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Specific dimensions of perceived procedural justice of selection procedures have been found to be related to various organizational outcomes in many correlational studies. In the present study, a total of 506 Israeli young men and women in two waves of data collection (Wave 1: N = 277; Wave 2: N = 229) rated the perceived selection procedural justice of preconscription military selection procedures for elite military jobs immediately after participation in these procedures and prior to receiving results. Confirmatory factor analysis provided support for Bauer et al.'s (2001) three-dimensional model of selection procedural justice: structural, social, and content job-relatedness. In Wave 2, the influence of selection procedural justice dimensions on perceptions of overall procedural selection justice, job attractiveness, and recommendation intention was tested. After controlling for preparticipation levels of these variables, the interpersonal aspect of selection justice was found to have a unique influence on postparticipation levels of all outcome measures.

During the past few years, organizational justice has joined job satisfaction, work motivation, and decision making as one of the major determinants of work attitudes, decisions, and behaviours. Organizational justice has become one of the central concepts of the psychology of work and organizations and one of the most prolific areas of research in the field of organizational psychology (Gilliland & Chan, 2001). One of the major issues...
in the field of organizational justice research focuses on the relationship between organizational justice and various outcome measures such as organizational citizenship behaviours (e.g., Ball, Trevino, & Sims, 1994) and organizational commitment (e.g., Lowe & Vodanovich, 1995). The present investigation addresses this issue in the context of a real-life military selection process in Israel and the influence of selection justice measures upon various organizational outcome measures was examined after controlling for preparticipation levels of these measures.

The roots of modern organizational justice theory can be found in equity theory (Adams, 1965). At first, organizational justice theory was concerned exclusively with distributive justice, i.e., the perceived fairness of outcomes. Later researchers found that workers were concerned not only with the fairness of the distributive aspects of organizational decisions but with the fairness or justice of the procedures associated with and leading to these decisions as well. This basic distinction between distributive and procedural organizational justice is widely accepted in the literature (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). A later development concerning the structure of organizational justice was initiated by Bies and Moag (1986), who distinguished between the interpersonal or interactional aspects of procedural organizational justice and more structural justice aspects of organizational procedures. More recently, various aspects of information concerning organizational procedures and decisions, such as the completeness of information provided about organizational procedures or the timeliness of information concerning organizational decisions, have been identified as a fourth dimension of organizational justice (Colquitt, 2001; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997).

**SELECTION JUSTICE**

An additional advance in the field of organizational justice has been the development of domain-specific measures and models of organizational justice (Gilliland & Chan, 2001). Gilliland (1993) proposed a 10-rule framework for the perceived procedural justice of selection processes that has been identified as the most comprehensive conceptualization of applicants’ perceptions of selection system fairness (Chan & Schmitt, 2004; Elkins & Phillips, 2000). On the basis of this framework, Bauer et al. (2001) developed a measure of perceived procedural justice for selection systems called the Selection Procedural Justice Scale (SPJS). Although providing general support for the Gilliland framework of selection justice, as a result of subsequent exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, Bauer et al. concluded that one of Gilliland’s 10 rules of selection justice, job-relatedness, should be split into two separate rules—*predictive job-relatedness* and *content job-relatedness*—resulting in an 11-rule framework.
In addition, Bauer et al. found that these 11 rules give rise to the following three-factor structure of selection procedural justice: *structure*, including the formal and explanatory aspects of selection justice such as (1) predictive job-relatedness, (2) opportunity to perform, (3) reconsideration opportunity, (4) openness of the selection administrators, (5) extent to which information about the selection system is known, (6) extent to which information derived from the selection process, such as results, is made known; *social*, including all interpersonal aspects such as (7) consistency of test administration, (8) test-site treatment of applicants, (9) communication between applicants and selection procedure administrators, (10) propriety of information requested from the applicant; and *content job-relatedness*, a single-indicator dimension. It should be noted that in comparison to the three widely accepted dimensions of procedural justice (e.g., Colquitt, 2001)—structural or formal, interpersonal or interactive, explanatory or informational—the Bauer et al. model of selection justice groups structural and explanatory aspects together on a single dimension and is unique in regard to its third dimension of content job-relatedness. This unique model of selection procedural justice will be tested in the present investigation.

**SELECTION JUSTICE AND OUTCOME VARIABLES**

Recently, research focusing on the relation between the perceived fairness of selection systems and applicant reactions has increased (Bauer et al., 2001). In their seven-area construct-oriented agenda for research on applicant reactions to selection procedures, Chan and Schmitt (2004) identified justice principles as one of the four major determinants of applicant reactions. For many job applicants, the initial contact with an organization is by means of the selection process. Therefore, the perceived fairness of the selection process might be expected to affect an applicant’s perceptions of the organization as a whole (Elkins & Phillips, 2000). Hausknecht, Day, and Thomas (2004) have proposed an updated model of applicant reactions to selection procedures in which applicant justice perceptions play a central role. They list five possible results of applicants’ negative reactions to selection procedures, which indicate the importance of studying and understanding these reactions: loss of promising candidates, dissuasion of potential candidates by the applicant, influence on the likeliness of job offer acceptance, probability of taking legal action, and the likelihood of future interaction with the company such as reapplication or purchasing the company’s products. Indeed, statistically significant relations between applicant reactions to selection procedures and a variety of important organizational variables have been uncovered in a number of empirical investigations. For example, Robertson, Iles, Gratton, and Sharples (1991) found a relation between applicants’ perceived fairness of selection
procedures and the level of their organizational commitment and their intentions to leave. Gilliland (1994) found a positive relation between selection procedural justice and the likelihood of applicants recommending the organization to others as a place of work or endorsing the organization’s products. The perception of selection fairness has been shown to be related to job offer acceptance (Singer, 1993), work attitudes and work performance (Gilliland, 1994), and to perceptions of organizational attractiveness (Bauer, Maertz, Dolen, & Campion, 1998). Bauer et al. (2001) have suggested that organizations may be able to influence an applicant’s perceptions of selection procedures and thereby influence their perceptions of the hiring process as a whole. However, Gilliland and Hale (2005) have recently pointed out the limits of selection justice’s impact and noted that the research does not support the notion that these perceptions influence employee attitudes after hiring. On the basis of an overview of the research literature, Truxillo, Steiner, and Gilliland (2004) caution that the influence of selection justice on organizational attractiveness may decrease over time and that the relation between selection justice and recommendation intention is at best equivocal.

It should be noted that essentially all of the research in this area is based on the assumption, sometimes implicit and sometimes explicit, of directional causality. The foundations for this assumption can found in the seminal work of Gilliland (1993), who suggested that selection justice perceptions, and in particular procedural justice perceptions, influence such individual outcomes as application recommendations and the decision to accept a job offer. More recent models of applicant reactions (Hausknecht et al., 2004; Ryan & Ployhart, 2000), which developed on the foundation of Gilliland’s model, also assume that applicant perceptions of various characteristics of the selection process help form applicant attitudes towards the job and the organization. However, although it is reasonable to assume that the experience of a fair or unfair selection procedure does indeed help to shape the degree of the organization’s attractiveness in the eye of the applicant, it is also reasonable to assume that the preparticipation organizational attractiveness may help to shape the degree of perceived selection justice (see Bauer et al., 1998; Hausknecht et al., 2004; Macan, Avedon, Paese, & Smith, 1994). Concerning preparticipation attitudes, Bell, Ryan, and Wiechmann (2004) offer a comprehensive model of the direct and mediated influence of justice expectations based on direct experiences, existing beliefs, and indirect experiences on outcome measures such as postparticipation justice perceptions, affects and attitudes, and behaviours. For example, they suggest that individuals who expect justice violations in the selection procedure may indeed be more likely to take notice of such instances. Such reasoning stresses the importance of taking preparticipation attitudes into account when examining the influences of specific selection justice
dimensions on overall postparticipation procedural justice. However, only a small number of investigations have attempted to examine the causality of perceptions of selection justice on outcome measures in real-life selection procedures by controlling for preparticipation levels of these measures (e.g., Bauer et al., 1998; Truxillo, Bauer, Campion, & Paronto, 2002). It should be noted that these studies focused on selection procedures that included a minimal amount of interpersonal interaction, such as written and video employment tests, and it is not clear if their results can be generalized to selection procedures that include more dynamic interpersonal aspects such as interviews and simulations. In addition, in both of these studies only the formal and explanatory aspects of selection justice were stressed. In the Bauer et al. study only one rule associated with the interpersonal aspects of selection justice was included; in the Truxillo et al. study only structural and informational selection justice perceptions were included.

In addition to the question of causality, two important methodological limitations can be found in many of the investigations dealing with the purported influence of selection justice on organizational outcome measures. First, many of these investigations are based on perceptions of selection justice measured after receiving feedback which most probably has an influence on these perceptions (Brockner & Wiesenfeld, 1996; Ployhart & Ryan, 1997). However, selection justice perceptions at the prefeedback stage in the employment process would seem to be of particular importance for an applicant’s career decisions. If, due to low prefeedback selection justice, an applicant decides that the organization is unattractive, it would be reasonable to assume that this perception would influence his or her decision to accept or reject that organization’s job offer. In a similar manner, prefeedback selection justice would probably influence an applicant’s decision to recommend, not to recommend, or to recommend against the organization to a friend. In the latter case, even if the applicant’s perceptions change at a later stage after receiving positive feedback, the damage to that organization’s reputation as a potential employer will already have been made. Although it would seem to be important to test the influences of selection justice on organizational attractiveness before any possible influences of selection process outcomes on these perceptions, van Vianen, Taris, Scholten, and Schinkel (2004) have pointed out the void of empirical investigations of selection organizational justice prior to receiving results.

A second limitation of much of the research in selection justice is due to the fact that many investigations have been carried out in simulated selection procedures that lack the ego involvement that is so central to real-life job selection procedures. The limitations of laboratory research settings and the problems of generalizing results from such simulations to actual
real-life organizational selection procedures have been noted by a number of researchers (Elkins & Phillips, 2000; Greenberg, 1990; Ployhart & Ryan, 1997). However, only a limited number of studies concerning perceptions of selection justice have used actual job applicants (see van Vianen et al., 2004).

The goal of the present research was to extend this vein of research and enhance our understanding of the influence of selection justice on organizational attractiveness by addressing some of these limitations. First, the multidimensional Bauer et al. (2001) model of selection procedural justice, which includes an interpersonal dimension, was used and tested. As recommended by a number of researchers in the field of selection justice, this investigation was performed on applicants participating in a real-life selection procedures. All of these procedures included significant interpersonal interactions aspects such as interviews. Most importantly, the outcome measures were collected both prior to participation in the selection process as well as immediately after participation, but before receiving feedback, to enable a more direct examination of the influence of selection justice perceptions on these measures at the postparticipation stage.

**METHOD**

**Research participants**

A total of 506 Israeli young men and women participating in preconscription military selection procedures for voluntary ground forces military jobs took part in the study. Data was collected in two waves (Wave 1: \( N = 277 \); Wave 2: \( N = 229 \)). All of the research participants had finished mandatory military general classification and selection procedures performed in conscription centres. On the basis of these basic procedures, applicants received notification of their eligibility for various clusters of military jobs. After indicating their desire to serve in specific army tasks, these applicants were later summoned to participate in more specific selection procedures for these jobs. Three hundred and seventy-nine females participated in selection procedures for a cluster of lucrative female combat jobs. One hundred and twenty-seven males participated in selection procedures for élite combat units. The age of the research participants ranged from 17 to 19 years. The restricted range of age was due to the fact that the preconscription military classification and selection procedures usually take place when Israeli youths are in the 12th grade.

The measures and procedures used in the two waves of data collection differed in a number of ways. In Wave 1, a number of items were omitted from the SPJS due to various organizational constraints such as overall questionnaire length, and one item was omitted from the analysis due to translation problems. In the second wave of data collection these problems
were corrected. In addition, in the first wave of data collection only postparticipation measures were collected, whereas in the second wave both preparticipation and postparticipation outcome measures of organizational attractiveness and overall selection procedural justice were used. Therefore, for the purposes of testing the Bauer et al. (2001) model of selection procedural justice, the corresponding items from both waves were combined and used. For purposes of examining the contribution of selection justice to the prediction of the outcome measures after controlling for preparticipation levels of these measures, only data collected in Wave 2 was used, including the improved version of the SPJS. Therefore the measures and procedures for each wave of data collection are presented separately.

Wave 1: Model testing

Measures. The Selection Procedural Justice Scale (SPJS), developed by Bauer et al. (2001), consists of 39 items providing 11 subscales. Items were translated into Hebrew and then back-translated into English. For all items a 5-point Likert response scale was used, ranging from 1 (“completely disagree”) to 5 (“completely agree”). Scores on all measures were calculated by averaging responses from relevant items resulting in scores ranging from 1 (low) to 5 (high). In the present investigation 26 items were included provided the following nine subscale scores: predictive job-relatedness (2 items, \( r = .34 \)), content job-relatedness (2 items, \( r = .67 \)), information known (2 items, \( r = .77 \)), opportunity to perform (3 items, \( \alpha = .87 \)), consistency (3 items, \( \alpha = .71 \)), openness (4 items, \( \alpha = .80 \)), treatment (5 items, \( \alpha = .88 \)), two-way communication (4 items, \( \alpha = .81 \)), and propriety (1 item).

Procedure. All research participants were taking part in the selection processes for various voluntary special combat jobs. These 1-day processes included a variety of selection procedures such as field exercises, cognitive ability tests, personality tests, and interviews. Immediately at the conclusion of these procedures, and before receiving any type of feedback, the research participants received the research questionnaire together with other standard questionnaires and forms. The instructions appearing on the research instrument stressed the anonymity of the questionnaire and the fact that their responses would in no way affect the results of the selection procedure. No names or identity numbers were written on the forms. However, since the research instrument was presented as part of the overall procedure, virtually all of the participants in the selection procedure completed the research questionnaire and placed them in a receptacle upon exiting the selection site.
Wave 2: Prediction of outcome measures

Measures. Again SPJS was used. After correcting for translation problems uncovered in Wave 1 and including omitted items, the 31 items included in Wave 2 provided the following 10 subscales: predictive job-relatedness (2 items, \( r = .49 \)), content job-relatedness (2 items, \( r = .71 \)), information known (2 items, \( r = .83 \)), opportunity to perform (4 items, \( z = .91 \)), consistency (3 items, \( z = .73 \)), openness (4 items, \( z = .81 \)), treatment (5 items, \( z = .87 \)), two-way communication (5 items, \( z = .84 \)), propriety (2 items, \( r = .38 \)), and feedback (2 items, \( r = .71 \)).

Participants responded to the following three outcome measures both prior to participating in the selection process (Time 1) as well as immediately after participation (Time 2). These brief measures were similar to those used in the Bauer et al. (2001) study and were chosen to allow for comparison of results. All items were translated into Hebrew and then back-translated into English. For all items a 5-point Likert response scale was used, ranging from 1 (“completely disagree”) to 5 (“completely agree”). Scores on all measures were calculated by averaging responses from relevant items resulting in scores ranging from 1 (low) to 5 (high).

Overall procedural justice was measured by three items (e.g., “Overall, in my opinion, this selection procedure is a fair way of selecting people for the job”). The Cronbach reliability coefficient for this measure was .78 for preparticipation and .79 for postparticipation.

One aspect of organizational attractiveness is the intention to recommend joining the organization to others—the recommendation intention. This aspect was measured by two items (e.g., “I would recommend this job to my friends”). The Pearson correlation between the items for the preparticipation measure was \( r = .86 \) and \( r = .80 \) for the postparticipation measure. A second aspect of organizational attractiveness measured in this study is a direct assessment of job attractiveness and this was measured by one item, “The job that I am being tested for is a good one”.

Procedure. The procedure was identical to that described in Wave 1 with two exceptions. First, together with preprocedure form filling, research participants responded to the measures of organizational attractiveness and overall selection justice before participating in the selection procedure (Time 1). In addition, in order to match preprocedure and postprocedure ratings, the research participants were directed to write their identity number on the forms. It was explained to the participants that the army is interested in improving its selection procedures and is therefore collecting the reactions of participants to various aspects of these procedures. It was stressed that their responses would in no way affect the results of the selection procedure. Immediately at the conclusion
of these procedures research participants received the SPJS and the outcome measures (Time 2).

RESULTS
The combined responses of the 506 research participants from Wave 1 and Wave 2 were subjected to confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using the AMOS Version 5.0.1 (Arbuckle, 2003) program. The results of the CFA indicate that the Bauer et al. (2001) model, although having a statistically significant chi-square, $\chi^2 = 97.57$, $df = 25$, $p < .01$, demonstrated an acceptable goodness-of-fit (CFI = .95, Bentler, 1990; SRMR = .06; Bentler, 1995) for Hu and Bentler’s (1999) stringent two-index cutoff strategy. According to this strategy, a model is supported if an incremental index is close to .95 and the absolute SRMR index is close to .06. For purposes of comparison, a unidimensional model of selection justice in which all aspects of selection are assigned to a single factor, was also tested. The results of the CFA for this model indicate an unacceptable goodness-of-fit, $\chi^2 = 341.91$, $df = 27$, $p < .01$; CFI = .86, SRMR = .11, and that the multidimensional Bauer et al. model is clearly superior to a unidimensional model.

In order to examine the relations between the measures of selection justice and the outcome measures for Wave 2 participants, all measure scores were calculated by averaging relevant scale items. The means, standard deviations and Pearson bivariate correlations for all study variables are presented in Table 1.

The correlations between the outcome measures ranged between .43 to .71 for the preparticipation measures and between .38 to .54 for the postparticipation measures, indicating the relative independency of these measures. It is interesting to note that while the relation between the two measures of organizational attractiveness preparticipation was rather high ($r = .71$), after participating in the selection procedure this correlation was much lower ($r = .36$). The independency of the three measures of selection justice is also indicated by the pattern of correlations between them, ranging between .35 to .53.

All measures of selection justice significantly correlated positively with postparticipation measures of overall selection procedural justice ($r = .47$ to $r = .64$), job attractiveness ($r = .20$ to $r = .41$), and recommendation intention ($r = .23$ to $r = .41$) in accordance with Gilliland’s (1993) theorizing and in a fashion similar to that reported by Bauer et al. (2001). Due to the similarity of domain between the specific selection justice measures and the overall selection justice measure, the higher correlations between these measures than with the measures of organizational attractiveness are not surprising. It can also be pointed out that for all outcome measures, the social selection justice dimension demonstrated the strongest correlations.
In order to explore the influence of selection justice relations on overall procedural selection justice and organizational attractiveness, these measures were regressed onto the three selection justice scale scores using hierarchical multiple regression. In all of these analyses, the appropriate Time 1 measure was entered on the first step in order to statistically control for preparticipation levels of the outcome measures. Time 2 structural and social selection justice perceptions measures were entered on the second step. Finally, in order to ascertain the possible unique contribution of content job-relatedness to the prediction of the outcome measures, this variable was entered on the third step. A summary of the regression results is presented in Table 2.

From the results presented in Table 2 it can be seen that the predictions of all postparticipation outcome variables were statistically significant, ranging from $R^2 = .26$ for job attractiveness to $R^2 = .57$ for perceived overall procedural justice. For all models, the specific justice measures entered on Step 2 contributed significantly ($\Delta R^2 = .08 - .22$) to the prediction of the outcome measures after controlling for preparticipation levels of these measures entered on Step 1. In addition, content job-relatedness had a small but significant contribution to the prediction of postparticipation overall selection procedural justice above and beyond the contributions of the structural and social aspects of selection justice ($\Delta R^2 = .03$). It can also be seen from Table 2 that social selection justice had a significant contribution to the prediction of all outcome measures ($\beta = .26 - .39$) and that this...


TABLE 2

Hierarchical regression of justice measures on outcome measures at Time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Overall procedural justice</th>
<th>Job attractiveness</th>
<th>Recommendation intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Time 1 perception</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>104.95 (1, 228)**</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparticipation outcome measure</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Time 2 justice</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>86.50 (3, 228)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Time 2 justice</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.03**</td>
<td>73.38 (4, 228)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beta coefficients are for the final step.

*p < .05, **p < .01.
contribution was stronger in comparison with the other aspects of selection justice. In the prediction of job attractiveness and overall selection procedural justice this contribution was stronger than for the Time 1 measures as well. These results clearly indicate the importance of the interpersonal aspects of selection justice in predicting important organizational outcome measures even after controlling for preparticipation levels of these measures.

**DISCUSSION**

This study focused on the influence of the three dimensions of perceived procedural selection justice in the Bauer et al. (2001) model on organizational outcome variables such as overall selection procedural justice, job attractiveness, and recommendation intention. The relations uncovered here between the three dimensions in the Bauer et al. model, which demonstrated acceptable levels of goodness-of-fit, and the outcome measures provide general support for Gilliland’s (1993) assumptions concerning the influence of specific aspects of selection justice on overall perceptions of procedural selection justice as well as on organizational attractiveness. However, the singular influence of the social or interpersonal aspects of selection justice on these measures was striking and somewhat surprising. In the Bauer et al. (2001) study, the social dimension was found to have the smallest contribution to overall perceived selection procedural justice, and to be of similar importance as the structural dimension in predicting recommendation intentions. In their study the social dimension had a singular contribution only in predicting job attractiveness. In comparison, in the present study the social dimension had the strongest contribution to overall selection procedural justice and was the only dimension with a significant contribution to the prediction of recommendation intention and job attractiveness.

Why was the interpersonal aspect of the selection justice found to be so important in the present study? One possible explanation is based on the agent–system model presented by Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, and Taylor (2000). According to this model, exchanges with an employee’s immediate supervisor lead to changes in supervisor-referenced outcomes whereas exchanges with the greater organization lead to changes in organization-referenced outcomes. In accordance with this model, these researchers found that interactional justice, i.e., an exchange with the supervisor, was related to organizational citizenship behaviours directed at the supervisor (agent oriented), whereas structural or formal aspects of procedural justice, i.e., an exchange with the organization, were related to behaviours on the organizational level such as organizational commitment (system oriented). Additional support for this agent–system model was provided by Colquitt et al.’s (2001) meta-analysis. Although measures of organizational attractiveness were not included in the Masterson et al. study, these measures
would assumingly be categorized as system-oriented outcomes. Accordingly, it would be expected that measures of organizational attractiveness would be influenced by structural justice perceptions rather than by interactional justice perceptions. However, the research participants in this study were at the preconscription stage and were not yet part of the military organization. For these youths, selection procedure administrators are, at this stage, the organization. In addition, since there is no ongoing relationship between the selection participants and the selection process administrators, as there is between managers and workers in organizations, no supervisor-referenced outcomes are salient. In other words, in this particular setting, there may be only "system" with no "agent". Therefore, in such a situation, even interactional justice would be expected to influence measures of organizational attractiveness.

It is possible to offer additional possible explanations regarding the importance of the interpersonal aspects of selection justice found in this study in comparison with the Bauer et al. (2001) findings. For example, the interpersonal face-to-face interactions in the selection procedures used here, which included both panel interviews and multirater field exercises, may have been more intense than in the Bauer et al. study and therefore the interpersonal aspects of selection justice may have been more salient. In addition, differences between the Israeli sample and the American sample on cultural variables such as an individualistic and collectivistic orientation (Hofstede, 1980) may have been important in moderating the relations between organizational justice perceptions and outcome measures (see Lam, Schaubroeck, & Aryee, 2002). Of course, these explanations are only conjecture and future research on job applicants at the prefeedback stage should examine these issues more closely.

In the present study justice perceptions were collected immediately after the conclusion of the selection procedure and before the candidates received any feedback of procedure results. This research strategy allowed for a cleaner measurement of selection procedural justice, not being influenced by distributive aspects of the selection procedure. In addition, depending on the amount of time until receiving results, the influence of selection justice during the prefeedback period may be very important regarding the candidate’s tendency to recommend the organization to a friend or to accept a final job offer at a later stage. It is therefore recommended that future research measure selection justice at this stage in of the selection procedure. However, since most investigations in the field of selection justice focus on the final perceptions of selection justice after receiving results, future research should include the postfeedback stage as well.

An additional limitation of this study concerns the lack of anonymity in the second wave of data collection. It would seem to be naive to believe that an applicant in a real-life selection procedure, who has not yet been accepted
to the job he or she desires, would be willing to candidly criticize various aspects of the selection process (including the actions of the selection administrators who have not as yet processed his or her application!). This would seem to be of a nature above and beyond simple social desirability concerns. In any case, it is recommended that future research deal with the issue of how such concerns may affect applicant responses.

Regarding the longitudinal approach of this investigation, although preparticipation levels of organizational attractiveness were statistically controlled for, the influence of selection justice in general, and the social aspects in particular, on postparticipation perceptions of organizational attractiveness was based on measures collected at the same time. In future research, levels of interpersonal selection justice should be experimentally manipulated in order to allow for a better examination of the direct influences of selection justice on various organizational outcomes.

Finally, the outcome measures used here were similar to those used in the Bauer et al. (2001) investigation in order to allow a direct comparison of the results. However, the measures of organizational attractiveness were limited to two specific facets of this construct—direct job attractiveness and recommendation intentions. Future research should use a wider range of organizational attractiveness measures that include reference not only to the job, as was the case here, but also to the organization itself (e.g., Ployhart, Ryan, & Bennett, 1999). In addition, most research in this area use measures of behavioural intentions rather than measures of real subsequent behaviours (Chan & Schmitt, 2004) or “soft outcomes” as opposed to “hard outcomes” according to Truxillo et al.’s (2004) terminology. It is recommended here that additional research in the field of selection justice and applicant reactions be performed using behavioural measures or at least the self-report of such behaviours.

On the basis of their study which included the manipulation of explanatory selection justice, Truxillo et al. (2002) recommended providing applicants with more information concerning the selection procedure as a “simple and inexpensive approach” to influence perceived selection justice. In a similar manner, we suggest training selection procedure administrators to be aware of the various elements of interpersonal selection justice and to make sure that “justice must be seen to be done” by the applicants in order to enhance perceptions of both overall selection procedural justice as well as job attractiveness, recommendation intention and resulting behaviour.
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