionnaire evaluations were more favorable (5.50) than for those who responded negatively (x = 4.36).

The open-ended question results provide evidence against common method variance. Overall, subjects written responses were reflective of responses given on questionnaire scales. There was a discernible pattern to responses on the open-ended question. Overall, subjects who provided positive remarks on the open-ended question concerning job relatedness, voice, interpersonal treatment, explanation of procedures, and time waiting for an outcome
also made favorable evaluations of these same categories on the questionnaire item responses. Those who provided negative remarks evaluated these categories less favorably. Both procedural and distributive fairness questionnaire judgments were more favorable for those who gave positive remarks on the open-ended question than for those who provided negative remarks.

While these results are favorable to arguing against common method variance, the open-ended question was still part of the questionnaire. In a method completely divorced from the primary method used to collect data, the interviews also support the information gathered from the survey questionnaires. For participants who believed they had voice, believed that explanations of procedures were made, believed they were treated well interpersonally, and did not have to wait a long period of time to receive word of an outcome decision, the majority of interview participants stated that the procedures used to make a decision and the outcome received from that decision were fair (see Tables 5 and 6). For participants who believed they had no voice, believed that no explanations were given, believed they were not treated well interpersonally, and had to wait a long period of time to receive word of an outcome decision, the majority stated that the procedures and the outcome were unfair. Additionally, when procedures
were considered fair, the outcome received from those procedures was considered fair.

This agreement between interview data and the results of the survey questionnaire suggests that the common method variance initially indicated by factor analysis was not a large problem with this study. While the number of interviews was relatively small, the trends suggested by the interview data were clear and consistent with the previous results of this study. That, along with the results of the open-ended survey question, suggest that applicants were responding to the variables of interest initially asked about on the survey, and not to the construction of that survey instrument.
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

Support for Proposed Model

The purpose of this dissertation was to use Greenberg's (1992) framework of organizational justice to examine fairness perceptions in the context of recruitment. A model was created to test predictions based on Greenberg's four categorizations of justice: Systemic Justice, configural justice, informational justice, and interpersonal justice. Overall, the results gathered from a mailed survey questionnaire and from interviews with applicants support the predictions made from this model. The job-relatedness of recruitment questions and applicants' perceived voice were used to test the category of systemic justice. The model predicted that job-relatedness and voice would be antecedents to procedural fairness and would not have a significant direct effect on distributive fairness. The results provided support for this contention. For all applicants, job-related questions were positively associated with procedural fairness and not related to perceptions of distributive fairness. Voice was positively related to procedural fairness: The more voice
an applicant had in the recruitment process the more procedurally fair they believed the process was.

Configural justice was tested by examining the relationship between procedural fairness and distributive fairness. As predicted by the model, procedural fairness was strongly related to distributive fairness. This study showed that when applicants believed the recruitment process was fair they also believed the outcome they received from the recruitment process was fair. This replicates previous organizational justice research.

The explanation of how decisions were made and the interpersonal treatment of applicants represented the category of informational justice. Greenberg (1992) contends that informational justice would be more appropriate to study in terms of procedural fairness as opposed to distributive fairness. The results support that contention. The more the recruitment procedures were explained to applicants the more fair these applicants believed the procedures were. Procedural fairness was also strongly associated with interpersonal treatment. When applicants were treated well interpersonally they evaluated procedural fairness more favorably than those who were not treated well interpersonally. There were no significant direct relationships between explanations of procedures and interpersonal treatment with distributive fairness in the model.
The only part of the model that did not result as predicted concerned interpersonal justice. Interpersonal justice refers to how a person is treated after receiving an outcome. This category was represented by time waiting for an outcome, with the assumption that the longer an applicant had to wait to receive news of the recruitment outcome the more they would connect that wait to poor interpersonal treatment. This was not the case. The path in the model between time waiting for an outcome and distributive fairness was not significant. However, a non-predicted path between procedural fairness and time waiting for an outcome was significant, indicating that how long one has to wait for an outcome may be more connected to company recruitment procedures, not whether one has been rejected for a job or not.

Being Rejected for a Job Versus Rejecting a Job Offer

Overall, there little differences between data pertaining to those who were rejected from a job and those who rejected a job offer in terms of path coefficients, correlations, the open-ended question, and the interviews. Significant and non-significant model paths for both groups of data were exactly the same. Also for both groups of data, control variables did not cancel out any significant additions of variance provided by the variables of interest.
However, there were several differences between being rejected for a job and rejecting a job offer that merit discussion. The most important difference concerned the goodness of fit indexes. These statistics revealed that the data for being rejected for a job better fit the model than data pertaining to rejecting a job offer. There could be several reasons for this. First, as with any causal model, the strength of associations and model fit is somewhat dependent on the number of subjects used to collect data (Cohen & Cohen, 1982). For this study, 244 subjects reported data for being rejected for a job while 110 responded to the situation of rejecting a job offer. Goodness of fit for this latter group may have been better with the inclusion of a similar number of subjects.

A second possible explanation is more important. Greenberg's framework and the subsequent work in this study are based on one particular context of investigation. As has been stated elsewhere (Greenberg, 1990), the majority of work completed concerning procedural justice has focused on estimations of fairness after receiving a negative outcome. Therefore, what knowledge we have is generally indicative of that context. We know little of fairness perceptions or the components of fairness when the outcome received is positive. In this study applicants were asked to react to both negative and positive situations. The model for this study provided a better fit for data that
reflected the well-researched, negative, context. For a positive context, however, the low index of goodness of fit suggests misspecifications in the model for this group of data. Further investigations of fairness perceptions in a positive reward context are needed to determine if this situation might need adjustments to the model, or a different model altogether.

There were other differences between these groups. T-tests disclosed that there were significant differences between groups concerning voice, explanation of procedures, time waiting for an outcome, procedural fairness, and distributive fairness. More favorable evaluations of these variables were given by those who rejected a job offer in all of these cases. This is logical. Since being offered a job is usually preceded by additional interviews and site visits, applicants simply have more opportunity to give voice and have procedures explained to them. Prize candidates stay in touch with the organization longer than unacceptable applicants. Since the outcome is positive for an applicant there is a higher probability that subsequent evaluations of procedures and outcome will be fair.

An interesting finding between groups is that there were no differences found for job relatedness and interpersonal treatment. While the survey, open-ended question, and interviews all demonstrated that recruiters did ask for non-job related information, applicants seemed
to receive these questions regardless of whether they were offered a job or not. This was the same for interpersonal treatment. While many applicants perceived that they were treated poorly during the process, that treatment did not depend on whether you were offered a job.

The lack of differences between groups for these two variables could stem from a variety of reasons. The most intuitive explanation concerns bias. Asking non-job related questions and/or treating applicants in an uncivil manner might communicate bias to the applicant. If this bias is perceived to be severe, the applicant may complain to a higher authority. This could lead to actions ranging from reprimands to law suits. Because of this, organizations may place particular emphasis on how their recruiters ask questions and treat individuals. Unfortunately, this study did show that not all organizations may have this foresight.

The examination of control variables also provides several differences between groups. For those who were rejected for a job the importance of salary explained a significant amount of variance when predicting procedural and distributive fairness ratings. This was not the case for those who rejected a job offer. This finding says that the more important the salary was to non-successful individuals the more favorably they evaluated procedural and distributive fairness. This suggests that for those
who may not have had the opportunity to advance further into the recruitment process, higher salary offers were associated with competence in recruitment procedures. In addition, the fairness of being rejected from a job was associated with higher salary postings. This encourages an interesting question. Do applicants automatically associate high salaries with fairness when first entering the recruitment process? This question seems more plausible when considering the results of those who rejected a job. There were no significant relationships between procedural and distributive fairness and the importance of salary for this data. What may be occurring is that applicants who move through the recruitment process focus on, or are exposed to, different aspects of fairness that require evaluation. When this occurs, salary takes on a different relationship with ideas of fairness.

A final difference that needs to be examined concerns estimations of repeat recruitment. Overall, applicants that favorably evaluated fairness indicated that they would apply to the same organization in the future. However, those people who were rejected for a job were more willing to repeat recruitment with the same company than those who rejected a job offer. This is an important finding in the context of recruitment. While an organization may dismiss a candidate at one time they may want that same person in the future. Fair treatment of a candidate may lower
his/her reluctance to re-contact that company. However, when a candidate turns down an offer of employment they may be dismissing that company for the future as well as the present. Whether this dismissal comes from recruitment fairness perceptions, the justification of their own selection decision, or because of fear of company retaliation if the applicant does apply again is a question for future research.

Importance to Recruitment Research

This study brings organizational justice to the area of recruitment and demonstrates the important of perceptions of fairness to applicants. What has been missing from recruitment research is a focus on the fairness of the selection decisions made by organizations. Topics of interest in this area have primarily been applicants' reactions to the recruiter or to some other aspect of the process. No study has looked at recruitment as a part of a decision making process in which outcomes are given. Both the organization and the applicants who take part in the recruitment process are judging one another. Perceptions of fairness are a logical gauge of this judgment.

The most important finding for the study of recruitment is one that has been shown to exist in other contexts for many years: If applicants believe the procedures used to make a recruitment decision are fair,
they will believe the outcome they receive from the recruitment process is fair. This is true even if applicants are turned down for a job. This is an important point for all organizations engaged in recruitment. For applicants that go through the recruitment process, and for others who may hear about the process from others, how a selection decision is made is just as important as the final outcome received. As shown throughout this study, how and what recruiters do will impact these perceptions of fairness.

Concerning the recruiter, most of the results of this dissertation fit with past recruitment research. Applicants seriously consider the way they have been personally treated throughout the process. However, what is important to note about the results from this study is that applicants use this information not only to evaluate organizational members who take part in recruitment but also to evaluate the process the organization uses to recruit. Not only will applicants like their recruiters better if they think they are courteous, friendly, and personable (Rynes & Miller, 1983; Harris & Fink, 1987; Taylor & Bergman, 1987), but they are also likely to make favorable fairness evaluations when recruiters show these considerate actions.

The importance of interpersonal treatment in the context of recruitment should not be underestimated. As
described previously, one applicant interviewed for this study placed great emphasis on how he was treated, and turned down a job offer because he was shown "no respect" from the recruiting company. Unfair treatment could lead to a permanent loss of a pool of applicants. How one is treated through the recruitment process could also lead to many characterizations of the organization and subsequent evaluations of future employment.

Applicants will evaluate procedures and outcomes as fair if the questioning throughout the recruitment process is job related. Consistent with past research (Downs, 1969; Fusilier & Hoyer, 1980; Hilgert & Eason, 1968; Schein, 1977; Thronson & Thomas, 1968), applicants in this study did not like questions that were too personal or biased in nature. Procedures were seen as more fair when questions were job-related rather than non-job related. However, the interview data suggested that applicants will accept some non-job related questions as satisfactory. The investigation of control variables also suggests that it is the situation of rejecting a job offer that may be important to job relatedness. Overall, if non-job related questions are seen as more common, or somehow more connected to personality traits that could predict work effort, subsequent evaluations of procedures were favorable.
Job-relatedness may also be an area where both organization and applicant determine "fit" for employment. For example, questions concerning hobbies, recreational activities, or even marital status may be used by the employer to determine if the applicant will fit in with the established members of the organization. In addition, the applicant may receive messages from these questions that will likewise gauge his/her fit into that establishment. If this is the case, and the applicant recognizes that certain questions can be used to estimate their acceptance into the organization, applicants may be very tolerant of non-job related inquiries. However, these questions must be presented in a manner and context that the applicant can easily recognize.

One particular finding in this study has been overlooked by past recruitment research. This is the amount of influence applicants believe they have during the process. Voice was very important for this sample. When applicants believed they had influence during recruitment they rated procedural and distributive fairness higher than applicants who believed they had no such influence. The recruitment process, particularly the interview, is a way applicants can sell themselves to the organization. This study indicates that if applicants do not get the chance to sell themselves they will view the recruitment process as unfair. As the interviews show, voice to recruits may be
as simple as saying something about themselves or having an opportunity to answer several questions without interruption. This suggests that recruiters should be trained and cautioned about their use of time during interviews. From a more practical viewpoint, giving the applicant sufficient time to express themselves may lead to information that will make a recruitment decision less, not more, difficult.

Previous recruitment research has shown that time waiting for a selection outcome impacts how applicants feel about the company and their chances for a job offer (Arvey et al., 1975; Bies, 1986; Rynes et al., 1991; Lumsden, 1967). This study also demonstrated negative reactions to waiting a long period of time for the results of the recruitment process. What this research has shown that other studies have not is that those applicants most likely to experience the adverse effects of time delays are those who are turned down for a job. Companies may see this as forgivable, but data concerning repeat recruitment indicates that those who are turned down for a job still have interest in applying to that same company again. Long delays may be enough to prevent future good performers from applying to the company in the future.

Contrary to the predictions of this study, reactions to time waiting for an outcome were more related to procedural fairness than to distributive fairness. This
was the case for all subjects. If this is true, favorable and unfavorable evaluations by applicants may be connected to the process of recruitment and how the company makes its decisions. The question to practitioners of recruitment becomes one of how the administration of the recruitment process is connected to other processes the applicant may experience when employed by the company. One applicant interviewed believed waiting a long time for a recruitment decision reflected "disorganization in the company." While this opinion may be dismissed if it was made by someone rejected for a job, it should be seriously considered if made by someone who rejected a job offer.

One final point must be made concerning perceptions of fairness and the recruitment process. Previous research (Rynes & Miller, 1983, Study 2; Taylor & Bergman, 1987) has shown that when certain variables are added to the study of recruitment characteristics the effects of the main recruitment variables of interest disappear. In this study, the addition of the number of interviews, the number of job offers, importance of geographic location, the amount of work experience the applicant had, and importance of salary did not nullify the strong effects of procedural justice. The ultimate evaluations of fairness were strongly related to variables identified by the proposed model for this sample of applicants.
However, the control variable of number of job offers was shown to play a role in this study. This was particularly true for those who were rejected for a job. In this situation, more job offers led to the following: The evaluation of job-related information as less important to procedural fairness, the evaluation of overall procedural fairness as less fair, and less willingness to repeat recruitment with the same company. This suggests that applicants who have been successful in a job search will cast a particularly critical eye on fairness when they are rejected for a job. Because they are successful, these applicants may have more experience with recruitment and use that experience to evaluate fairness. Success in one recruitment process may also raise expectations for success in other recruitment processes. In either case, the job candidate who has experienced success may be skeptical of recruitment procedures that deliver a negative outcome.

To summarize, the results of this study correspond and add to previous recruitment research. Applicants do evaluate the fairness of the recruitment process, and those evaluations seem to be based on the organizational representatives they deal with, the questions they are asked, the opportunity to influence the decision, and the time they wait to hear from the company concerning a decision. In particular, how applicants are treated and
the opportunity to influence a selection decision appears to be very important to perceptions of fairness.

Importance to Organizational Justice Research

The primary importance this dissertation provides to the study of organizational justice is the connection made between justice concepts and recruitment. This adds to one previous research study (Bies, 1986) that demonstrated the importance of fairness to job applicants. Just as with performance evaluation (Greenberg, 1987), compensation (Folger & Konovsky, 1989), and grievance activity (Fryxell & Gordon, 1990), recruitment provides another human resource function in which the causes and consequences of fairness are relevant.

Also important is the support given to Greenberg's (1992) framework of the interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. According to Greenberg, there are really two forms of organizational justice: Procedural and distributive. Procedural justice should be most effected by structural mechanisms (such as process control and a lack of bias) and interpersonal treatment that show courtesy and respect during the procedures used to make a decision. Distributive justice should be most effected by the way distributions are made and the interpersonal treatment shown after the decision outcomes are given.
The model created from this framework was tested and generally supported. The representations of structural mechanisms (job relatedness, which reflected lack of/presence of bias; and voice, which represented process control) were directly related to procedural fairness but not to distributive fairness. Interpersonal treatment used in the enactment of procedures (represented by the variable of interpersonal treatment, which reflected how people were treated when decision information was gathered; and the explanation of how a final decision was to be made) was directly related to procedural fairness but not to distributive fairness. The way distributions were made (represented by procedural fairness, which reflected an evaluation of the distributive norm) was strongly associated with distributive fairness. The only part of the model that was not supported was interpersonal treatment after an outcome was distributed (represented by time waiting for an outcome): These perceptions were more strongly associated with procedural fairness than with distributive fairness.

These are important findings for the study of organizational justice. While each element examined in this study has been recognized before as important to procedural or distributive fairness, little research has been conducted where these elements have been measured together, with estimations of the impact of each element.
As a whole, the framework provided by Greenberg suggests a useful way to categorize organizational justice. Furthermore, these results indicate that it is unwise to separate all personal treatment perceptions from procedural fairness perceptions. Whether procedures will be evaluated as fair or unfair depends on the judgments of personal treatment received when those procedures are enacted. Related to this, it is important to note the effect perceptions of personal treatment had on ultimate evaluations of procedural fairness. In the models for data pertaining to being rejected for a job and for rejecting a job offer, the largest direct effect on procedural fairness was personal treatment. How applicants are treated during the recruitment process is the leading predictor of fairness evaluations for this sample.

Also important to the study of organizational justice was the goodness of fit of the model to two sets of data. The model presented was much more applicable to individuals that received a negative outcome. The examination of positive outcomes and evaluations of fairness is needed. It would be natural to dismiss positive outcomes as inconsequential, or to believe that the only time justice is important is when negative outcomes are received. Correlational data in this study shows that the same basic variables of job relatedness, voice, explanation of procedures, and interpersonal treatment are still important
when a positive outcome is given. However, there are likely to be other variables that could be added to the specified model that would provide a better fitting framework. For example, the context of when a positive outcome is given may be important. The results show that looking at positive outcomes may add to our overall knowledge of organizational justice.

A final point to be made about the importance of these results to organizational justice concerns the association between procedural fairness and distributive fairness. The testing of this model unquestionably emphasizes that the determination of procedural fairness will effect subsequent evaluations of distributive fairness. The survey questionnaire items, the open-ended question contained on the survey, and the interview data all show that procedural fairness predicts distributive fairness. This is not surprising. What is important to note is the relationship of job relatedness, voice, the explanation of procedures, and interpersonal treatment as antecedent variables: They are all directly related to procedural fairness and not directly related to distributive fairness. This result, while taken for granted, is crucial to all students of distributive justice. When distributing rewards to reflect social norms (Deutsch, 1975; Leventhal, 1976) or to obtain certain behavior (Greenberg & Cohen, 1982), the ultimate acceptance and satisfaction with those rewards will be
based on the elements that determined how those rewards were distributed.

Implications for Recruitment and Organizational Justice

Recruitment

The results of this study lead to several implications for the study of the recruitment process. The most important implication is the connection between procedural fairness and distributive fairness. Organizations should realize that how they conduct their recruitment process will effect applicant perceptions of the fairness of that process.

It has been shown in previous recruitment research that job applicants prefer to be questioned about job related issues and take exception to questions that may constitute as an invasion of privacy (Fusilier & Hoyer, 1980; Rosenbaum, 1973; Schein, 1977). However, results gathered from interviews indicate that, in terms of fairness, there are certain non-job related questions that are considered acceptable as long as they can be connected to indicators of performance on the job. It would be useful to exactly identify what is deemed acceptable and unacceptable and how this relates to perceptions of fairness.

The issues of the amount of voice and the kind of interpersonal treatment given to applicants should be studied further in the recruitment context. It has been
shown in past research, and through this study, that how an applicant is treated will effect evaluations of the recruitment process. However, it is not known what is considered acceptable and unacceptable behavior. Do recruiters have to be overly friendly and courteous to applicants, or merely "professional?" In terms of voice, data concerning the types of voice (explanation of background, the taking of job-related tests, an opportunity to ask questions that may impress recruiters) that may impact evaluations of the recruitment process is needed.

This model suggests that time waiting for an outcome is a predictor of procedural, not distributive, fairness. However, time waiting for an outcome may not be the ideal variable to measure interpersonal justice. While time waiting for an outcome is an indication of treatment after a decision is made, it would be better to discover how the company communicated its decision to the applicant. Contents of rejection letters, personal conversations, or applicant follow-ups after a decision has been made would provide a more accurate view of interpersonal justice. This needs to be analyzed in future research.

Finally, a major implication to be made from this dissertation concerns how recruitment is conducted. Supporting the work of Rynes et al. (1991), this dissertation shows that for all of our enlightenment concerning overt discrimination, subtle bias in the
interview, and personal treatment, organizations still treat applicants in an unfair manner. Applicants care about fair treatment from organizations. Applicants treated in a grossly unfair manner may not be able to overcome negative feelings towards the organization. This could be important to companies if they should ever again recruit these same applicants.

**Organizational Justice**

One major justice implication from this dissertation is the potential importance of Greenberg's (1992) framework. Identifying interpersonal treatment as a part of both procedural and distributive justice seems to be a useful way to incorporate "interactional justice" (Bies, 1987) into a more logical presentation of justice concepts. This needs to be further explored. Testing the framework in other contexts would help to determine the validity of Greenberg's conceptualizations.

Interpersonal treatment was a major predictor of procedural fairness in this study. This adds to other studies that have shown the importance of personal treatment to evaluations of fairness (Bies & Moag, 1986; Bies & Shapiro, 1987; Moorman, 1992). Future examinations of procedural fairness should include some measure of interpersonal treatment. To omit this variable would provide an incomplete picture of procedural justice in whatever context studied.
The inclusion of organizational justice in the area of recruitment suggests possible directions for future research. Voice was shown to predict procedural fairness but no attempt was made to clarify what was important in the ultimate evaluation of influence. Would simply getting to speak during an interview constitute voice? Would the amount of time an applicant had to speak to organizational representatives influence voice? Determining what constitutes voice in this setting may help our overall understanding of voice as a determinant of procedural fairness.

Finally, this dissertation also examined recruitment in a very broad fashion. It would be useful to examine fairness from the perspective of the individual components of recruitment. How are fairness perceptions made in initial interviews compared to second interviews? Are there different standards for fairness when an applicant goes to an on-site visit? Given the history of sexual and racial discrimination in the United States, does gender or race affect perceptions of justice during recruitment? Answers to these questions would be useful for the study of organizational justice in recruitment.

Study Limitations

There are several limitations to the research that was conducted. The main testing of the hypotheses was done through survey data. While common method variance did not
seem to be a major problem, the amount of interviews conducted to prove this was relatively small. Laboratory experiments with strong controls and a large number of subjects would help to validate or disprove the results gathered here.

One issue that was not addressed by this dissertation concerned the labor market. At the time of this study, the United States was under a severe recession. Because of this, organizations that recruited at this particular university campus had a large number of applicants for a few number of jobs. How recruiters and organizations treat individuals may be quite different when the number of applicant to jobs ratio is reversed.

Another limitation concerns sample size and the fact that each survey recipient was asked to evaluate two different situations. There were 244 subjects who answered questions pertaining to being rejected for a job. Only 110 answered questions pertaining to rejecting a job offer. Because of the realities of survey research, this was the most feasible method to obtain a relatively large sample size. However, for a better estimation of effects and predictive associations, a larger sample is needed. This is especially true for those who rejected a job offer.

One area that was not studied concerned the identification of sample demographic differences. No information was gathered concerning gender, age, or
socioeconomic background. These variables have been shown in past recruitment research to effect certain variable manipulation. Future research needs to examine these types of variables when studying justice in recruitment. While not absolutely necessary for the present research, inclusion of these items would have provided a richer source of information.

A final limitation to the present study is a lack of information concerning perceptions of the organization. A more thorough examination of the issues addressed here would have included perceptions of recruiters, organizational policy, and more detailed information concerning each phase of recruitment (interviews, second interviews, on-site visits). Inclusion of these items would have added greatly to this study. Given the limitations of survey research, this was not possible. A more controlled, organizationally sponsored research effort would be more likely to ensure the acquisition of this data.

Conclusion

To conclude, perceptions of fairness seem to be important to applicants that go through the process of recruitment. The job-relatedness of recruitment questions, the amount of voice applicants receive throughout the process, how procedures are explained, and the interpersonal treatment applicants receive from
organizational representatives all predict levels of procedural fairness. Procedural fairness, in turn, predicts distributive fairness in this setting. This was true for data pertaining to being rejected for a job and for data pertaining to the rejection of a job offer. In the context of recruitment, organizations should pay attention to the way they treat individuals who apply to their companies. To ignore the communication of how decisions are made would be to invite unfavorable evaluations of the recruitment process.
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APPENDIX
Questionnaire

Instructions: In the past six months, you have gone through a job search process where you have found your present place of employment. For the first questions you are about to read, please answer in regard to a company that you wanted to work for, but REJECTED you for employment. In other words, think of one organization that you very much wanted to work for, and that turned you down for employment, and then recall the recruitment process (as described in the questions) you experienced with that organization. If no companies rejected you during your job search, please move to the questions on page XX. Please answer as honestly and as precisely as you can.

Control Variables:
Please circle the number that best corresponds with your answer.

1. How many interviews did you complete before you were rejected for this job?
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11+

2. How many job offers did you receive before you were rejected by this particular firm?
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11+

3. How much work experience did you have going into your job search?
   ---------------
   None at All
   None at All
   None at All

   None at All

   None at All

   None at All

   None at All

Please check the appropriate box for the following questions.

4. For this job in which you were rejected, were you required to fill out and submit an application blank?
   YES_______  NO_______

5. For this job in which you were rejected, were you required to submit a resume?
   YES_______  NO_______

6. For this job in which you were rejected, were you required to provide references?
   YES_______  NO_______
7. For this job in which you were rejected, were you required to go through an interview?
   YES________  NO________

8. For this job in which you were rejected, were you required to go on an on-site visit to the company?
   YES________  NO________

9. For this job in which you were rejected, were you required to take a pre-employment test?
   YES________  NO________
   If yes, what type of test(s) were you required to take?
   _____ A Personality Test   _____ A Drug Test
   _____ A Job-Related Test  _____ An Honesty Test
   _____ Other (Please explain): ____________________________

10. The geographic location that the company was in was very important to me.

---
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

11. The salary this job paid (if you know) was very important to me.

---
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

Process Variable Questions

Job Relatedness

12. Organizational representatives asked me about issues that I could not connect to the job.

---
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
13. Organizational representative asked me questions that were personal and that made me uncomfortable.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree

14. Organizational representatives focused on gathering information that directly related to how well I would do on the job.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree

Process Control

15. During the recruitment process with this company, I had the opportunity to speak with company representatives concerning why I might be right for the job.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree

16. During the recruitment process with this company, I had ample opportunity to provide information about myself that could have influenced the company's job offer decision.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree

17. During the recruitment process with this company, I had the opportunity to persuade member(s) of the organization by fully presenting my position about my qualifications for the job.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree
Explanation of Procedures

18. During the recruitment process, company representatives provided a reasonable explanation for how a final selection decision would be made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. During the recruitment process, the company gave adequate reasons for how a job offer decision was to be made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpersonal Treatment During the Process

20. Organizational representatives were courteous to me during the recruitment process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Organizational representatives were friendly to me during the recruitment process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Organizational representatives were considerate of my feelings during the recruitment process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Time Waiting for Outcome

23. After my last contact with this company, this company was late in getting back to me concerning the news that I was rejected for this job.

\[
\text{Strongly Disagree} \quad \text{Strongly Agree}
\]

24. How long did you have to wait to hear about whether you were rejected or not from this company after the last time you were in contact with them?

1 week 2 weeks 3 weeks 4 weeks 5 weeks 6 weeks 7+ weeks

Open Ended Question Concerning the Process

25. In general, how did you feel about the recruitment process (use of resumes, interviews, on-site visits, tests, etc.) used by this company? Did they do anything that angered you? That pleased you? Be as specific as you can.

Fairness Variable Questions

Procedural Fairness

26. The recruitment process at this company was fair.

\[
\text{Strongly Disagree} \quad \text{Strongly Agree}
\]

27. This company uses fair procedures to conduct their recruitment process.

\[
\text{Strongly Disagree} \quad \text{Strongly Agree}
\]
Distributive Fairness

28. In my situation, the outcome (being rejected for the job) of this recruitment process was fair.

\[ \begin{array}{cccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\end{array} \]

Strongly Disagree \hspace{1cm} Strongly Agree

29. Applicants get the outcome (receiving a job offer or not) they deserve as a result of this company's recruitment process.

\[ \begin{array}{cccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\end{array} \]

Strongly Disagree \hspace{1cm} Strongly Agree

Rejection/Turn Down Variables

30. I very much wanted to work for this company.

\[ \begin{array}{cccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\end{array} \]

Strongly Disagree \hspace{1cm} Strongly Agree

31. Please circle the number that best corresponds to your feelings concerning the company that rejected you.

1. This company was extremely unattractive, I was not disappointed at all when they rejected me. Even if they would have made me an offer, there was no way I would have accepted.

2. This company was unattractive. I was not disappointed that they rejected me. I might have been able to work there, but I doubt it.

3. This company was unattractive. I was not that disappointed that they rejected me. I could have worked there, and maybe liked it, but things worked out for the best.

4. This company was neither attractive nor unattractive. I really had no feelings related to being rejected by this company.

5. This company was attractive, and it would have been OK to work there. I was a little disappointed when they turned me down.
6 This company was attractive, I would have liked to work there. I was somewhat disappointed when they turned me down.

7 This company was extremely attractive to me. I very much wanted to work for this company, and was very disappointed when they turned me down.

32. If this company were to contact me again about possible employment, I would go through the recruitment process with them again.

Strongly Disagree

Strongly Agree
STOP! PLEASE READ THE INSTRUCTIONS

Instructions: For the next questions you are about to read, please answer in regard to a company that YOU REJECTED for employment. In other words, think of one organization that YOU turned down for employment, and then recall the recruitment process (as described in the questions) you experienced with that organization. If you did not turn down an offer of employment, place the questionnaire in the envelope and mail.

Control Variables:

Please circle the number that best corresponds with your answer.

1. How many interviews did you complete before you rejected this job?
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11+

2. How many job offers did you receive before you rejected this particular firm?
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11+

3. How much work experience did you have going into your job search?
   ^---------^---------^---------^---------^---------^---------^
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   None at All Great Deal

Please check the appropriate box for the following questions.

4. For this job you rejected, were you required to fill out and submit an application blank?
   YES_______ NO_______

5. For this job you rejected, were you required to submit a resume?
   YES_______ NO_______

6. For this job you rejected, were you required to provide references?
   YES_______ NO_______

7. For this job you rejected, were you required to go through an interview?
   YES_______ NO_______
8. For this job you rejected, were you required to go on an on-site visit to the company?
   YES________ NO_______

9. For this job you rejected, were you required to take a pre-employment test?
   YES________ NO_______

   If yes, what type of test(s) were you required to take?
   _____ A Personality Test _____ A Drug Test
   _____ A Job-Related Test _____ An Honesty Test
   _____ Other (Please explain): ___________________________

10. The geographic location that the company was in was very important to me.

   ^---------^---------^---------^---------^---------^--------^  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly
   Disagree
   Strongly
   Agree

11. The salary this job paid (if you know) was very important to me.

   ^---------^---------^---------^---------^---------^--------^  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly
   Disagree
   Strongly
   Agree

Process Variable Questions

Job Relatedness

12. Organizational representatives asked me about issues that I could not connect to the job.

   ^---------^---------^---------^---------^---------^--------^  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly
   Disagree
   Strongly
   Agree

13. Organizational representative asked me questions that were personal and that made me uncomfortable.

   ^---------^---------^---------^---------^---------^--------^  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly
   Disagree
   Strongly
   Agree
14. Organizational representatives focused on gathering information that directly related to how well I would do on the job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Process Control**

15. During the selection process with this company, I had the opportunity to speak with company representatives concerning why I might be right for the job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. During the recruitment process with this company, I had ample opportunity to provide information about myself that could have influenced the company's job offer decision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. During the recruitment process with this company, I had the opportunity to persuade member(s) of the organization by fully presenting my position about my qualifications for the job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation of Procedures**

18. During the recruitment process, company representatives provided a reasonable explanation for how a final selection decision would be made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. During the recruitment process, the company gave adequate reasons for how a job offer decision was to be made.

| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Strongly Agree    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

Interpersonal Treatment During the Process

20. Organizational representatives were courteous to me during the recruitment process.

| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Strongly Agree    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

21. Organizational representatives were friendly to me during the recruitment process.

| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Strongly Agree    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

22. Organizational representatives were considerate of my feelings during the recruitment process.

| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Strongly Agree    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

Time Waiting for Outcome

23. After my last contact with this company, this company was late in getting back to me concerning the news that I was rejected for this job.

| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Strongly Agree    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
24. How long did you have to wait to hear about whether you were rejected or not from this company after the last time you were in contact with them?

1 week 2 weeks 3 weeks 4 weeks 5 weeks 6 weeks 7+ weeks

Open Ended Question Concerning the Process

25. In general, how did you feel about the recruitment process (use of resumes, interviews, on-site visits, tests, etc.) used by this company? Did they do anything that angered you? That pleased you? Be as specific as you can.

Fairness Variable Questions

Procedural Fairness

26. The recruitment process at this company was fair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. This company uses fair procedures to conduct their recruitment process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distributive Fairness

28. In my situation, the outcome (receiving a job offer) of this recruitment process was fair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Applicants get the outcome (receiving a job offer or not) they deserve as a result of this recruitment process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rejection/Turn Down Variables

30. I very much wanted to work for this company.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly Strongly
Disagree Agree

31. Please circle the number that best corresponds to your feelings concerning the company you rejected.

1 This company seemed so unattractive that there was no way I would accept a job offer from them.

2 This company was very unattractive. I would have accepted only if no other company had made me an offer.

3 This company was unattractive. It was not as bad as some other companies that recruited me, but there were other companies that were more attractive.

4 This company was neither attractive nor unattractive. I can't give a good reason for my rejection of this company.

5 This company was attractive, but I had many job offers and this company did not compare to those other offers.

6 This company was attractive, but I had one other job offer that was even more attractive.

7 This company was very attractive to me. I did not want to turn them down, but circumstances out of my control forced me to.

32. If this company were to contact me again about possible employment, I would go through the recruitment process with them again.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly Strongly
Disagree Agree
Interview Questions

Instructions: For the next questions I am about to ask you, please answer in regard to a company that (REJECTED YOU/YOU REJECTED) for employment. In other words, think of one organization that (YOU turned down/TURNED YOU down) for employment, and then recall the recruitment process (as described in the questions) you experienced with that organization.

Job Relatedness

1. During the recruitment process with this company, did an organizational representative ask you any questions that you thought were non-job related? Strange or inappropriate? (If yes:) How did that make you feel? Did it concern you?

Process Control

2. Do you think you had the opportunity to influence the decision that was made about you? If yes, how? If no, why?

Explanation of Procedures

3. Did organizational representatives explain to you how a final interview decision would be made concerning you? What types of information did they give you concerning this?

Interpersonal Treatment

4. Did the organization treat you well interpersonally during this process? Explain.

Time Waiting for an Outcome

5. Was this company late in getting back to you after the last phase of recruitment? If "yes": What assumptions did you make about why they weren't getting back to you? How did this delay make you feel?

Process in General

6. In general, how did you feel about the recruitment process (use of resumes, interviews, on-site visits, tests, etc.) used by this company? Did they do anything that angered you? That pleased you? Be as specific as you can.
Procedural Fairness

7. Overall, would you say that the procedures used to make a selection decision about you at this company were fair? Explain why in as much detail as possible.

Distributive Fairness

8. Was the outcome you received from the recruitment process at this company (receiving a job offer) fair? Why/Why not?