Career Development International

(in press)

The influence of general beliefs on the formation of justice expectations:
The moderating role of direct experiences.

Brigitte Geenen¹

Karin Proost^{1, 2, 6}

Bert Schreurs⁴

Marius van Dijke³

Eva Derous⁵

Karel De Witte⁶

Jasper von Grumbkow¹

¹Open University of the Netherlands

²Hogeschool-Universiteit Brussel

³Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University

⁴Maastricht University School of Business and Economics

⁵Ghent University

⁶University of Leuven

Number of words: 4459 (excluding tables, figures, abstract and references)

Type of paper: Field study

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Brigitte Geenen, Open University of the Netherlands, P.O. Box 2960, 6401 DL Heerlen, the Netherlands, Email: BAM.Geenen@gmail.com.

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper was to investigate the influence of applicants' justice beliefs (i.e., belief in a just world and belief in tests) on justice expectations with respect to a forthcoming application for the job of prison guard. Further, the moderating role of direct experiences on the relationship between beliefs and justice expectations was studied.

Design/methodology/approach – A written survey was administered to 803 applicants, just before the start of the selection procedure. Data were self-reported and collected at one point in time.

Findings – Significant positive relationships were found between both beliefs (i.e., belief in a just world and belief in tests) on procedural and distributive justice expectations. Moreover, the relationship between belief in tests and both types of justice expectations was stronger among experienced applicants. Conversely, the relationship between belief in a just world and distributive justice expectations was stronger among inexperienced applicants. This moderation was not found with respect to procedural justice expectations.

Originality/value – Insight into how justice expectations are formed in selection contexts, and consequently, how organizations can influence these expectations, is largely missing. Bell, Ryan, and Wiechmann (2004) provided a conceptual model on antecedents of justice expectations but its theoretical underpinning is rather weak and not well-understood. Construal level theory was used in this study as a theoretical basis to predict how applicants might form justice expectations with respect to future selection procedures.

Key words: personnel selection, justice expectations, direct experiences, belief in tests, belief in a just world, construal level theory

One important aspect of human resources management is to attract and retain highly qualified personnel to the organization. In a tight labor market, companies are battling the war for talent, intensifying the need to deploy effective recruitment efforts and to brand their organization (Schreurs & Syed, 2011). Gradually, organizations started to realize that applicants' decision to continue their job pursuit with a company are partly based on perceptions of the company's hiring practices (Turban, 2001). In early stages of the hiring process, applicants are particularly attentive and sensitive to fairness-relevant information (Gilliland, 1993). Accordingly, in order to take a leading role in the battle for talent, it is paramount for companies to treat applicants fairly during the hiring process (Truxillo, Steiner, & Gilliland, 2004).

Over the years a lot of knowledge has been gathered on antecedents and consequences of applicants' fairness *perceptions* (see Hausknecht, Day, & Thomas, 2004, for an overview). Rather recently, however, also fairness *expectations* started to receive some interest (see Bell et al., 2004). Expectations have been shown to have a strong influence on fairness perceptions (i.e., through confirmation biases, see Bell et al., 2004) and through fairness perceptions, also affect important organizational outcomes (e.g., organizational attractiveness and job pursuit intentions, Schreurs, Derous, Proost, & De Witte, 2010). This growing interest in fairness expectations outcomes stands in contrast to the void of research on the antecedents of fairness expectations. Understanding the sources of fairness expectations and consequently how these expectations are shaped, may nevertheless be helpful in developing effective recruitment strategies.

To further research in this field, Bell et al. (2004) developed a conceptual model including antecedents and consequences of justice expectations. In this model, they distinguished between three groups of antecedents: direct experiences with the

selection procedure, indirect experiences (e.g., through communication with peers), and pre-existing beliefs (e.g., belief in a just world, belief in tests). Unfortunately, the theoretical basis of this model as well as empirical support for the proposed relationships are still relatively meager.

The present study focuses on two pre-existing beliefs (i.e., belief in a just world, and belief in tests), and the way through which they influence justice expectations. As such, we add to the literature in two ways. First, we provide an empirical test of the proposed relationships between beliefs and justice expectations. Second, based on propositions from construal level theory (CLT, Liberman & Trope, 1998; Trope & Liberman, 2000, 2010), we argue that the influence of beliefs on justice expectations depends on the amount of direct experiences of the applicant. We specifically test the possibility that the influence of concrete, selection-specific beliefs, such as belief in tests, on justice expectations is stronger in the presence of more direct experiences; and that the influence of abstract beliefs, such as belief in a just world, is stronger when applicants lack direct experiences with the selection procedure. These hypotheses will be tested in a large pool of real applicants for the job of prison guards for the federal government in Belgium.

General beliefs and Justice Expectations

Expectations refer to beliefs that one holds about the future as well as subjective estimates of the likelihood of future events (Olson, Roese, & Zanna, 1996). These expectations serve as powerful determinants of future behavior, attitudes and affect (Bandura, 1997; Carver & Scheier, 1998; Segerstrom & Sephton, 2010). Also in selection context, applicants form expectations about the forthcoming selection procedure and outcome, and specifically about the *fairness* they can expect with respect to the selection procedure (i.e., procedural justice expectations), and the

outcome of the selection procedure (i.e., distributive justice expectations, see Bell et al., 2004).

Bell et al. (2004) suggested that, to a certain extent, all expectations people form about their future may be influenced by existing beliefs. Consequently, *justice* expectations may be guided by general beliefs people hold about fairness. One important ‘fairness belief’ is the belief in a just world (BJW). This belief reflects an individuals’ confidence in the idea that everyone gets what he/she deserves, and that good people are rewarded and bad people are punished (Lerner, 1982; Lerner & Miller, 1978; Lerner & Montada, 1998). This is a rather general and mostly implicit assumption that people hold and need in order to make the world controllable (Hafer & Bègue, 2005). People are highly motivated to preserve this belief, even when confronted with injustice (Reichle, Schneider, & Montada, 1998). In order to restore the cognitive balance when confronted with injustice, people tend to blame the innocent victim for the injustice done to him/her (Reichle et al., 1998). Along the same line, developmental research found this belief to be rather stable across the life-span (for a review, see Furnham, 2003).

With respect to expectations, individuals high on BJW tend to believe more strongly that they will be treated fairly in future events and that they will be reciprocated fairly in social exchange situations (Lipkus & Bissonnette, 1996, 1998). With respect to the selection context, this may mean that applicants high on BJW will more strongly expect to be treated in a just way (i.e., higher levels of procedural justice) and that their efforts will be reciprocated in a fair way (i.e., higher levels of distributive justice). Hence, the following hypothesis can be formulated:

Hypothesis 1: Belief in a just world is positively related to procedural justice expectations (H1a) and distributive justice expectations (H1b).

Another important ‘fairness belief’, that is less general and more tailored to the specific context of personnel selection, is the belief in tests. This belief represents the idea that tests are good and valid instruments to be used to select people into jobs (Arvey, Strickland, Drauden, & Martin, 1990). Bell et al. (2004) suggested a positive relationship between belief in tests and expectations of fairness in the sense that applicants who believe in the validity of tests, will probably place more trust in the selection procedure and outcome and as such expect more justice than applicants who put low faith in the use of selection tests. Preliminary empirical evidence for this suggestion was found by Chan, Schmitt, Sacco and DeShon (1998) and by Lievens, De Corte and Brysse (2003), who found that belief in tests related positively to perceptions of fairness, measured prior to the selection process. This results in the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2: Belief in tests will be positively related to procedural justice expectations (H2a) and distributive justice expectations (H2b).

Moderation of direct experiences

Bell et al. (2004) further argued that the reliance on beliefs to form justice expectations may be especially true for events that people have not experienced directly. This suggests a moderation effect of direct experiences, so that the relationship between beliefs and justice expectations will be stronger in the absence of direct experiences. Based on CLT, we will argue in the following paragraphs that this proposition might be true for more abstract beliefs, such as the belief in a just world, but not for more concrete beliefs, such as belief in tests.

CLT (Liberman & Trope, 1998; Trope & Liberman, 2000, 2010) suggests that temporal distance from future events affects the way people make predictions about those events by changing the way people mentally construe those events. According

to this theory, when people make predictions about the near future, they base their prediction on concrete, contextual and incidental information. When making predictions about the distant future, people are more guided by abstract, general and decontextualized information. For example, when people are asked to make predictions about their performance in an upcoming quiz, these predictions were more influenced by their perceived competence (an abstract, high-level consideration) than by specific task characteristics of the quiz (concrete, low-level considerations) when the quiz was in the far future. The opposite was true when the quiz was planned in the near future (Nussbaum, Trope, & Liberman, 2001; see also Nussbaum, Liberman, & Trope, 2006).

Belief in a just world might be considered an abstract belief, applying to different contexts and different life domains, and not tailored to the selection context at hand (Dalbert & Stoeber, 2006; Furnham & Procter, 1992). As mentioned before, this belief remains rather stable throughout the life-span and direct experiences have limited influence on this belief (see Furnham, 2003, for an overview).

Nussbaum, Trope and Liberman (2003) suggested and found support for the idea that in the absence of low-level, contextualized information, high-level, abstract information will be used to predict behavior both in the near and the far future. When, however, both types of information become available, people will rely more on the concrete information in order to make predictions for the near future. In the same line, Förster (2009) found that lack of direct experiences enhances level of construal in the sense that novelty enhances global perception, whereas through gathering direct experiences, people engage in more detailed, local perception. The author suggested that in order to prepare for novel events, people engage in higher levels of construals. As such, we suggest that inexperienced applicants may form their expectations about

the upcoming selection procedure, even for the near future, on the basis of abstract beliefs, such as belief in a just world. On the contrary, when concrete information becomes available (e.g., through directly experiencing the selection procedure), and in line with CLT, the influence of this general, abstract belief on the formation of justice expectations for the near future, will diminish. Consequently, we formulated the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: Direct experiences moderate the relationship between belief in a just world and justice expectations, so that the positive relationship with procedural justice expectations (H3a) and distributive justice expectations (H3b) is more pronounced among inexperienced applicants.

For inexperienced applicants, who have not passed through any selection procedure, their belief in tests is abstract and not contextualized. When gathering experience with personnel selection and through learning that selection tests play a dominant role in personnel selection (Lievens & De Soete, 2011), however, this belief becomes more concrete. By passing through the selection procedure and through a process of experiential learning (Kolb, 1984), applicants learn about the procedure and about the dominant role that tests play in determining one's outcome. On the basis of this experience, applicants will adjust their notion of belief in tests, incorporating more concrete and contextualized details (Nussbaum, Liberman, & Trope, 2006). Based on CLT, it can then be suggested that this more concrete belief will more strongly influence predictions for the near future (i.e., forthcoming selection procedure) than the initial abstract belief in test. As such, we suggest a stronger positive relationship between belief in tests and justice expectations among experienced applicants, leading to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4: Direct experiences moderate the relationship between belief in

tests and justice expectations, so that the positive relationship with procedural justice expectations (H4a) and distributive justice expectations (H4b) is more pronounced among experienced applicants.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Participants were applicants for the job of prison guard for the federal government in Belgium. This entails a large-scale procedure where thousands of applicants apply every year. Numerous applicants fail this test but have the possibility to re-apply for it in the next years, so some participants are to a certain extent ‘experienced’ applicants. Candidates may re-apply unlimited.

Data were collected during the first hurdle of the selection procedure, which consisted of a written examination for which applicants were all gathered together in a large room and received four hours to complete the examination. Due to the large number of applicants, it took about one hour before all applicants were seated together in this room and the examination could start. In order not to disturb the regular selection procedure, questionnaires were placed on all desks before applicants entered the examination room. On top of the questionnaire, a clear request was made to start answering the questionnaire immediately (i.e., during the time that other applicants were entering the room). In accordance with regulations, the examination started as soon as all applicants were seated. At that moment, applicants also had to stop answering the questionnaire. As a result, applicants last entering the examination room did not have sufficient time to complete the survey and questionnaires were returned uncompleted or even blank.

Several precautions were taken to prevent socially desirable responding. Specifically, in the instructions it was emphasized that cooperation was voluntary and

that participants were free to stop at any time. It was stressed that data were collected for research purposes only and that results would have no impact on the further selection course or outcome.

In total, 1073 applicants participated in this study. However, due to incomplete responses, 270 questionnaires were omitted from the analyses resulting in 803 usable responses. This sample consisted of 38% women. The average age was 34 ($SD = 9.45$). Respondents had on average 14 years of work experience ($SD = 9.49$). More specifically, 14% of the respondents already worked for the federal government. 72% of the applicants were ‘inexperienced’ applicants, who applied for the first time. The number of re-applications varied between 1 (17%) and 9 (1 applicant).

Measures

Belief in tests. Belief in tests was measured with four items of the Test Attitude Survey (Arvey et al., 1990) on a five-point Likert scale (1 = *totally disagree*, 5 = *totally agree*). Items were slightly reworded in order to fit the specific selection test (i.e., examination). A sample item is “Exams are a good way of selecting people into jobs”. Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .82.

Belief in a just world. Belief in a just world was measured with eight items, taken from Lipkus, Dalbert, and Siegler (1996). Items were measured on a six-point Likert scale (1 = *totally disagree*, 6 = *totally agree*). A sample item is: “I feel that the world treats me fairly”. Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .88.

Direct experiences. Direct experiences was measured with one item in which applicants were asked how often they had taken part in the first stage of the application process for the job of prison guard. Higher numbers indicated more past experiences.

Justice expectations. Justice expectations were measured with the scales

developed by Colquitt (2001), adapted to the selection context by Bell et al. (2006). We measured the two justice dimensions on a Likert type scale (1 = *totally disagree*, 5 = *totally agree*): distributive justice (4 items; e.g., “During this examination for prison guard, I expect that my test score will be justified, given my performance”) and procedural justice (7 items; e.g., “During this examination for prison guard, I expect that the procedures will be applied consistently. Cronbach’s alphas for these scales were respectively .84 and .71.

Control variables. In line with earlier findings, we controlled for age and gender (0 = *men*, 1 = *women*). Specifically, Bell et al. (2006) found a negative relationship between age and procedural justice expectations and found that women expected more interpersonal justice than men.

Analyses

The hypotheses were tested using hierarchical moderated regression analyses. Control variables were entered in the first step. The main effects of direct experiences and both beliefs were entered in the second step and the interaction terms between direct experiences and beliefs were entered in the third step. In line with Aiken and West (1991), the independent variables and moderator were standardized to obtain the interaction term.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Means, standard deviations and correlations are presented in Table 1. Both BJW and belief in tests had a significant positive relationship with justice expectations. Direct experiences had a significant negative relationship with belief in a just world and belief in tests, as well as with distributive and procedural justice expectations.

Prior to testing the hypotheses, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis to determine whether the four measures (i.e., two types of beliefs and two types of justice expectations) were empirically distinct from one another. Fit indices indicated an acceptable fit of the proposed four-factor (i.e., belief in a just world, belief in tests, procedural justice expectations, distributive justice expectations) model, χ^2 (222) = 1275.54, RMSEA = .08 [.074-.083], CFI = .94, NFI = .93, SRMR = .07, PCFI = .82, PNFI = .81.

In order to rule out the possibility that main effects actually resulted from common-method variance, we estimated two additional models (cf. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). First, a Harman's single factor test showed a weak fit for a one-factor confirmatory model, χ^2 (228) = 4017.79, RMSEA = .17, CFI = .78, NFI = .77, SRMR = .13, PCFI = .70, PNFI = .70 suggesting that common method effects are not a likely contamination of the results of this study. To confirm these results, we re-estimated the initial four-factor model but this time, we added a general method factor with all indicators loading onto this factor as well as onto their own theoretically relevant factor. This resulted in an improvement in absolute fit indices, χ^2 (195) = 666.40, RMSEA = .06 [.051-.060], CFI = .97, NFI = .96, SRMR = .04 but in a clear decrease in the parsimony adjusted fit indices, PCFI = .75, PNFI = .74. In sum, it appears that common method variance is unlikely to be driving our results.

Testing the hypotheses

Results of the hierarchical regression analyses are presented in Table 2. Positive relationships were found between the two beliefs (i.e., belief in a just world and belief in tests) and both types of justice expectations, providing support for Hypotheses 1 (a and b) and 2 (a and b).

Partial support was also found for the hypothesized interaction between BJW and direct experiences (H3). For BJW, an interaction was found with direct experiences on distributive justice (see Figure 1) in line with Hypothesis 3b. Simple slopes analyses showed that the positive relationship between BJW and distributive justice expectations was stronger for inexperienced, $\beta = .39, t = 8.72, p < .01$, than for experienced applicants, $\beta = .15, t = 3.56, p < .01$. This interaction between BJW and direct experiences, however, was not significant with respect to procedural justice expectations (H3a).

Hypothesis 4, suggesting an interaction between belief in tests and direct experiences, was supported for both types of justice expectations (see Figure 2 for procedural justice expectations; see Figure 3 for distributive justice expectations). Specifically, simple slopes analyses (Aiken & West, 1991) showed that the positive relationship between belief in tests and procedural justice expectations was stronger among experienced applicants, $\beta = .35, t = 8.31, p < .01$, than among inexperienced applicants, $\beta = .24, t = 5.25, p < .01$ (H4a). The same results were found with respect to distributive justice expectations. The positive relationship between belief in tests and distributive justice expectations was stronger among experienced applicants, $\beta = .39, t = 9.29, p < .01$, than among inexperienced applicants, $\beta = .22, t = 5.03, p < .01$ (H4b).

Discussion

This study investigates antecedents of applicants' justice expectations and more specifically considers the influence of existing beliefs in combination with direct experiences on justice expectations. So far, little is known about the specific antecedents that are salient in selection contexts and about their interplay to form justice expectations.

The results of this study showed that both BJW and belief in tests are positively related to both expectations of distributive and procedural justice. The results further showed that in the presence of direct experiences, beliefs can either lose or gain salience for the formation of justice expectations, depending on the level of abstraction of the belief. Specifically and in line with our expectations, the relationship between the more abstract BJW and distributive justice expectations was stronger among inexperienced applicants. Conversely, the relationship between the concrete, selection-specific belief in tests and both distributive and procedural justice expectations was stronger among experienced applicants.

The interaction between direct experiences and BJW, however, was not found with respect to procedural justice expectations. A tentative explanation might be that belief in a just world is largely focused on fair *procedures*, which makes this belief more salient with respect to procedures (i.e., procedural justice expectations) and less with respect to outcomes (i.e., distributive justice). For example, Lerner (1982) described the need to believe in a just world as a desire to assume that there are manageable *procedures* which are effective in producing fair outcomes. Also, BJW is strongly related to internal locus of control (Rubin & Peplau, 1973). This means that strong believers in a just world, who receive an unfair outcome, will attribute this to some internal cause and argue that they deserve the unfair outcome (Hafer & Olson, 1989). As such, they may be reluctant to attribute the unfair outcome to an unfair procedure in an attempt to preserve their belief in a just world. Consequently, when forming expectations for the next selection procedure, strong believers may base their subsequent expectations again on their general BJW, even when they have witnessed the selection procedure before.

Theoretical implications

Within the organizational justice literature, recently scholars started to explore justice *expectations* and their influence on how people approach, perceive, and react to organizational events. This study adds to the justice literature as well as the applicants reactions literature (for an overview, see Hausknecht et al., 2004) by studying antecedents of fairness expectations in a personnel selection context. The results of this study can help organizations to manage these expectations and as such to shape applicants' justice perceptions.

The focus of the present study is on the influence of pre-existing beliefs on justice expectations. Bell et al. (2004) argued that these beliefs form the basis for all expectations. This study supported the conceptual model of Bell et al. (2004) by supporting a significant relationship between beliefs and justice expectations. This study also added to this model by showing that not all beliefs have equal salience for the formation of justice expectations under the presence of direct experiences.

The moderation of direct experiences on the relationship between belief in tests and justice expectations was in line with CLT (Trope & Liberman, 2000, 2010). In the presence of direct experiences, belief in tests might become more concrete and contextualized and as such become more salient for predicting the near future (i.e., fairness of the upcoming selection procedure) than the more abstract belief in tests that is held by inexperienced applicants. The results were less straightforward with respect to BJW. In the literature, it is suggested that this belief is rather stable throughout the life-span and rather unaffected by life experiences (Furnham, 2003). As such, it can be considered a rather abstract, decontextualized belief, even in the presence of direct experiences. Based on CLT, it can then be suggested that this belief will be less salient to make predictions for the near future, especially in the presence of more concrete information (i.e., direct experiences). Evidence for this reasoning

was found for distributive justice but not for procedural justice. Future research could investigate whether an alternative explanation for this finding may lie in different levels of abstraction of these two types of justice.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The data collection in the present study occurred only at one point in time making it impossible to support claims of causality. The use of self-report measures with all variables measured at the same time may also have introduced the possibility that main effects actually result from common-method variance. However, a series of confirmatory factor analyses (i.e., Harman's single-factor test and common method factor, Podsakoff, et al., 2003) showed that there was no evidence of common method variance. Hence, we are confident that our study accurately reflects how the constructs relate to one another. Furthermore, Crampton and Wagner (1994) report that common method variance may not be a significant problem in organizational research, and Evans (1985) and McClelland and Judd (1993) suggest that common method variance cannot account for indirect effects.

In this study we focused on the moderating role of applicants' direct experiences on justice expectations. Bell et al.'s (2004) suggested that also indirect experiences (e.g., observing others, communication from other individuals, institutions or media) could influence the formation of justice expectations. Further research could consider whether indirect experiences fulfill the same moderating role on justice expectations. Based on the idea that indirect experiences influence justice expectations depending on several other factors such as the nature and the reliability of the source (Bell et al., 2004; Pornpitakpan, 2004;) and tie strength (i.e., the closeness of the relationship with the source, see Van Hove & Lievens, 2007), these indirect experiences may moderate the influence of beliefs on justice expectations in

an even more complex way.

This study focused on distributive and procedural justice expectations. Although these are the two basic forms of justice, later research has further subdivided procedural justice into three components, namely procedural justice, informational justice and interactional justice (Colquitt, 2011). Further research could consider these four types of justice expectations. A possible avenue for the future might be to investigate whether beliefs more strongly influence more formal aspects of the selection encounter (outcome and procedure), and to a lesser extent interpersonal aspects (interpersonal treatment and information received). These interpersonal judgments are possibly based more strongly on direct experiences with the recruiter and the recruiting organization, and less shaped on the basis of general beliefs.

Practical Implications

Through studying antecedents of applicants' justice expectations, tools can be handed to organizations in order to manage these justice expectations and consequently to shape applicants perceptions of justice. The results of the present study showed a significant relationship between belief in tests and distributive and procedural justice expectations, which even increases in strength in the presence of direct experiences. Hence, organizations may consider highlighting the validity of their selection tests in an attempt to increase their applicants' belief in tests. A stronger belief in tests will raise expectations about justice, which in turn, will influence applicant justice perceptions and more distal outcomes, such as job pursuit intentions and behavior. The literature to date, however, does not provide any clear guidelines on how to proceed. Lievens, DeCorte and Brysse (2003) found that providing applicants with information on the validity and the reliability of selection

tests did not increase their perceptions of fairness. Truxillo, Bauer, Campion and Paronto (2002) on the contrary, did find positive effects of providing information on job relatedness and the feedback process to applicants on fairness judgments. Finally, a meta-analytic study of Truxillo, Bodner, Bertolino, Bauer and Yonce (2009) suggests that offering explanations does affect applicants' perceptions of justice. Hence, providing test-related information may be a cost-effective solution to increase perceptions (and possibly expectations) of fairness.

Conclusion

To conclude, this study showed that BJW and belief in tests relate to justice expectations and that this relationship is moderated by direct experiences. Whereas the relationship between BJW and distributive justice expectations was less pronounced in the presence of direct experiences, the relationship between belief in tests and justice expectations was stronger in the presence of direct experiences.

References

- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple Regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Arvey, R. D., Strickland, W., Drauden, G., & Martin, C. (1990). Motivational components of test-taking. *Personnel Psychology*, 43, 695-716.
doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1990.tb00679.x
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy. The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Bell, B. S., Ryan, A. M., & Wiechmann, D. J. (2004). Justice expectations and applicant perceptions. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12, 24–38. doi: 10.1111/j.0965-075X.2004.00261.x
- Bell, B. S., Wiechmann, D. J., & Ryan, A. M. (2006). Consequences of Organizational Justice Expectations in a Selection System. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 455–466. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.2.455
- Carver, C.S., & Scheier, M.F. (1998). *On the self-regulation of behavior*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chan, D., Schmitt, N., Sacco, J.M., & DeShon, R.P. (1998). Understanding pretest and posttest reactions to cognitive ability and personality tests. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 471–485.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 386–400. doi: 10.1037//0021-10.86.3.386.
- Crampton S. M., & Wagner, J. A. (1994). Percept-percept inflation in micro-organizational research: an investigation of prevalence and effect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 67-76. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.79.1.67
- Dalbert, C., & Stoeber, J. (2006). The personal belief in a just world and domain-

- specific beliefs about justice at school and in the family: A longitudinal study with adolescents. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 30, 200-207. doi: 10.1177/0165025406063638
- Evans, M. G. (1985). A Monte Carlo study of the effects of correlated method variance in moderated multiple regression analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 36, 305-323. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(85)90002-0
- Furnham, A. (2003). Belief in a just world: Research progress over the past decade. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 34, 795-817.
- Furnham, A., & Procter, E. (1992). Sphere-specific just world beliefs and attitudes to AIDS. *Human Relations*, 45, 265-280. doi:10.1177/001872679204500303
- Gilliland, S. W. (1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems: An organizational justice perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 694-734.
- Förster, J. (2009). Cognitive consequences of novelty and familiarity: How mere exposure influences level of construal. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 444-447.
- Hafer, C.L., & Bègue, L. (2005). Experimental research on just-world theory: Problems, development, and future challenges. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131, 128-167.
- Hafer, C.L., & Olson, J.M. (1989). Beliefs in a just world and reactions to personal deprivation. *Journal of Personality*, 57, 799-823.
- Hausknecht, J. P., Day, D. V., & Thomas, S. C. (2004). Applicant reactions to selection procedures: An updated model and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 57, 639-683. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.00003.x

- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lerner, M. J. (1982). *The belief in a just world: A fundamental delusion*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Lerner, M. J., & Miller, D. T. (1978). Just world research and the attribution process: Looking back and ahead. *Psychological Bulletin*, 85, 1030-1051.
doi:10.1037/0033-2909.85.5.1030
- Lerner, M. J., & Montada, L. (1998). An overview: Advances in belief in a just world theory and methods. In L. Montada (Ed.), *Responses to victimizations and belief in a just world* (pp. 1-7). New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Liberman, N., & Trope, Y. (1998). The role of feasibility and desirability considerations in near and distant future decisions: A test of temporal construal theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 5-18.
- Lievens, F., De Corte, W., & Brysse, K. (2003). Applicant Perceptions of Selection Procedures: The Role of Selection Information, Belief in Tests, and Comparative Anxiety. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11, 65-75. doi: 10.1111/1468-2389.00227
- Lievens, F., & De Soete, B. (2011). Instrumenten om personeel te selecteren in de 21^{ste} Eeuw: Onderzoek en praktijk. *Gedrag & Organisatie*, 24, 18-42.
- Lipkus, I.M., & Bissonnette, V.L. (1996). Relationships among belief in a just world, willingness to accommodate, and marital well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 1043-1056.
- Lipkus, I.M., & Bissonnette, V.L. (1998). The belief in a just world and willingness to accommodate among married and dating couples. In L. Montada & M.J. Lerner (Eds.), *Responses to victimization and belief in a just world* (pp. 127-

- 140). New York: Plenum Press.
- Lipkus, I. M., Dalbert, C., & Siegler, I. C. (1996). The importance of distinguishing the belief in a just world for self versus for others: Implications for psychological well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 666-677. doi: 10.1177/0146167296227002
- McClelland, G. H., & Judd, C. M. (1993). Statistical difficulties of detecting interactions and moderator effects. *Psychological bulletin*, 114, 376-390.
- Nussbaum, S., Liberman, N., & Trope, Y. (2006). Predicting the near and distant future. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 135, 152-161.
- Nussbaum, S., Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2001). Time-dependent changes in prediction of future events. Tel Aviv University, unpublished manuscript.
- Nussbaum, S., Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2003). Creeping dispositionism: The temporal dynamics of behavior prediction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 485-497.
- Olson, J. M., Roese, N. J., & Zanna, M. P. (1996). Expectancies. In E. T. Higgins & A.W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 211–238). New York: Guilford Press.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B. Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 879-903. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
- Pornpitakpan, C. (2004). The persuasiveness of source credibility: A critical review of five decades' evidence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34, 243-281.
- Reichle, B., Schneider, A., & Montada, L. (1998). How do observers of victimization preserve their belief in a just world cognitively or actionally? Findings from a

- longitudinal study. In L. Montada & M. Lerner (Eds.), *Responses to victimization and belief in a just world* (pp. 55-63). New York: Plenum Press.
- Rubin, Z., & Peplau, L.A. (1973). Belief in a just world and reactions' to another's lot. A study of participants in the national draft lottery. *Journal of Social Issues*, 29, 73-93.
- Schreurs, B., & Syed, F. (2011). Battling the war for talent: An application in a military context. *Career Development International*, 16, 36-59, doi: 10.1108/13620431111107801
- Schreurs, B., Derous, E., Proost, K., & De Witte, K. (2010). The relationship between selection expectations, perceptions and organizational attraction: A test of competing models. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 18, 447-452. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2389.2010.00527.x
- Segerstrom, S.C., & Sephton, S.E. (2010). Optimistic expectancies and cell-mediated immunity: The role of positive affect. *Psychological Science*, 21, 448-455.
- Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2000). Temporal construal and time-dependent changes in preferences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 876-889.
- Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2010). Construal-level theory of psychological distance. *Psychological Review*, 117, 440-463.
- Truxillo, D.M., Bauer, T.N., Campion, M.A., & Paronto, M.E. (2002). Selection fairness information and applicant reactions: A longitudinal field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 1020-1031.
- Truxillo, D. M., Bodner, T. E., Bertolino, M., Bauer, T. N., & Yonce, C. A. (2009). Effects of Explanations on Applicant Reactions: A meta-analytic review. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 17, 346-361. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2389.2009.00478.x

- Truxillo, D.M., Steiner, D.D., & Gilliland, S.W. (2004). The importance of organizational justice in personnel selection: Defining when selection fairness really matters. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12, 39-53.
- Turban, D.B. (2001). Organizational attractiveness as an employer on college campuses: An examination of the applicant population. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 293-312.
- Van Hove, G., & Lievens, F. (2007). Social influences on organizational attractiveness: Investigating if and when word of mouth matters. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37, 2024-2047.

Note

The research reported here was made possible thanks to the cooperation of the Selection Office of the Belgian Federal Government (Selor) to collect the data.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations between the variables in this study.

	M	SD	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 Age	34.21	9.45	-.02	-.11**	-.09**	.17**	-.00	-.05
2 Gender	.38	.49		-.03	-.04	-.05	-.05	-.03
3 Belief in a just world	4.19	.86			.23**	-.14**	.33**	.29**
4 Belief in tests	3.61	.84				-.24**	.38**	.37**
5 Direct Experiences	.52	1.09					-.16**	-.21**
6 Distributive justice expectations	3.45	.85						.50**
7 Procedural justice expectations	3.74	.54						

** : $p < .01$

Table 2. Results of the moderated hierarchical regression analysis on both types of justice expectations

DV Distributive Justice Expectations		Unstandardized B's			R ²	Adj R ²	R ² change	F change	df1	df2
		Step 1	Step 2	Step 3						
1	Age	-.00	.05*	.05*						
	Gender	-.04	-.02	-.02	.00	-.00	.00	.80	2	800
2	BJW		.22**	.22**						
	Belief in tests		.27**	.26**						
	Direct experiences		-.06+	-.05	.21	.21	.21	70.50**	3	797
3	BJW x experiences			-.10**						
	Belief in tests x experiences			.07*	.23	.22	.02	9.33**	2	795
DV Procedural Justice Expectations		Unstandardized B's			R ²	Adj R ²	R ² change	F change	Df1	Df2
		Step 1	Step 2	Step 3						
1	Age	-.03	.01	.01						
	Gender	-.02	-.01	-.01	.00	.00	.00	1.24	2	800
2	BJW		.11**	.11**						
	Belief in tests		.16**	.16**						
	Direct experiences		-.06**	-.04+	.20	.19	.19	63.39**	3	797
3	BJW x experiences			.01						
	Belief in tests x experiences			.03*	.20	.20	.01	3.51*	2	795

+: p < .10; *p < .05; **: p < .01

Figure Captions

Figure 1.

The relationship between belief in a just world and distributive justice expectations as a function of direct experiences.

Figure 2.

The relationship between belief in tests and procedural justice expectations as a function of direct experiences.

Figure 3.

The relationship between belief in tests and distributive justice expectations as a function of direct experiences.

Figure 1.

Figure 2.

Figure 3.