

# DIGITALES ARCHIV

ZBW – Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft  
ZBW – Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Aouam, Hamza; Belmouffeq, Bouchra

## Article

# Fairness reactions to personnel selection techniques in Morocco

Management dynamics in the knowledge economy

## Provided in Cooperation with:

National University of Political Studies and Public Administration, Bucharest

*Reference:* Aouam, Hamza/Belmouffeq, Bouchra (2024). Fairness reactions to personnel selection techniques in Morocco. In: Management dynamics in the knowledge economy 12 (3/45), S. 221 - 240.

<https://www.managementdynamics.ro/index.php/journal/article/download/593/500/2841>.

doi:10.2478/mdke-2024-0014.

This Version is available at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11159/703104>

## Kontakt/Contact

ZBW – Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft/Leibniz Information Centre for Economics  
Düsternbrooker Weg 120  
24105 Kiel (Germany)  
E-Mail: [rights\[at\]zbw.eu](mailto:rights[at]zbw.eu)  
<https://www.zbw.eu/econis-archiv/>

## Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieses Dokument darf zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen. Sofern für das Dokument eine Open-Content-Lizenz verwendet wurde, so gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.



<https://zbw.eu/econis-archiv/termsofuse>

## Terms of use:

*This document may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes. You are not to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public. If the document is made available under a Creative Commons Licence you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the licence.*

# Fairness Reactions to Personnel Selection Techniques in Morocco

Hamza AOUAM<sup>1</sup>, Bouchra BELMOUFFEQ<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Faculty of Law, Economic and Social Sciences of Ain Sebaa, Beausite, BP. 2634 Ain Sebaa - 2634, Casablanca, MA; [id hamza.aouam-etu@etu.univh2c.ma](mailto:hamza.aouam-etu@etu.univh2c.ma) (corresponding author)

<sup>2</sup> The Faculty of Law, Economic and Social Sciences of Ain Sebaa, Beausite, BP. 2634 Ain Sebaa - 2634, Casablanca, MA; [id belmouffeq@yahoo.fr](mailto:belmouffeq@yahoo.fr)

**Abstract:** Candidate reactions represent a pressing contemporary subject, with heightened expectations for favorable treatment from companies during recruitment. Negative encounters adversely affect employer branding and candidate attraction. Thus, meticulously cultivating the candidate experience is imperative. This research examines the responses of candidates to various hiring methods in Morocco. A total of 244 job seekers rated the favorability and fairness of selection methods, including interviews, resumes, work-sample tests, biographical information blanks, written ability tests, personal references, personality tests, honesty tests, graphology, and personal contacts. Moroccan job seekers completed an online questionnaire, and data were analyzed using IBM SPSS. The snowball sampling method was employed, with participants initially identified on LinkedIn. Our primary objective is to assess the prevalence of the ten selection procedures used in Morocco and examine candidates' favorability towards these approaches. Within-subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA) evaluated differences in candidates' responses to the selection methods. Applicants expressed the most positive responses towards résumés, work-sample tests, interviews, and personality tests, while graphology, references, and biographical information were the least favorable. Regarding procedural justice, applicants rated frequency of use, predictive validity, opportunity to perform, employer's rights, and face validity most positively, while interpersonal warmth and invasion of privacy were least valued. However, this study faced several limitations. The cross-sectional design hindered robust causal inferences, and reliance on single-item measures for procedural fairness and organizational outcomes limited our findings' depth. Generalizing results to the broader Moroccan population requires caution due to potential regional and sectoral variations. While snowball sampling increased the sample size, it precluded response rate calculation. Practical implications and future research perspectives are also highlighted.

**Keywords:** selection methods; candidates; favorability; fairness perceptions; procedural justice; organizational outcomes; Morocco.

Received: March 20, 2024  
Revised: May 8, 2024  
Accepted: June 18, 2024  
Published: September 25, 2024

## Introduction

In a dynamic and fiercely competitive landscape, organizations are acutely aware of the significance of the candidate experience as it pertains to the relationship between the two parties. Candidates who have had such experiences may develop favorable perceptions of the organizations and, as a result, be more inclined to engage in subsequent activities such as recommending them to colleagues or friends, investing in them, becoming clients, or expressing interest in becoming future candidates (Hausknecht, Day, & Thomas, 2004). On the contrary, candidates who have encountered unfavorable treatment will not hesitate to endorse the organization to other prospects. Instead, they will vent their discontent on career portals, social media platforms, and online directories such as Glassdoor. This practice will inevitably harm the organization's employer brand (Miles & McCamey, 2018). Glassdoor is an online platform where current and former employees can anonymously review companies and their management, providing insights into company culture, salaries, and interview experiences. In order to meet their expectations,

## How to cite

Aouam, H., & Belmouffeq, B. (2024). Fairness Reactions to Personnel Selection Techniques in Morocco. *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy*, 12(3), 221-240. DOI 10.2478/mdke-2024-0014

ISSN: 2392-8042 (online)

[www.managementdynamics.ro](http://www.managementdynamics.ro)

<https://content.sciendo.com/view/journals/mdke/mdke-overview.xml>

organizations are compelled to closely monitor candidates' responses and perceptions of justice; thus, it is necessary to analyze candidates' responses in various contexts.

In the area of personnel selection methods in Morocco, there is a considerable gap in our knowledge of how job seekers perceive and respond to the multiplicity of strategies deployed by businesses. The lack of comprehensive information on perceptions of favorability and fairness of selection methods such as interviews, *résumés*, work-sample tests, biographical information blanks, written ability tests, personal references, personality tests, honesty tests, graphology, and personal contacts hinders the optimization of recruitment processes in the Moroccan context.

While a limited body of literature addresses candidates' reactions to selection methods, Morocco's unique cultural and organizational context calls for a specific study. The problem identified focuses on the need to fill this knowledge gap and identify the degree of preponderance of these ten selection methods based on the Moroccan jobseekers' experiences. In addition, understanding the favorability ratings given by applicants to these techniques is crucial to adapting selection processes to the expectations and preferences of the Moroccan workforce.

The exploration of the opinions of Moroccan candidates within the framework of our study originates from observations made on social networks such as LinkedIn, Facebook, and Glassdoor, which have been the subject of numerous criticisms regarding the selection methods used by companies in Morocco. Candidates regularly express their discontent regarding the relevance and effectiveness of these methods, which has sparked our interest in this subject. The desire to explore these opinions stems from the recognition of their importance for several reasons. Firstly, candidates' observations on social networks provide a direct and immediate insight into their experiences in the recruitment and selection process, which can be extremely informative for companies. Secondly, by understanding candidates' frustrations and concerns, it becomes possible to identify areas where improvements are needed, thus contributing to the optimization of recruitment and selection practices.

This study has three main contributions that constitute our contribution to the scientific community. First, the study of candidates' reactions remains unexplored in the Maghreb countries (Morocco, Algeria, Libya, Tunisia, and Mauritania), which led us to conduct this research in the Moroccan context. The aim is to fill the scientific gap in the context of the study. Secondly, the study of applicants' reactions and justice perceptions is still expanding, and researchers are constantly asking future researchers to conduct further research on other contexts not yet explored (Anderson et al., 2012; Hassan et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2016; McCarthy, Bauer, Truxillo, Anderson, Costa, & Ahmed, 2017). The study population also represents an element of originality to be taken into account since previous studies sought to examine applicants' reactions with a sample composed of university students. This sample group does not allow for an explicit understanding of candidates' feelings as students have never experienced job search compared to candidates who are actively searching for a job (Anderson, 2003; Hoang et al., 2012; Jónsdóttir & Hafsteinsson, 2008; Zibarras, 2018). Thirdly, this research work will allow us to compare the results of our study with those of other studies that have examined applicants' reactions and perceptions of favorability towards selection methods.

In addition to our contributions outlined above, this study aims to achieve several specific objectives. Firstly, we seek to investigate the degree of familiarity of Moroccan applicants with ten selection methods commonly employed in organizational recruitment processes. By examining the extent to which applicants are acquainted with these methods, we aim to shed light on their awareness and understanding of traditional selection practices. Secondly, we aim to assess the favorability of Moroccan candidates towards these ten selection techniques, exploring their perceptions of the efficacy, fairness, and appropriateness of each method. This assessment will provide valuable insights into candidates' preferences and attitudes towards different selection approaches, thereby

informing recruitment strategies and practices. Lastly, we endeavor to explore the influence of applicants' perceptions on organizational outcomes, such as intention to recommend; attractiveness of the organization; intention to sue. By investigating how candidates' perceptions of selection methods impact these outcomes, we aim to uncover the potential implications for organizational success and effectiveness in talent acquisition and retention strategies.

In the field of personnel selection, understanding applicants' reactions to different methods is essential to designing effective and fair recruitment processes. This study focuses on the Moroccan context, examining jobseekers' perceptions of ten distinct selection techniques. Guided by a practical framework, our research not only provides empirical evidence but also extends the applicability of the model to a unique cultural context (Steiner & Gilliland, 1996). As organizations increasingly adopt global recruitment strategies, the need to adapt established models to diverse contexts becomes evident. Our proposal invites academics and practitioners to consider the practical implications of Steiner and Gilliland's model in the multicultural landscape, calling for a reassessment of personnel selection strategies to align with the dimensions of equity and justice emphasized by the model. This early integration of a proven theoretical framework paves the way for an exploration of candidate reactions and their theoretical implications, offering an overview of the dynamic interplay between established models and cultural nuances in personnel selection. The purpose of this comparative analysis is to ascertain whether the favorable attitudes towards Moroccan candidates are consistent with the results of other research endeavors or distinctive to each country.

In this study, we aim to investigate the perceptions of applicants towards various selection methods and their association with procedural justice dimensions and important outcomes. To guide our investigation, we have formulated the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: We predict that applicant favorability perceptions will vary across different selection methods, with interviews, résumés, and work-sample tests eliciting the strongest favorability perceptions and references, biography, and graphology generating the weakest favorability perceptions.

Hypothesis 2: We anticipate that the frequency of use, opportunity to perform, and face validity will emerge as the most significant procedural justice rules influencing applicants' perceptions, while invasion of privacy and interpersonal warmth will be the least important rules.

Hypothesis 3: We expect that perceptions of favorability towards selection tools will exhibit positive associations with recommendation intentions, application intentions, and organizational attractiveness and negative associations with litigation intentions.

Additionally, we seek to address the following research questions:

Research question 1: What is the distribution of the ten selection methods in Morocco according to applicants' preferences?

Research question 2: What dimensions of procedural justice are associated with recommendation intentions, application intentions, organizational attractiveness, and litigation intentions?

By explicitly stating our hypotheses and research questions, we aim to provide a clearer understanding of the purpose and scope of our study, thereby facilitating reader comprehension and engagement with our research findings.

## Literature review

Numerous researchers have conducted extensive investigations into the subject of justice perceptions across various contexts, with the aim of examining candidates' perspectives on selection methods. The aforementioned authors have undertaken research in the following countries: Greece (Nikolaou & Judge, 2007), Romania (Ispas, Ilie, Iliescu, Johnson, & Harris, 2010), France (Steiner & Gilliland, 1996), Belgium (Stinglhamber,

Vandenberghe, & Brancart, 1999), Spain/Portugal (Moscoso & Salgado, 2004), Pakistan (Hassan, Abid, Ahmad, Ali, Khan, & Zafar, 2020), Israel (Brender & Sheaffer, 2015), Turkey (Bilgic & Acarlar, 2010), Italy (Bertolino & Steiner, 2007), China (Liu, Potočnik, & Anderson, 2016), Vietnam (Hoang, Truxillo, Erdogan, & Bauer, 2012), United Arab Emirates (Ababneh & Chhinzer, 2014), Saudi Arabia (Anderson, Ahmed, & Costa, 2012), Iceland (Jónsdóttir & Hafsteinsson, 2008), The Netherlands (Anderson & Witvliet, 2008), India (Snyder & Shahani-Denning, 2012).

### ***Favorability perceptions and personnel selection techniques***

Steiner and Gilliland were the first to investigate candidates' preferences towards selection tools in an international context, pioneering research in this area (1996). These selection tools have been studied in several contexts based on their model. The model is based on ten selection techniques that are defined by these two authors in their research work, which was aimed at studying French and American students' perceptions of favorability towards ten personnel selection techniques (see Table 1).

**Table 1. Brief Description of Selection Techniques in Steiner and Gilliland's Model**

| <b>Selection method</b>        | <b>Description</b>   |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Interviews                     | A conversation in person during which the recruiter asks the candidate several questions in order to assess knowledge, know-how and attitude.  |
| Résumé                         | Detailed description of all information about a candidate (academic and professional background, interests, etc.).   |
| Work-sample tests              | A professional situation to evaluate the skills of a candidate by putting him or her in a professional situation with which the candidate will be confronted.                                      |
| Biographical information blank | A document in the form of a multiple-choice questionnaire requires specific information to be filled in about the applicant's academic and professional background, interests, date of birth, etc. |
| Written ability tests          | A written test that assesses the candidate's intelligence, reasoning, verbal, and mathematical skills.   |
| Personal references            | Consists of contacting the candidate's former employers in order to validate some of the information obtained during the job interview before confirmation of employment.                          |
| Personality tests              | A written assessment aiming to measure the applicant's character qualities by asking inquiries regarding their thoughts and prior experiences.   |
| Honesty tests                  | A test that assesses personality traits relating to the candidate's beliefs about stealing and prior experiences in connection to honesty.   |
| Graphology                     | It consists of an assessment of the candidate's writing style as well as the form of writing.  |
| Personal contacts              | A selection technique that consists of recommending a candidate for a vacant position in an organization.  |

Source: Steiner and Gilliland (1996)

Brender and Sheaffer (2015) studied differences in fairness perceptions of selection methods among immigrants and Israeli-born individuals. In a sample of 950 employees, significant differences emerged, with work-sample tests and interviews being preferred by Israelis, while non-Israelis favored résumés, personal references, and graphology. Immigrants, following Hofstede's (1980) model, are uncomfortable with uncertainty-predicting tools like "interviews and tests." Similarly, a study in the Netherlands found high favorability for resumes, interviews, and work-sample tests among applicants, whereas honesty tests, personal contacts, and graphology were less valued (Anderson & Witvliet, 2008). The findings align with prior research, notably pioneering work on applicants' fairness reactions in an international context (Steiner & Gilliland, 1996). In their two-sample study (USA and France), they discovered similar preferences to Anderson and Witvliet's (2008) study. French and American applicants favor the interview, work-sample tests, and résumé while showing reluctance towards honesty

tests (France) and graphology (United States). Notably, despite generally negative perceptions of graphology, the French sample, particularly students, appreciates it for its moderate scientific basis, ability to identify candidates' strengths, and legitimacy as a source of information for French employers (Steiner & Gilliland, 1996).

Phillips and Gully (2002) examined the reactions of American and Singaporean employees to 11 personnel selection techniques. Contrary to the generalizability hypothesis, interviews, résumés, and work-sample tests were favorably valued in both groups, while personal contacts and graphology received poor preferences. Additionally, Americans rated the opportunity to perform and face validity as more crucial rules of procedural justice than Singaporeans. The use of ethnicity as a selection tool was positively perceived only by Singaporeans. Another study explored the favorability perceptions of Spanish and Portuguese applicants towards selection techniques, involving 125 Spanish and 104 Portuguese students (Moscoso & Salgado, 2004). Results showed a high degree of favorability for interviews, résumés, and work-sample tests, with less appreciation for personal contacts and graphology. Written ability tests and references received mixed appreciation. There were only small differences in how candidates in each country felt about selection techniques. This is in line with what other researchers have found about how applicants feel about selection techniques (De Jong & Visser, 2000; Jónsdóttir & Hafsteinsson, 2008; Marcus, 2003; Steiner & Gilliland, 1996; Stinglhamber et al., 1999). The latest research in Arab countries (Ababneh & Chhinzer, 2014; Anderson et al., 2012) has also examined the existence of cultural differences in perceptions of justice between countries.

Anderson et al. (2012) assert the absence of cultural differences between countries through the results found with 193 Saudi applicants. These results are identical to those of another study that was conducted in the United Arab Emirates (Ababneh & Chhinzer, 2014). These authors examined the perceptions and reactions of students of different nationalities towards 12 selection methods. Cross-cultural differences in perceptions of fairness towards selection techniques are reduced through similarities found in several works investigating cross-cultural differences, including Germany (Marcus, 2003), Romania (Ispas et al., 2010), France (Steiner & Gilliland, 1996), Belgium (Stinglhamber et al., 1999), Spain/Portugal (Moscoso & Salgado, 2004), and Pakistan (Hassan et al., 2020).

### ***Perceptions of favorability and rules of procedural justice***

The objective of Steiner and Gilliland's model was to examine not only the fairness perceptions of applicants with regard to the procedural justice dimensions but also their perceptions of favorability towards personnel selection techniques. The two authors endeavored to extrapolate from Gilliland's model (1993) by crafting a novel conceptual framework. This framework is predicated upon the meticulous analysis of candidates' perceptions, delineated along two principal axes: favorability "the degree of acceptability of a selection tool by candidates" and procedural justice "applicants' perceptions of justice regarding the policies and procedures applied for decision-making" (Steiner & Gilliland, 1996, p.134, as cited in Stinglhamber et al., 1999).

The rules of procedural justice outlined in the framework consist of seven key principles. These rules specifically highlight procedural justice elements that are most salient to the candidates (Steiner & Gilliland, 1996). The seven rules of procedural justice are predictive validity (whether good performance in the selection process is predictive of good performance on the job); face validity (the content of the selection instrument must be equivalent to and similar to the missions and duties to be performed on the job); opportunity to perform (the extent to which the selection tool gives candidates the chance to perform their skills); employer's right (corresponds to the employer's right to gather information via the use of the selection method); frequency use (corresponds to the degree of use, acceptance of the selection tool in a particular context); interpersonal warmth (the extent to which applicants receive treatment with kindness and warmth);

invasion of privacy (the selection tool used by the employer should not violate the privacy of the candidates, either in terms of its content or in the way it is administered).

Numerous studies have utilized Steiner and Gilliland's model to examine candidates' reactions to procedural justice dimensions. Research by Nikolaou and Judge (2007), Ababneh and Chhinzer (2014), Bilgiç and Acarlar (2010), and Moscoso and Salgado (2004) has explored the favorability of organizational justice dimensions across various contexts. Bertolino and Steiner (2007) discovered that Italian students prefer selection methods that allow them to showcase distinctive abilities. Additionally, the inclusion of the frequency of use is a new dimension of procedural justice in the model proposed by Steiner and Gilliland.

A study in Romania involving 240 employees used Steiner and Gilliland's model to assess perceptions of personnel selection techniques. The findings indicated that employees favor tools with scientifically valid "face and predictive validity" (Ispas et al., 2010). Romanian employees prefer widely used selection tools that showcase competencies, but they show low favorability towards a recruiter's interpersonal warmth and invasion of privacy. The dimension 'frequency of use' is consistently valued positively by candidates in various studies (Ababneh & Chhinzer, 2014; Moscoso & Salgado, 2004; Steiner & Gilliland, 1996). Across studies, face validity, frequency of use, and opportunity to perform are highly valued procedural justice dimensions (Ababneh & Chhinzer, 2014; Bertolino & Steiner, 2007; Bilgiç & Acarlar, 2010). Candidates expect scientifically valid selection tools, objectivity, and the chance to demonstrate their qualities. Conversely, invasion of privacy, interpersonal warmth, and predictive validity are less valued dimensions, with the invasion of privacy being the least appreciated by applicants (Ababneh & Chhinzer, 2014; Hoang et al., 2012; Phillips & Gully, 2002).

### ***Organizational outcomes and fairness perceptions***

In addition to examining candidates' perceptions of selection instruments and various facets of procedural justice, numerous studies have focused on organizational outcomes, including: intention to recommend (Gilliland, 1993, 1994; Hausknecht et al., 2004; Konradt, Warszta, & Ellwart, 2013); attractiveness of the organization (Allen, Jimmieson, Bordia, & Irmer, 2007; Sumanth & Cable, 2011); intention to sue (Ababneh & Chhinzer, 2014); and intention to apply (Chapman & Webster, 2006; Harris & Fink, 1987). Several authors have shown a favorable association between applicants' perceptions and organizational attractiveness. In other words, applicants find an organization attractive when they perceive the selection system favorably (Bauer, Truxillo, Sanchez, Craig, Ferrara, & Campion, 2001; Hausknecht et al., 2004). In addition, some researchers have asserted the effect of candidates' fairness perceptions on recommendation intentions. They argue that when a candidate appreciates the selection methods used by an organization, the candidate will be motivated to recommend that organization to other candidates (Ababneh & Chhinzer, 2014; Hausknecht et al., 2004). From a similar perspective, some authors have shown a positive relationship between candidates' favorability perceptions and their application intentions (Harris & Fink, 1987; Konradt et al., 2013). Finally, several research studies have underlined the influence of applicants' favorability beliefs on litigation intentions (Ababneh & Chhinzer, 2014; Bauer et al., 2001). Particularly for organizations that operate in an international setting and utilize personnel from various nations, candidates' reactions in different countries are critical (Ababneh & Chhinzer, 2014; Liu et al., 2016; Rynes & Connerly, 1993; Snyder & Shahani-Denning, 2012; Steiner & Gilliland, 1996). Therefore, "the aim here is to determine whether candidates' reactions and fairness perceptions are determined by local factors, which vary according to organizations and countries (cultural specificities), or whether these reactions are stable and therefore generalizable over different contexts (generalization)" (Anderson, Salgado, & Hülshager, 2010, p. 3). Based on a model proposed in prior research, this study aims to explore the effect of procedural fairness elements and Moroccan candidates' attitudes towards ten selection techniques on organizational outcomes (Steiner & Gilliland, 1996).

## Methodology

### *The case of Morocco*

Morocco, officially known as the Kingdom of Morocco, is an Islamic country located in North Africa. Bordered by the Atlantic Ocean to the west, Spain and the Mediterranean Sea to the north, and Algeria to the east, Morocco covers an area of 446,550 square kilometres, featuring diverse landscapes, including mountainous regions and desert areas. The population of Morocco, as of 2023, is approximately 37,067 million inhabitants (The World FactBook, 2024). The ethnic composition of Morocco is primarily Arab-Berber, with Arab and Berber ethnicities constituting approximately 92% of the population. This diverse group encompasses individuals with both Arab and Berber ancestry, contributing to the rich cultural tapestry of Moroccan society.

In addition to Arab-Berbers, Morocco is home to other ethnic groups, including Europeans, who make up around 5% of the population, and Sub-Saharan Africans, accounting for approximately 2%. The presence of these ethnic minorities adds to the cultural diversity of the country, reflecting Morocco's historical ties to Europe and its role as a melting pot of various cultural influences (Wikipedia, 2024). Culturally, Morocco exhibits a high hierarchical distance (70 points in Hofstede's model), leading to centralized organizations with strong supervision and a directive management style, emphasizing community interests over individual ones (Al-Alawi & Alkhodari, 2016).

According to the recent report from the High Commission for Planning (HCP) 2024, the situation of the labor market in Morocco is complex and nuanced. The devastating effects of drought continue to be felt, with a net loss of 80,000 jobs, mainly in rural areas. Conversely, urban areas have seen growth with the creation of 78,000 new positions. Despite this contrasting dynamic, unemployment has increased significantly, now affecting 1,645,000 people nationwide. This phenomenon is particularly pronounced among youth, graduates, and women. These figures highlight the urgency of taking measures to stimulate employment and reduce economic disparities. Morocco is considering a transition to a diversified economy, focusing on high-value-added sectors such as information technology, aerospace, and renewable energy. At the same time, efforts are being made to regulate the labor market and combat informal work, aiming to improve job quality and enhance social protection for workers. However, these initiatives must also address persistent structural challenges, including regional disparities in access to economic opportunities. The issue of youth and graduate unemployment remains a major concern, requiring innovative and tailored solutions.

### *Participants and procedure*

This study included Moroccan job seekers who completed an online questionnaire. Only actively seeking job candidates were considered. The data from this study was analyzed using IBM SPSS. We used the snowball method for this research's non-probability sampling. Our study population was identified using "LinkedIn" because it is the most credible job search website in Morocco and allowed us to find actively seeking candidates. We then asked respondents to identify others with similar traits.

Our study focused on Moroccan job seekers who actively participated in online platforms, primarily LinkedIn, where we distributed an online questionnaire. While this approach allowed us to efficiently target actively seeking candidates, it's crucial to acknowledge potential biases. The use of the snowball sampling method may have resulted in the overrepresentation of specific groups, and relying solely on online platforms inherently excludes individuals lacking internet access.

The sample size ( $n = 244$ ) was comprised of 35.3% men and 64.7% women. The mean age of individuals who took part was 26.94 years (standard deviation (SD) = 5.001). 34.8% had no more than one year of professional experience (including internships), 27.2% had



1–3 years, 16.5% had 3–5 years, and 21.4% had over 5 years. The participants were reassured that the information collected through this questionnaire is confidential and will only be used for academic purposes.

### ***Measures***

For each dependent variable, we developed a number of items. Subjects were asked to respond to the questionnaire by selecting the number corresponding to their opinion on a seven-point Likert scale (1 = 'strongly disagree'; 2 = 'disagree'; 3 = 'somewhat disagree'; 4 = 'indifferent'; 5 = 'somewhat agree'; 6 = 'agree'; 7 = 'strongly agree').

All components of Steiner and Gilliland's questionnaire were used in our study to measure familiarity with selection procedures, perceptions of favorability, and the aspects of procedural fairness associated with these perceptions. This instrument was used because of its ubiquitous and broad usage in previous comparable studies (Ababneh & Chhinzer, 2014; Anderson & Witvliet, 2008; Anderson et al., 2012; Bertolino & Steiner, 2007; Hassan et al., 2020; Hoang et al., 2012; Ispas et al., 2010; Liu et al., 2016).

We translated the questionnaire from English to French using a back-translation process involving expert bilingual translators. After the initial translation, we identified differences through a second translator's input. The French version was then translated back into English and reviewed by a native English speaker. We also incorporated items to assess the impact of candidates' fairness perceptions on organizational attractiveness, recommendation intentions, litigation intentions, and application intentions.

### ***Favorability perceptions***

Participants completed an online questionnaire via LinkedIn. The initial section of the questionnaire delineated the study's overarching purpose and methodologies. Following this, the subsequent segment gathered demographic details from participants, encompassing factors such as gender, age, professional experience, and current job-seeking status. Moreover, participants were prompted to specify the job title they envisaged applying for. Subsequently, participants were tasked with assessing ten selection methods relative to their designated target job. Each method was accompanied by a succinct description of its nature and objectives, adapted from Steiner and Gilliland (1996), which was presented to all participants (refer to Table 1). The third section of the questionnaire presented each selection method alongside a series of items, requiring participants to respond to identical prompts for each of the ten methods. Two items were employed to measure the variable "favorability" for each selection method. The first item queried, "How would you rate the effectiveness of this method in identifying qualified people for the position you indicated earlier?" The second item inquired, "If you did not get the position based on this selection method, what would you think of the fairness of this procedure?"

Subjects answered these two items via a Likert scale with seven points (1 = 'very unfavorable'; 2 = 'unfavorable'; 3 = 'somewhat unfavorable'; 4 = 'neutral'; 5 = 'somewhat favorable'; 6 = 'favorable'; 7 = 'very favorable'). With Cronbach's alpha coefficient at 0.947, surpassing the commonly accepted threshold of 0.70, the Likert scale responses from participants on these two items demonstrate robust internal consistency. Consequently, we can confidently assert the reliability of the measurement instrument in capturing the intended construct.

### ***Procedural justice***

This variable was measured via seven items that evaluated predictive validity; face validity; opportunity to perform; employer's right; frequency of use; invasion of privacy; interpersonal warmth. Subjects answered these items via a Likert scale with seven points (1 = 'strongly disagree'; 2 = 'disagree'; 3 = 'somewhat disagree'; 4 = 'indifferent'; 5 = 'somewhat agree'; 6 = 'agree'; 7 = 'strongly agree'). The Cronbach's alpha in this research

was 0.975. This very high value indicates exceptionally strong internal consistency among the measured items. It suggests that the elements of the measurement instrument used in this study are closely related and consistently measure the same construct. Therefore, we can conclude that the measurement instrument demonstrates extremely high reliability in capturing the intended construct.

### ***Organizational outcomes***

Participants rated their opinions on organizational attractiveness, recommendation intentions, lawsuit intentions, and application intentions on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = 'strongly disagree'; 2 = 'disagree'; 3 = 'somewhat disagree'; 4 = 'indifferent'; 5 = 'somewhat agree'; 6 = 'agree'; 7 = 'strongly agree'). One item assessed organizational attractiveness, another examined recommendation intention, and a third evaluated application intentions. Items were drawn from earlier studies on applicant reactions (Bauer et al., 2001; Ployhart & Ryan, 1998). Litigation intentions were evaluated with one item modified from Seitz, Truxillo, and Bauer (2001). Participants were also asked whether they had been previously assessed by each selection method (yes or no). Additionally, respondents provided personal information, including age, gender, years of experience, current work status, and the desired position title. The study employed a 'within-subjects' design with six dependent variables (favorability, organizational outcomes, procedural justice) and one independent variable with ten modalities (selection method).

### **Results**

The first research question aimed to understand how often job seekers in Morocco encounter different selection methods. To explore this, we looked at the percentage of participants who reported having experience with each method, as shown in Table 2. The table indicates that the most common selection method experienced by applicants is the résumé (96%), followed by the interview (95%), personal contacts (56%), and work-sample tests (49%). Conversely, graphology (10%), honesty tests (16%), biography (22%), and references (29%) were less frequently encountered. These findings align with results from studies conducted in other contexts (Ababneh & Chhinzer, 2014; Anderson & Witvliet, 2008).

To test Hypothesis 1, we performed a within-subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA) using SPSS to assess favorability ratings among the ten selection techniques. The findings suggest substantial changes in attitudes towards favorability across the ten selection approaches,  $F(9, 2007) = 55.38$ ,  $P < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .20$ . Table 2 presents the mean and standard deviation for each selection procedure based on favorability perceptions.

As expected, Moroccan applicants viewed the interview, résumé, work-sample tests, and personality tests as the most favorable. These findings align with results from other studies (Anderson & Witvliet, 2008; Marcus, 2003; Phillips & Gully, 2002). Conversely, graphology, references, and biography were considered the least favorable selection methods. Perceptions of personal contacts, written ability tests, and honesty tests fell in the middle of the scale and showed no significant variation among them. Thus, the data support Hypothesis 1.

**Table 2. Description, prevalence, and perceptions of favorability**

| Selection method               | Description  | Percentage of participants evaluated by this method | Favorability perceptions |      |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|------|
|                                |  |   | M                        | SD   |
| Interviews                     | A conversation in person during which the recruiter asks the candidate several questions in order to assess knowledge, know-how and attitude.  | 94.6  | 4.67                     | 1.79 |
| Résumé                         | Detailed description of all information about a candidate (academic and professional background, interests, etc.).   | 96.4  | 4.31                     | 1.79 |
| Work-sample tests              | A professional situation consists of evaluating the skills of a candidate by putting him or her in a professional situation with which the candidate will be confronted.                           | 48.7  | 4.21                     | 1.81 |
| Biographical information blank | A document in the form of a multiple-choice questionnaire requires specific information to be filled in about the applicant's academic and professional background, interests, date of birth, etc. | 21.9  | 3.17                     | 1.58 |
| Written ability tests          | A written test that assesses the candidate's intelligence, reasoning, verbal, and mathematical skills.   | 43.3  | 4.12                     | 1.85 |
| Personal references            | Consists of contacting the candidate's former employers in order to validate some of the information obtained during the job interview before confirmation of employment.                          | 29.5  | 3.19                     | 1.67 |
| Personality tests              | A written assessment aiming to measure the applicant's character qualities by asking inquiries regarding their thoughts and prior experiences.   | 43.3  | 4.21                     | 1.81 |
| Honesty tests                  | A test that assesses personality traits relating to the candidate's beliefs about stealing and prior experiences in connection to honesty.   | 16.1  | 3.81                     | 1.86 |
| Graphology                     | It consists of an assessment of the candidate's writing style as well as the form of writing.  | 9.8   | 2.81                     | 1.53 |
| Personal contacts              | A selection technique that consists of recommending a candidate for a vacant position in an organization.  | 56.3  | 3.45                     | 1.76 |

Means are significantly different at  $p < .05$

Source: own processing

To test Hypothesis 2, we first calculated correlations between procedural fairness elements and favorability perceptions for each selection method. Next, we averaged these correlations to generate coefficients for each dimension of procedural justice with perceptions of favorability for the ten selection methods (see Table 3). The table reveals that predictive validity ( $r = .66$ ), face validity ( $r = .63$ ), right of the employer ( $r = .61$ ), the opportunity to perform ( $r = .60$ ), and frequency of use ( $r = .58$ ) are the most favorable dimensions for applicants. Conversely, interpersonal warmth ( $r = .28$ ) and invasion of privacy ( $r = .25$ ) were viewed less favorably by candidates. These results support

Hypothesis 2 and align with findings from previous research in different contexts (Phillips & Gully, 2002; Moscoso & Salgado, 2004).

**Table 3. Mean correlations of procedural justice dimensions with perceived favorability**

| Procedural dimensions  | M    |
|------------------------|------|
| Face validity          | 0.63 |
| Widely used            | 0.58 |
| Employer's right       | 0.61 |
| Opportunity to perform | 0.60 |
| Predictive validity    | 0.66 |
| Interpersonal warmth   | 0.28 |
| Invasion of privacy    | 0.25 |

Source: own processing

**Table 4. Correlations between the perception of favorability and organizational outcomes for each selection method**

| Selection method  | Organizational attractiveness | Application intentions | Recommendation intentions | Litigation intentions |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Interviews        | .711**                        | .648**                 | .655**                    | -.134*                |
| Résumé            | .664**                        | .681**                 | .639**                    | -0.03                 |
| Work-sample tests | .708**                        | .663**                 | .676**                    | -.138*                |
| Biographical      | .608**                        | .604**                 | .569**                    | .160*                 |
| Written ability   | .697**                        | .697**                 | .649**                    | -0.03                 |
| Personal          | .626**                        | .571**                 | .592**                    | .143*                 |
| Personality tests | .654**                        | .634**                 | .669**                    | -0.034                |
| Honesty tests     | .675**                        | .649**                 | .640**                    | 0.054                 |
| Graphology        | .616**                        | .558**                 | .535**                    | .189**                |
| Personal contacts | .657**                        | .653**                 | .648**                    | .151*                 |
| <b>r average</b>  | 0.6616                        | 0.6358                 | 0.6272                    | 0.0331                |

\*Significant at  $p < .05$ ; \*\* Significant at  $p < .01$

Source: own processing

Hypothesis 3 proposes a relationship between candidates' perceived favorability and company outcomes. To verify this hypothesis, we performed bivariate correlations of perceived favorability and company outcomes for each selection procedure, as presented in Table 4. The findings demonstrate a substantial positive correlation between perceived favorability and organizational attractiveness, application intentions, and recommendation intentions for each selection technique. Nevertheless, there is a weak and non-significant correlation between perceived favorability and litigation intentions, indicating that the perceived favorability of selection methods does not significantly impact litigation intentions. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 is partially validated.

For the second research question, we calculated bivariate correlations between the seven dimensions of procedural justice and organizational outcomes for each selection technique. In Table 5, the mean correlations of each procedural fairness component with organizational attractiveness for every selection technique (last row of the table), from highest to lowest, are as follows: frequency of use (mean  $r = .74$ ), face validity (mean  $r = .66$ ), employer's right (mean  $r = .65$ ), predictive validity (mean  $r = .63$ ), opportunity to perform (mean  $r = .63$ ), invasion of privacy (mean  $r = .15$ ), and interpersonal warmth (mean  $r = .02$ ).

**Table 5. Correlations between procedural justice dimensions and organizational attractiveness for each selection method**

| Selection method               | Face validity | Frequency of use | Employer's right | Opportunity to perform | Predictive validity | Interpersonal warmth | Invasion of privacy |
|--------------------------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Interviews                     | .701**        | .806**           | .728**           | .647**                 | .641**              | -0.07                | 0.11                |
| Résumé                         | .714**        | .778**           | .669**           | .641**                 | .579**              | 0.03                 | 0.08                |
| Work-sample tests              | .703**        | .746**           | .695**           | .698**                 | .667**              | -0.07                | 0.07                |
| Biographical information blank | .606**        | .687**           | .585**           | .576**                 | .518**              | .138*                | .210**              |
| Written ability tests          | .704**        | .716**           | .721**           | .708**                 | .701**              | -0.007               | 0.11                |
| Personal references            | .662**        | .772**           | .674**           | .636**                 | .632**              | 0.03                 | .281**              |
| Personality tests              | .582**        | .747**           | .641**           | .581**                 | .634**              | 0.05                 | .157*               |
| Honesty tests                  | .626**        | .707**           | .619**           | .586**                 | .656**              | -0.02                | 0.10                |
| Graphology                     | .615**        | .634**           | .585**           | .639**                 | .640**              | 0.09                 | .299**              |
| Personal contacts              | .640**        | .760**           | .581**           | .600**                 | .645**              | -0.006               | 0.09                |
| <b>r average</b>               | 0.6553        | 0.7353           | 0.6498           | 0.6312                 | 0.6313              | 0.0165               | 0.1507              |

\*Significant at  $p < .05$ ; \*\* Significant at  $p < .01$

Source: own processing

**Table 6. Correlations between procedural justice dimensions and application intentions for each selection method**

| Selection method | Face validity | Frequency of use | Employer's right | Opportunity to perform | Predictive validity | Interpersonal warmth | Invasion of privacy |
|------------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Interviews       | .661**        | .751**           | .731**           | .599**                 | .576**              | -0.09                | 0.08                |
| Résumé           | .718**        | .758**           | .733**           | .588**                 | .543**              | 0.08                 | -0.02               |
| Work-sample      | .680**        | .676**           | .727**           | .666**                 | .618**              | 0.006                | 0.05                |
| Biographical     | .581**        | .690**           | .629**           | .553**                 | .515**              | .239**               | .192**              |
| Written          | .725**        | .694**           | .707**           | .658**                 | .638**              | -0.03                | 0.09                |
| Personal         | .540**        | .660**           | .644**           | .538**                 | .538**              | 0.11                 | .205**              |
| Personality      | .575**        | .678**           | .684**           | .561**                 | .647**              | 0.008                | 0.10                |
| Honesty tests    | .663**        | .631**           | .641**           | .544**                 | .628**              | -0.05                | .155*               |
| Graphology       | .529**        | .535**           | .560**           | .490**                 | .506**              | 0.06                 | .217**              |
| Personal         | .598**        | .718**           | .541**           | .566**                 | .588**              | -0.03                | 0.09                |
| <b>r average</b> | 0.627         | 0.6791           | 0.6597           | 0.5763                 | 0.5797              | 0.0303               | 0.1159              |

\*Significant at  $p < .05$ ; \*\* Significant at  $p < .01$

Source: own processing

As illustrated in Table 6, there exists a positive correlation between procedural justice dimensions and application intentions. The mean correlations of each procedural justice component with application intentions for every selection technique (last row of the table), from highest to lowest, are as follows: frequency of use (mean  $r = .68$ ), employer's right (mean  $r = .66$ ), face validity (mean  $r = .63$ ), predictive validity (mean  $r = .58$ ), opportunity to perform (mean  $r = .58$ ), invasion of privacy (mean  $r = .12$ ), and interpersonal warmth (mean  $r = .03$ ).

**Table 7. Correlations between procedural justice dimensions and recommendation intentions for each selection method**

| Selection method | Face validity | Frequency of use | Employer's right | Opportunity to perform | Predictive validity | Interpersonal warmth | Invasion of privacy |
|------------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Interviews       | .697**        | .765**           | .769**           | .631**                 | .611**              | -0.10                | 0.04                |
| Résumé           | .686**        | .758**           | .706**           | .574**                 | .572**              | 0.06                 | 0.01                |
| Work-sample      | .651**        | .726**           | .716**           | .645**                 | .634**              | -0.01                | 0.08                |
| Biographical     | .584**        | .681**           | .612**           | .551**                 | .547**              | .255**               | .212**              |
| Written          | .638**        | .675**           | .706**           | .646**                 | .611**              | 0.06                 | .141*               |
| Personal         | .574**        | .677**           | .670**           | .584**                 | .571**              | 0.08                 | .192**              |
| Personality      | .597**        | .674**           | .688**           | .602**                 | .695**              | 0.04                 | .143*               |
| Honesty tests    | .653**        | .626**           | .647**           | .563**                 | .622**              | -0.01                | .208**              |
| Graphology       | .562**        | .558**           | .567**           | .526**                 | .501**              | 0.12                 | .296**              |
| Personal         | .584**        | .728**           | .593**           | .567**                 | .620**              | -0.04                | .139*               |
| <b>r average</b> | 0.6226        | 0.6868           | 0.6674           | 0.5889                 | 0.5984              | 0.0455               | 0.1461              |

\*Significant at  $p < .05$ ; \*\* Significant at  $p < .01$

Source: own processing

Moreover, we identified a positive correlation between procedural justice dimensions and intentions to recommend. The average correlations of each procedural justice component with recommendation intentions for each selection method (last row of Table 7), from highest to lowest, are as follows: frequency of use (average  $r = .69$ ), employer right (mean  $r = .67$ ), face validity (mean  $r = .62$ ), predictive validity (mean  $r = .60$ ), opportunity to demonstrate competencies (mean  $r = .59$ ), invasion of privacy (mean  $r = .15$ ), and interpersonal warmth (mean  $r = .05$ ).

**Table 8. Correlations between procedural justice dimensions and litigation intentions for each selection method**

| Selection method | Face validity | Frequency of use | Employer's right | Opportunity to perform | Predictive validity | Interpersonal warmth | Invasion of privacy |
|------------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Interviews       | -0.12         | -.138*           | -.182**          | -0.09                  | -0.02               | .411**               | .467**              |
| Résumé           | -0.03         | -0.06            | -.152*           | -0.01                  | 0.08                | .255**               | .507**              |
| Work-sample      | -0.10         | 0.01             | -0.12            | -0.10                  | -0.06               | .347**               | .507**              |
| Biographical     | .149*         | .316**           | 0.10             | .265**                 | .173**              | .152*                | .263**              |
| Written          | 0.007         | 0.04             | -0.06            | 0.04                   | 0.02                | .311**               | .480**              |
| Personal         | .166*         | .230**           | .132*            | .193**                 | .185**              | .248**               | .341**              |
| Personality      | -0.01         | 0.02             | -0.05            | 0.03                   | 0.00                | .298**               | .188**              |
| Honesty tests    | 0.08          | .137*            | 0.08             | .181**                 | 0.11                | .256**               | .277**              |
| Graphology       | .281**        | .313**           | .157*            | .315**                 | .253**              | .157*                | .385**              |
| Personal         | .140*         | .141*            | -0.03            | .171*                  | 0.12                | .337**               | .240**              |
| <b>r average</b> | 0.0563        | 0.1009           | -0.0125          | 0.0995                 | 0.0861              | 0.2772               | 0.3655              |

\*Significant at  $p < .05$ ; \*\* Significant at  $p < .01$

Source: own processing

When we looked at the relationship between the seven dimensions of procedural justice and the intention to sue (Table 8), we saw that the dimensions "invasion of privacy" and "interpersonal warmth" were significantly linked to the intention to sue across all selection methods. Conversely, the correlation between the dimension 'frequency of use' and litigation intentions is significant for six selection methods, and there is a noteworthy connection between the dimension 'opportunity to perform' and litigation intentions, but only for five selection methods. However, the relationships between litigation intentions and the characteristics 'predictive validity', 'face validity', and 'employer's right' are generally inconsequential (see Table 8).

The mean correlations of each procedural justice component with litigation intentions for every selection technique, from highest to lowest, further elucidate these findings: invasion of privacy (mean  $r = .37$ ), interpersonal warmth (mean  $r = .28$ ), frequency of use (mean  $r = .10$ ), opportunity to perform (mean  $r = .10$ ), predictive validity (mean  $r = .09$ ), face validity (mean  $r = .06$ ), employer's right (mean  $r = -0.01$ ).

## **Discussion**

The aim of this investigation was to delve into Moroccan candidates' attitudes towards selection techniques, with a focus on prevalence, favorability, and procedural justice dimensions. This research addresses the calls from several researchers to extend the study of candidates' attitudes to selection techniques beyond European and American countries (Hassan et al., 2020; Lievens, 2007; Moscoso & Salgado, 2004) and to utilize a sample of applicants rather than students (Anderson, 2003; Jónsdóttir & Hafsteinsson, 2008; Moscoso & Salgado, 2004). The study serves as a replication and extension of Steiner and Gilliland's research to other contexts.

The main goal of this article was to investigate the degree of familiarity of Moroccan applicants with ten selection methods. The results affirm that résumé, interview, personal contacts, and work-sample tests are the most frequently encountered selection methods in Morocco, while honesty tests and graphology are the least common. Despite differences in percentage terms compared to research studies in other contexts (Ababneh & Chhinzer, 2014; Anderson & Witvliet, 2008; Snyder & Shahani-Denning, 2012), the most common and least prevalent selection techniques remain consistent. The second objective was to assess the favorability of Moroccan candidates towards the ten selection techniques. The results align with other studies, indicating résumés, work-sample tests, interviews, and personality tests as the most highly rated methods.

Graphology, references, and biography were the least favored methods among Moroccan candidates. These preferences align with the specificities of the Moroccan labor market, in which candidates are averse to potential employers contacting their former employers for information. Personal contacts were also among the least favored methods, reflecting candidates' disapproval of selection processes based on recommendations, as these are seen as hindering equal opportunities. As with other studies (Ababneh & Chhinzer, 2014; Bertolino & Steiner, 2007) the dimensions of procedural justice that are strongly linked are frequency of use, predictive validity, opportunity to perform, employer's right, and face validity. Face validity and opportunity to perform, vital dimensions for positive perceptions, are emphasized in the social justice literature (Gilliland, 1993). In contrast, interpersonal warmth and invasion of privacy are the least valued dimensions by Moroccan applicants, emphasizing a preference for scientifically valid selection methods that allow candidates to distinguish themselves.

Another goal was to explore the influence of applicants' perceptions on organizational outcomes. Face validity, frequency of use, and the employer's right emerge as strong predictors of recommendation intentions, organizational attractiveness, and application intentions. These dimensions also align with the most valued by applicants. Regarding the relationship between perceived favorability and organizational outcomes, a positive correlation is found for all outcomes except litigation intentions. Perceived favorability influences intentions to litigate only for specific selection methods: job interviews, simulation tests, biography, references, graphology, and personal contacts.

In line with these findings, the study validates Hypothesis 1, confirming that applicant favorability perceptions are strongest for interviews, résumés, and work-sample tests and weakest for references, biography, and graphology. The discussion also supports Hypothesis 2, as the dimensions of procedural justice associated with positive perceptions are found to be frequency of use, predictive validity, opportunity to perform, employer's right, and face validity. Moreover, Hypothesis 3 is confirmed by the positive correlation

between applicants' perceived favorability and organizational outcomes, namely recommendation intentions, application intentions, and organizational attractiveness, while litigation intentions show a weak and non-significant correlation.

Regarding the research questions posed within the scope of this article, the first research question aims to determine the proportion of predominance of the 10 selection tools according to candidates in the Moroccan context. We found that the resume, interview, personal contacts, and work-sample tests are the most encountered selection tools by candidates, while graphology, honesty tests, biography, and references are the least encountered. These results are similar to research conducted in two countries, namely the UAE (Ababneh & Chhinzer, 2014), and the Netherlands (Anderson & Witvliet, 2008). These findings are entirely logical because the resume, interview, and work-sample tests are standard selection tools used by all companies in Morocco. Indeed, personal contacts are also frequently encountered by candidates because this tool has a presence in the job market in Morocco, as candidates often succeed in securing positions through their network of acquaintances. Graphology, honesty tests, biography, and references are the least encountered tools by candidates because they are rarely used by companies in Morocco.

Based on the findings related to the second research question, the dimensions of procedural justice appear to play a critical role in shaping candidates' perceptions and intentions across various aspects of the selection process. Firstly, concerning organizational attractiveness, dimensions such as frequency of use, face validity, employer's right, predictive validity, and opportunity to perform demonstrate strong positive associations. These results suggest that candidates are more likely to view organizations as appealing when they perceive fair treatment in these procedural justice dimensions. This underscores the importance of consistent application of selection methods, clear justification for their use, acknowledgement of employer authority, and providing fair opportunities for candidates to showcase their capabilities in fostering positive perceptions of organizational attractiveness. Similarly, when examining application intentions, the same dimensions show notable positive associations. Candidates are more inclined to express intentions to apply to organizations that they perceive as fair in terms of frequency of use, employer's right, face validity, predictive validity, and opportunity to perform. This implies that perceptions of procedural justice significantly influence candidates' willingness to engage with organizations through the application process.

Moreover, recommendation intentions also align with these patterns, exhibiting positive associations with dimensions such as frequency of use, employer's right, face validity, predictive validity, and opportunity to demonstrate competencies. Candidates are more likely to recommend organizations to others when they perceive fair procedural justice practices in these critical areas. In contrast, litigation intentions demonstrate associations with different dimensions. Invasion of privacy and interpersonal warmth are positively linked with litigation intentions, indicating that candidates may be more inclined to consider legal action when they perceive violations of privacy or a lack of interpersonal warmth during the selection process. Interestingly, weaker positive associations are observed with dimensions like frequency of use and opportunity to perform, suggesting that candidates may consider legal action when they perceive unfairness in these procedural justice dimensions as well.

This study thus contributes to an understanding of candidates' attitudes towards selection techniques in the Moroccan context and provides valuable insights for both researchers and practitioners in the field of personnel selection.



### **Limitations and future research directions**

Even though our study enabled us to analyze applicants' fairness attitudes towards selection processes in the Moroccan context, several limitations should be addressed. Our research was based on a cross-sectional strategy (the use of a cross-sectional questionnaire), which doesn't allow for a more solid causal association between the variables. Hence, there is a need to establish a longitudinal or experimental study in order to explain in depth the causal relationship between the variables studied. Furthermore, our research relied on one item to assess the characteristics of procedural fairness and organizational results. These measures have also been used by several researchers in their studies (Ababneh & Chhinzer, 2014; Anderson & Witvliet, 2008; Steiner & Gilliland, 1996). Moreover, the use of several items for a single variable is not practical since our questionnaire was already long to fill out.

In order to expand the existing literature on applicants' reactions, it would be interesting to conduct studies in other contexts that are different in terms of culture, HR practices, etc. Furthermore, caution should be taken when generalizing these results to Morocco. As a country with a population of over 37.13 million, the perceptions of those living in rural areas or in small businesses might vary compared to the perceptions of our study sample. Finally, it is worth mentioning that we used the 'snowball method' sampling method to maximize our sample. However, this method did not allow us to calculate the response rate. Therefore, it would be better to use a larger, stratified sample size.

While our study primarily employed a quantitative approach to examine the reactions of applicants towards selection techniques, we acknowledge the insightful suggestion to explore the possibility of integrating qualitative research methods in future investigations. Qualitative methods, such as interviews, could provide a deeper understanding of participants' perspectives, allowing us to uncover nuanced insights and address potential limitations associated with the quantitative approach. In future studies, we may consider adopting a mixed-methods approach to complement the quantitative findings with qualitative richness, thereby offering a more comprehensive exploration of the complexities surrounding applicants' reactions to selection methods. This proposed adjustment aligns with the aim of capturing a holistic understanding of the phenomenon under investigation.

### **Practical implications**

In order to mitigate the negative perceptions of Moroccan candidates towards the selection methods that were least appreciated by them, organizations should provide additional information and explanations on the interest and purpose of using these tools. This research is the first to evaluate applicants' attitudes towards selection procedures in the Moroccan context. Moroccan organizations or multinationals operating in Morocco should focus on using selection tools that have been perceived favorably by Moroccan candidates and avoid the use of graphology, references, and biography, as candidates consider them inappropriate for use in recruitment. This is important for Moroccan organizations, as perceptions of fairness in selection methods directly influence recommendation intentions, application intentions, and organizational attractiveness. Therefore, Moroccan organizations should review their recruitment processes and adopt objective selection methods in order to improve applicants' fairness perceptions.

To address negative perceptions of selection methods among Moroccan candidates, organizations should consider several strategies aimed at fostering fairness and transparency in their recruitment processes. Firstly, investing in training and education for hiring managers and recruitment teams on the importance of fair and objective selection methods is essential. Workshops or seminars focusing on unconscious bias training can equip decision-makers with the knowledge and skills needed to conduct fair evaluations of candidates. Moreover, transparency in recruitment processes is crucial for

building trust and confidence among candidates. Organizations should provide clear information about the selection criteria, assessment methods, and decision-making processes to ensure transparency throughout the hiring process. This transparency not only helps candidates understand how they are being evaluated but also demonstrates the organization's commitment to fairness and equity.

Additionally, implementing feedback mechanisms can provide valuable insights into candidates' perceptions of the recruitment process and areas for improvement. Post-application surveys or interviews can be used to gather feedback on the perceived fairness of selection methods and identify any biases or inefficiencies that need to be addressed. Furthermore, organizations should prioritize continuous improvement by regularly reviewing and evaluating their recruitment processes. This includes conducting audits of selection methods, benchmarking against industry best practices, and soliciting feedback from both candidates and hiring managers for ongoing improvement. Finally, advocating for diverse hiring panels can help mitigate the risk of bias in decision-making. By ensuring the composition of diverse evaluators, organizations can incorporate different perspectives and reduce the influence of individual biases, ultimately promoting fairer evaluations of candidates.

By implementing these strategies, organizations can not only improve the fairness and effectiveness of their recruitment processes but also enhance applicants' perceptions of fairness, ultimately contributing to a more positive candidate experience and organizational reputation.

## Conclusions

As our study is the first to have explored Moroccan jobseekers' viewpoints and reactions to standard hiring procedures, our research results constitute a step forward in the applicant reactions literature. Our sample of 244 jobseekers enabled us to make findings on the opposing theories of reaction generalization against situational specificity concerning applicants' reactions to selection procedures extensively utilized in the selection process. Our data indicate that candidate reactions tend to be comparable across nations. These generalizable favorability reactions seem to be in line with earlier conclusions addressing the validity of selection methods. By linking our results with other published results investigating the widespread adoption of selection techniques worldwide, our results enable studies on candidate reactions to move forward significantly by setting up the generalizability of reactions to selection approaches and establishing new avenues for essential subsequent studies on candidate preferences and fairness perceptions.

This study represents a pioneering effort in both the Moroccan and wider Arab context, providing novel insights into the perceptions of Moroccan job seekers regarding selection methods. By filling a significant gap in the existing literature, this research offers valuable contributions to the fields of organizational psychology, human resource management, and cross-cultural studies. Our study marks the first systematic exploration of applicant perceptions of selection methods in Morocco and, indeed, among Arab countries. Prior to this research, there has been a notable absence of empirical studies addressing this topic within the region. Therefore, our study serves as a foundational piece of research that lays the groundwork for further investigation into this critical area.

One of the key original contributions of this study lies in its potential to inform and guide organizational recruitment strategies within the Moroccan context. By elucidating how Moroccan applicants perceive various selection methods, this research equips companies with valuable insights that can be leveraged to tailor their recruitment processes to better align with candidates' preferences and expectations.

## References

- Ababneh, K. I., & Chhinzer, N. (2014). Job Applicant reactions to selection methods in the United Arab Emirates (UAE). *International Management Review*, 10(2), 32. <http://americanscholarspress.us/journals/IMR/pdf/IMR-2-2014/v10n2-art4.pdf>
- Al-Alawi, A.I., & Alkhodari, H. J. (2016). Cross-cultural differences in managing businesses: applying Hofstede cultural analysis in Germany, Canada, South Korea and Morocco. *International Business Management*, 95, 40855-40861.
- Allen, J., Jimmieson, N. L., Bordia, P., & Irmer, B. E. (2007). Uncertainty during organizational change: Managing perceptions through communication. *Journal of Change Management*, 7(2), 187–210.
- Anderson, N. (2003). Applicant and recruiter reactions to new technology in selection: A critical review and agenda for future research. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11(2-3), 121–136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00235>
- Anderson, N., Ahmed, S., & Costa, A. C. (2012). Applicant reactions in Saudi Arabia: Organizational attractiveness and core-self-evaluation. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 20(2), 197–208. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2012.00592.x>
- Anderson, N., Salgado, J. F., & Hülshager, U. R. (2010). Applicant reactions in selection: Comprehensive meta-analysis into reaction generalization versus situational specificity. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 18(3), 291–304. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2010.00512.x>
- Anderson, N., & Witvliet, C. (2008). Fairness reactions to personnel selection methods: An international comparison between the Netherlands, the United States, France, Spain, Portugal, and Singapore. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 16(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2008.00404.x>
- Bauer, T. N., Truxillo, D. M., Sanchez, R. J., Craig, J. M., Ferrara, P., & Campion, M. A. (2001). applicant reactions to selection: development of the selection procedural justice scale (SPJS). *Personnel Psychology*, 54(2), 387–419. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2001.tb00097.x>
- Bertolino, M., & Steiner, D. D. (2007). Fairness reactions to selection methods: An Italian study. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 15(2), 197–205. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2007.00381.x>
- Bilgiç, R., & Acarlar, G. (2010). Fairness perceptions of selection instruments used in Turkey. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 18(2), 208–214. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2010.00502.x>
- Brender-Ilan, Y., & Sheaffer, Z. (2015). Do immigrants have different procedural justice perceptions of personnel selection methods? The case of native Israelis and immigrants from the former Soviet Union. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 23(1), 27–36. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12092>
- Chapman, D., & Webster, J. (2006). Toward an integrated model of applicant reactions and job choice. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(6), 1032–1057. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190600696572>
- De Jong, A., & Visser, D. (2000). Black and white employees' fairness perceptions of personnel selection techniques. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 30(4), 17–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/008124630003000403>
- Jonsdottir, J. H., & Hafsteinson, L. G. (2008). Sanngirni atta aeferea sem notaear eru vie starfsmannaval: Viebroge islendinga: Fairness reactions to personnel selection methods in Iceland. *Journal of Psychology*, 13, 109–125.
- Harris, M. M., & Fink, L. S. (1987). A field study of applicant reactions to employment opportunities: does the recruiter make a difference? *Personnel Psychology*, 40(4), 765–784. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1987.tb00623.x>
- Hassan, Q., Abid, G., Ahmad, J., Ali, M., Khan, A. H., & Zafar, R. (2020). Applicants reaction towards the personnel selection methods in Pakistan. *Cogent Business & Management*, 7(1), 1816418. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1816418>
- Hausknecht, J. P., Day, D. V., & Thomas, S. C. (2004). Applicant reactions to selection procedures: An updated model and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(3), 639–683. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.00003.x>

- Hoang, T. G., Truxillo, D. M., Erdogan, B., & Bauer, T. N. (2012). Cross-cultural examination of applicant reactions to selection methods: United States and Vietnam. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 20(2), 209–219. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2012.00593.x>
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>
- Ispas, D., Ilie, A., Iliescu, D., Johnson, R. E., & Harris, M. M. (2010). Fairness reactions to selection methods: A Romanian study. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 18(1), 102–110. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2010.00492.x>
- Gilliland, S. W. (1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems: An organizational justice perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(4), 694–734. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1993.9402210155>
- Gilliland, S. W. (1994). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to a selection system. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(5), 691–701. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.5.691>
- Konradt, U., Warszta, T., & Ellwart, T. (2013). Fairness perceptions in web-based selection: Impact on applicants' pursuit intentions, recommendation intentions, and intentions to reapply. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 21(2), 155–169. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijisa.12026>
- Lievens, F. (2007). Employer branding in the Belgian army: The importance of instrumental and symbolic beliefs for potential applicants, actual applicants, and military employees. *Human Resource Management*, 46(1), 51–69. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20145>
- Liu, X., Potočník, K., & Anderson, N. (2016). Applicant reactions to selection methods in China. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 24(3), 296–303. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijisa.12148>
- Marcus, B. (2003). Attitudes towards personnel selection methods: A partial replication and extension in a German sample. *Applied Psychology*, 52(4), 515–532. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00149>
- Maroc Diplomatie. (2024). *The Labor Market: A First Quarter of 2024*. Marked by Drought. <https://maroc-diplomatique.net/le-marche-du-travail-un-premier-trimestre-2024-sous-le-signe-de-la-secheresse/>
- McCarthy, J. M., Bauer, T. N., Truxillo, D. M., Anderson, N. R., Costa, A. C., & Ahmed, S. M. (2017). Applicant perspectives during selection: A review addressing “so what?”, “what’s new?”, and “where to next?” *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1693–1725. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316681846>
- Miles, S. J., & Mc Camey, R. (2018). The candidate experience: Is it damaging your employer brand? *Business Horizons*, 61(5), 755–764. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2018.05.007>
- Moscoso, S., & Salgado, J. F. (2004). Fairness Reactions to personnel selection techniques in Spain and Portugal. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12(1–2), 187–196. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0965-075x.2004.00273.x>
- Nikolaou, I., & Judge, T. A. (2007). Fairness reactions to personnel selection techniques in Greece: The role of core self-evaluations. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 15(2), 206–219. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2007.00382.x>
- Phillips, J. M., & Gully, S. M. (2002). Fairness reactions to personnel selection techniques in Singapore and the United States. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13(8), 1186–1205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190210149475>
- Ployhart, R. E., & Ryan, A. M. (1998). Applicants' reactions to the fairness of selection procedures: The effects of positive rule violations and time of measurement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(1), 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.1.3>
- Rynes, S. L., & Connerley, M. L. (1993). Applicant reactions to alternative selection procedures. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 7(3), 261–277. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01015754>

- Seitz, R., Truxillo, D. M., & Bauer, T. N. (2001, April). *Test familiarization: Effects on reactions to written and video tests* [Paper presentation]. The Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.
- Snyder, J., & Shahani-Denning, C. (2012). Fairness reactions to personnel selection methods: A look at professionals in Mumbai, India. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 20(3), 297–307. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2012.00601.x>
- Steiner, D. D., & Gilliland, S. W. (1996). Fairness reactions to personnel selection techniques in France and the United States. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(2), 134–141. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.2.134>
- Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., & Brancart, S. (1999). Les réactions des candidats envers les techniques de sélection du personnel : une étude dans un contexte francophone. *Le Travail Humain*, 62(4), 347–361.
- Sumanth, J. J., & Cable, D. M. (2011). Status and organizational entry: How organizational and individual status affect justice perceptions of hiring systems. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(4), 963–1000. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01233.x>
- The World Factbook. (2024). *Morocco-Country Summary*. CIA GOV. <https://www.cia.gov/the-world-factbook/countries/morocco/summaries/>
- Wikipedia. (2024). *Demographics of Morocco*. Wikipedia. [https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/D%C3%A9mographie\\_du\\_Maroc#cite\\_note-1](https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/D%C3%A9mographie_du_Maroc#cite_note-1)
- Zibarras, L. (2018). Applicant perceptions and reactions to selection. In F. Patterson & L. Zibarras (Eds.), *Selection and Recruitment in the Healthcare Professions* (pp. 193–221). Springer International Publishing.