

Hassan, Qandeel et al.

**Article**

## Applicants reaction towards the personnel selection methods in Pakistan

Cogent Business & Management

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Taylor & Francis Group

*Suggested Citation:* Hassan, Qandeel et al. (2020) : Applicants reaction towards the personnel selection methods in Pakistan, Cogent Business & Management, ISSN 2331-1975, Taylor & Francis, Abingdon, Vol. 7, Iss. 1, pp. 1-13,  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1816418>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/244943>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



## Applicants reaction towards the personnel selection methods in Pakistan

Qandeel Hassan, Ghulam Abid, Jamil Ahmad, Muhammad Ali, Ahmed Hussain Khan & Rabbia Zafar |

To cite this article: Qandeel Hassan, Ghulam Abid, Jamil Ahmad, Muhammad Ali, Ahmed Hussain Khan & Rabbia Zafar | (2020) Applicants reaction towards the personnel selection methods in Pakistan, Cogent Business & Management, 7:1, 1816418, DOI: [10.1080/23311975.2020.1816418](https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1816418)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1816418>



© 2020 The Author(s). This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license.



Published online: 09 Sep 2020.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 533



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Received: 16 July 2019  
Accepted: 24 August 2020

\*Corresponding author: Qandeel Hassan, Business Studies, National College of Business Administration and Economics, Lahore, Pakistan  
E-mail: [syeda.qandeel28@gmail.com](mailto:syeda.qandeel28@gmail.com)

Reviewing editor:  
Joseph Amankwah-Amoah, Kent Business School, University of Kent, Canterbury, UK

Additional information is available at the end of the article

## MANAGEMENT | RESEARCH ARTICLE

# Applicants reaction towards the personnel selection methods in Pakistan

Qandeel Hassan<sup>1\*</sup>, Ghulam Abid<sup>2</sup>, Jamil Ahmad<sup>1</sup>, Muhammad Ali<sup>3</sup>, Ahmed Hussain Khan<sup>1</sup> and Rabbia Zafar<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** The purpose of this study is to investigate applicants' reactions towards different personnel selection methods used in Pakistan. A sample of 149 undergraduates, graduates, and working adults rated their perceptions of the favorability and fairness of these personnel selection methods, namely: resumes, job knowledge tests, biographical information, interviews, personal references, work-sample tests, personality tests, written ability tests, personal contacts, and situational judgment tests. Our first research objective is to provide details about applicant reactions, detailed system of the same and methods on a range based on working adults, graduates, and undergraduates. The second major objective is to identify the interaction effects of favorability and system fairness based upon applicant reactions. Descriptive data analysis was performed using IBM SPSS and the data was collected from Lahore, Islamabad, and Jhelum. The results demonstrated that 112 applicants reported the most favorable rating reaction towards the interview personnel selection method, with the effectiveness of identifying qualified people for

### ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Qandeel Hassan holds an M.Phil degree in Business Administration from National College of Business Administration & Economics (NCBA&E), Lahore, Pakistan.

Ghulam Abid is an Assistant Professor of Management in the Department of Business Studies at Kinnaird College For Women, Lahore, Pakistan. He received his PhD degree from the NCBA&E. His research focuses on employee thriving and positive organizational scholarship.

Jamil Ahmad holds an M.Phil degree in Business Administration and currently a PhD scholar at NCBA&E. He has a several years of governance and management experience in a large organization.

Muhammad Ali is working as an Assistant Professor at IBA, University of the Punjab, Lahore since 2018. He completed his split Ph.D. in Business Administration from NCBA&E and University of British Columbia, Canada in 2017.

Ahmed Hussain Khan holds an M.Phil degree in Business Administration and currently a PhD scholar at National College of Business Administration.

Rabbia Zafar received her M.Phil from NCBA&E and is currently involved in research revolving around punitive.

### PUBLIC INTEREST STATEMENT

The biggest challenge for any organization is to select the right person for the right job. Multiple available selection methods can be utilized by the organizations, such as biographical information, interviews, personality tests, personal references, work sample tests, assessment centers. For this most suitable and fair selection method is to be adopted which not only enables to assess the needs of the organization and select the right person, but should also be convenient for the applicants to respond objectively. Therefore, the objective of our study is to identify the effects of interaction on favorability and system fairness using these applicant reactions on different methods. It is found that interviews are more suitable and appreciated by the applicants than any other selection method.

the job, while 101 applicants reported a favorable rating reaction towards job knowledge tests, noting the fairness of this procedure. In addition, implications for the current assessment of selection practices from the applicants' viewpoints, the strengths and limitations of the study, and directions for future research are all discussed. The practices of different predictor methods are considered in the conclusion.

**Subjects: Operations Management; Personnel Selection, Assessment; Human Resource Management; Management & Organization;**

**Keywords: personnel selection methods; applicant reactions**

### 1. Introduction

Research on organizational staff structure has mainly focused on the most traditional methods and techniques used while hiring employees for the job. Marcus (2003) showed that hiring a person is the very first point of contact between the employee and the employer, and therefore studies should search for fair reactions. These may affect applicants' decisions while being hired, as well as their perceptions before being hired (Khilji, 1995) as an employee or consumer. Companies that do not pay attention to such issues face multiple consequences, i.e low applicant response rate and poor market reputation. Throughout the previous two decades, applicants and reactions have been considered to be of key interest. During this time, the facts and figures of main investigations, narrative criticisms (Chan & Schmitt, 2004; Ryan & Ployhart, 2000), and meta-analyses (Anderson, Salgado et al., 2010; Truxillo, Bodner et al., 2009) were issued, and studies on applicant reactions were established as a point of focus. These studies have provided us with applicants' reactions to and perceptions of companies and their hiring processes, with support provided from dissimilar states, and through offering administrations with research on applicant responses upon which they can detract from their hiring system.

The countries that were used to gather data for research have grown with time, with the majority of studies extracted from Western countries. These research attempts are comprised of applicants' reaction samples, drawn from the 2002 United States (Hoang et al., 2012; Nikolaou & Judge, 2007; Phillips & Gully, 2002; Steiner & Gilliland, 1996), France (Steiner & Gilliland, 1996), Singapore (Phillips & Gully, 2002), Spain and Portugal (Moscoso & Salgado, 2004), South Africa (De Jong & Visser, 2000), Germany (Marcus, 2003), Belgium (Stinglhamber et al., 1999), Greece (Nikolaou & Judge, 2007), Italy (Bertolino & Steiner, 2007), the Netherlands (Anderson & Witvliet, 2008), Turkey (Bilgic & Acarlar, 2010), Romania (Ispas et al., 2010), Vietnam (Hoang et al., 2012), Iceland (Jonsdottir & Hafsteinson, 2008), Saudi Arabia (Anderson, Ahmed et al., 2012), and China (Anderson, Liu et al., 2016). Until now, research conducted on the same topic was unable to evaluate selection methods in Pakistan, portraying how we have less knowledge about the mechanisms of the reactions and beliefs of applicants in non-Western nations. This study requires revising the reactions of a sample of salaried working adults, graduates, and undergraduates in Pakistan through renowned selection methods in the country. No such study has been carried out in Pakistan, which is important, considering the rapid economic growth and growing role of the country on the global markets.

The research from Western countries is predicted to be incompatible with the environment in Pakistan, due to differences in personnel practices, political climate, history, and cultural values. The current study provides applicants' reactions to different selection methods. The major considerations of this study are to consider Gilliland's (1993) "fair reactions" evaluation of graduates, undergraduates, and working adults using the reactions of the sample drawn from Pakistan.

An organization's system of hiring is very important for keeping a well-maintained database of applicants (Lyons & Marler, 2011; Potocnik, Anderson and Latorre, 2015). Multiple available selection methods can be utilized by the organizations, such as biographical information, interviews,

personality tests, personal references, work sample tests, assessment centers, etc. (Furnham & Jackson, 2011). In addition, Pakistan is gaining popularity all over the world in global markets, but there are currently no studies regarding Pakistani applicants' reactions based on selection methods. The current study reports this gap.

Therefore, the objectives of the study are twofold. The first is to provide details on applicants' reactions using detailed systems and methods in a range based on working adults, graduates, and undergraduates. The second objective is to identify the effects of interaction on favorability and system fairness using these applicant reactions.

This study offers three basic contributions. The first is to study the applicants' reactions in Pakistan. The second is the reactions of working adults, graduates, and undergraduates to the selection method. In addition, previous research was based on applicants with suspicious work experience (e.g., graduates). Therefore, undergraduates and working adults in our research sample dominated numerous personnel selection methods in Pakistani organizations, considering the acceptability of the criteria individually. Thirdly, prior methods (e.g., Steiner & Gilliland, 1996) have led us to compare our research conducted on the Pakistani sample with samples from other countries (United States, Singapore, China, and Greece, etc.).

## 2. Literature review

### 2.1. Applicants' viewpoints on selection methods

This research is important for a number of reasons. This research area on applicants' reactions is relatively new but has been known to be important for the last 20 years (Anderson & Hu, 2009; Anderson, Liu et al., 2016; Salgado, 2001). Different reactions have different effects on an employer's desirability (e.g., Bauer et al., 2001; Truxillo, Bauer, & Sanchez, 2001). There are two types of costs associated with dissatisfaction during the selection process—those spent on recruitment and losing employees (Murphy, 1986). Thus, behavior during selection affects the behavior of the applicant, who is considered the customer of the recruiting organization (Hausknecht et al., 2004). Taking into consideration an administration's productivity, it is important to note that the awareness of candidate responses directly affects the improvement of selection processes (Truxillo, Bauer et al., 2002, 2009).

A well-prepared system may help to avoid such costs. Applicants' reactions to recruitment systems also contribute to the recruiter's image. Furthermore, studies have focused on other reasons why research on applicants' reactions are important. The applicant's perception may affect on-the-job approaches, as well as the behavior of those appointed afterwards (Gilliland, 1993). Candidates who faced discriminatory treatment during selection may consider taking legal actions. Even if the system approach was successful, negative thinking may affect job performance (Ryan & Ployhart, 2000). Finally, to appraise the capacity for upgrading, unproductive applicants are still within the association, and their responses would also be useful to record (Ford et al., 2009). If unsuccessful candidates stay in their positions, inferior treatment may result in difficulty executing work tasks, associating with citizenship practices, and thinking, for both their activities and more (Hausknecht et al., 2004). The selection procedure is difficult for employees, as it gives rise to both positive and negative feelings (Anderson, 2004). At the end, selection provides both sides with an outcome to reach decisions, as well as to understand procedures from the applicants' and the organization's perspective (Chan & Schmitt, 2004).

An important theoretical framework to influence the field of candidate responses is provided by Gilliland's (1993) justice model. This framework has been drawn from Greenberg (1990), with the many research studies on this topic provided by Anderson, Salgado et al. (2010). The most common applicant reactions questionnaire is derived from Steiner and Gilliland (1996). According to this framework, two issues are associated with the fairness of selection systems (Gilliland, 1993): (1) procedural justice (i.e., considers whether an applicant thinks he/she is treated on fair

basis) and (2) distributive justice (i.e., result oriented). The applicant's view, based on procedural and distributive justice, determines their perception of system-based fairness (Anderson & Hu, 2009; Anderson, Salgado et al., 2010).

### **2.2. Reaction generalization versus situational specificity**

Studies of candidate responses to diverse selection procedures have been done over many states, including the United States (Hoang et al., 2012; Nikolaou & Judge, 2007; Phillips & Gully, 2002; Steiner & Gilliland, 1996), France (Steiner & Gilliland, 1996), Singapore (Phillips & Gully, 2002), Spain and Portugal (Moscoso & Salgado, 2004), South Africa (De Jong & Visser, 2000), Germany (Marcus, 2003), Belgium (Stinglhamber et al., 1999), Greece (Nikolaou & Judge, 2007), Italy (Bertolino & Steiner, 2007), the Netherlands (Anderson & Witvliet, 2008), Turkey (Bilgic & Acarlar, 2010), Romania (Ispas et al., 2010), Vietnam (Hoang et al., 2012), Iceland (Jonsdottir & Hafsteinson, 2008), Saudi Arabia (Anderson, Ahmed et al., 2012), and China (Anderson, Liu et al., 2016).

Nevertheless, candidate responses have yet to be studied in Pakistan, despite the fact that Pakistan is an emerging economy in the South Asia and become important for the global economy due to CPEC (China-Pakistan Economic Corridor). The applicants knew well how to observe practical fairness, distributive fairness, and perception selection procedures. Similarly, additional outcomes maintained that candidate responses were inclined towards organizational perceptions, receiving job offers, and the probability of suggesting the organization to others (Anderson, Ahmed et al., 2012). A study on the same research topic found that candidate responses agreed extensively in their positive ratings for prevalent procedures in these said countries. A meta-analysis studied how applicant reactions are based upon their diverse cultures (Anderson, Salgado et al., 2010). The outcomes provided almost the same reactions across countries, supporting the "reaction generalizability" hypothesis. This changes the idea that applicant perceptions are based on differences in culture, legislation, and human resource management practices (Marcus, 2003; Moscoso & Salgado, 2004). According to these studies, the interviews and work sample tests were the most satisfactory selection methods, in the same manner as resumes, cognitive tests, personality tests, and references were also considered to be favorable personnel selection procedures. On the other hand, honesty tests, personal contacts, and graphology were the least preferred personnel selection methods (Anderson, Salgado et al., 2010).

A similar design of applicant responses is also found in these studies (Anderson, Ahmed et al., 2012; Hoang et al., 2012). Our study complies with the response generalization assumption, particularly the previous study findings for Vietnam and Saudi Arabia, and can provide an instructive model for Pakistan because there are some similar cultural characteristics. At present, these are considered to be cohesive, with strong values on personal relationships. Still, applicant reactions to selection procedures are used to identify the requirements of a Pakistani culture or system. Therefore, the purpose of the present research is to identify applicant reactions to different personnel selection methods, specifically in Pakistan.

### **2.3. The context: Culture, HRM, and selection practices**

Pakistan is an Islamic country in Southern Asia and shares a special position among Western Asia, Central Asia, and Eastern Asia. It is rich in terms of its natural resources, while also being a nation with high cultural values. Pakistan's population, exceeding 198,809,261 million people, ranks in fifth in the world. Pakistan has a 1,046 km (650-mile) coastline along the Arabian Sea and the Gulf of Oman and shares borders with India to the east, Afghanistan to the west, Iran to the southwest, and China on the far northeastern side of the country. Although Pakistan has a wide and rich range of salt reserves, economic activity is mostly comprised of textile production and textile revenues. Pakistan has been a member of the World Trade Organization since 1 January 1995, and of GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) since 30 July 1948, unlocking its marketplaces to worldwide assets. There are tremendous multinational businesses in Pakistan, which own immense shares in of banking, telecommunications, and insurance.



Khilji (1995, 1999b) suggested that the culture of Pakistan is a combination of religion, Indian origins, British inheritance, and American effects. Commercial values are considered to be forced associative, with high uncertainty avoidance and a large power distance diemention according to Hofstede's model (Hofstede, 1980, 1991; Khilji, 1995). Some valuable indications are also delivered by Hofstede's model about cultural characteristics (Hofstede, 2011). According to Hofstede (2011), the qualities of Pakistani culture that are also considered by the author are characterized as high influence of power and high uncertainty. On the masculinity index, Pakistani culture lies in the center (Hofstede, 1991), explaining that individuals tend to have both qualities generally associated with men (i.e. being aggressive, ambitious, and competitive) and with women (i.e. a modesty, caring for others, and cooperation). In previous studies, Pakistan was ranked low for individualism, and had more cohesive behavior as compared to other Asian countries.

Pakistan has a distinctive cultural array, with a mix of an educated workforce that largely can speak English, liberal privatization and investment policies, and strategic geographical importance; however, Pakistan still lacks attention in management research. Tayeb (1997) argues that in Muslim countries, Islam affects organizations' structures, which might affect Human Resource Management (HRM). HRM in Pakistan has fewer values and HR jobs are not considered as important. In general, the idea anyone can perform HR jobs is fairly common (Khilji, 1999b). In the Western world, international institutions like the EU (European Union) and NAFTA (North American-Free Trade Agreement) control HRM policies and practices; however, Pakistan is inconsistent with procedures enforced by international bodies like the ILO (International Labor Organization). The field of HRM frequently provides new rules to retain employees, and the field of HRM is committed to looking for improvements in Pakistan because the national culture has an impact on the government's HR functions (Newman & Nollen, 1996). The area of HRM in Pakistan has a different status than in the West as elitist, seen as lacking in trust and deficient in communication. If HRM is successful in one culture, its success is not ensured in another culture (Khilji, 2003), so Pakistani employees have been looking forward to further development. The development of HRM is also dependent upon the economy, developing with a growing economy.

In the past few years, rapid population growth also increased the demand for service, in part because of an increase in female workers. Some of these factors include favoritism, absence of trained employees and stiff civil service, which had an impact on HRM services in Pakistan. The development of the quantity of national and private administrations, which have been increasing ever since the 1970s. Other influencing factors are individual relations, cultural and provincial preferences and affiliation. There are no laws against discriminations exist consequently leading to issues related to managers, irrespective of rank, are the victim of shared social prospects, giving preference to families, relations, and peoples who try to influence with power. These issues limit the organization which can use only few selection methods in such cultural mode.

### 3. Method

#### 3.1. Sample and procedure

The research was conducted utilizing a sample consisting of a group of graduates, undergraduates and working employees. A total of 149 participants took part in the survey, with the locus revolving around the cities Lahore, Islamabad and Jhelum. The data related to this specific study was analyzed using IBM SPSS. The average age of the participants was 26 (SD = 1.328), 103 (69.1%) respondents were males and 46 (30.9%) were females. The majority of the participants had a Masters degree (51.0%), while 33.6% held a MS/M.Phil degree and the remainder, 15.4%, had BA degrees. Most respondents, 70.5% had less than 1 year of work experience, with the remainder more than a year's worth of experience. Full-time workers represented 57.0%, and part-time workers 43.0%, of the sample.

Applicant reactions were recorded using the questionnaires and the 10 selection methods listed in Table 1. We translated Steiner and Gilliland (1996) questionnaire, and each method was provided with its detail. The procedure title was identical to Steiner and Gilliland (1996) 10

**Table 1. Rating the effectiveness of this method for identifying qualified people for the job**

| <b>Selection Methods</b>       | <b>M</b> | <b>SD</b> | <b>Least Favorable</b> | <b>Quite Favorable</b> | <b>Neutral</b> | <b>Favorable</b> | <b>Most Favorable</b> |
|--------------------------------|----------|-----------|------------------------|------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Interviews                     | 4.66     | .722      | 2                      | 3                      | 1              | 31               | 112                   |
| Resumes                        | 3.77     | 1.009     | 9                      | 9                      | 16             | 89               | 26                    |
| Work-sample Test               | 3.26     | .831      |                        | 21                     | 85             | 27               | 16                    |
| Biographical Information Blank | 3.15     | .739      |                        | 23                     | 89             | 29               | 8                     |
| Written Ability Test           | 3.85     | .951      | 1                      | 18                     | 21             | 72               | 37                    |
| Personal References            | 2.74     | 1.391     | 32                     | 43                     | 33             | 13               | 28                    |
| Personality Test               | 3.44     | 1.105     | 2                      | 34                     | 42             | 39               | 32                    |
| Personal Contacts              | 2.89     | 1.244     | 33                     | 18                     | 38             | 53               | 7                     |
| Job Knowledge Test             | 4.10     | .733      |                        | 3                      | 24             | 77               | 45                    |
| Situational Judgment Tests     | 3.72     | .943      |                        | 19                     | 35             | 63               | 32                    |



selection method, with the only difference related to the selection method in this study being the “Job Knowledge Test” and “Situational Judgment Tests” method, which was added to Steiner and Gilliland (1996) questionnaire.

These methods were used to compare the findings with previous studies using samples from a few countries. For every method, two questions were used for the process favorability assessment using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (least favorable) to 5 (most favorable). The two questions that were asked were: “How would you rate the effectiveness of this selection method for identifying qualified people for the job?”; and “If you did not get the job based on this selection method, what you would think of the fairness of this procedure?” To evaluate procedural dimensions of every single personnel selection methods, seven questions were asked by means of a 5-point Likert scale, starting from 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree).

The dimensions used were as follows: (1) scientific evidence (scientific research is done to find the values); (2) face validity (identification of qualified candidates for the job in question); (3) opportunity to perform (this identifies individuals important qualities, and provides how each is different); (4) employer’s rights (employers can obtain information from applicants using the selection method); (5) interpersonal warmth (the selection is free of personal feelings); (6) respect of privacy (personal privacy is also considered); and (7) widely used (because personnel selection is used in commonly). Two measures—interpersonal warmth and respect of privacy—were reversed to reflect a clear and higher value of those.”

#### 4. Results

We rated the effectiveness of different selection methods for identifying qualified people for the job. The interview method has a Mean of 4.66 and a SD of 0.722. A total of 112 of the applicants rated the interview method which appeared as “most favorable”, 31 as “favorable” and 6 rated the interview method as “quite favorable”. Table 1 shows the Mean for resumes to be 3.77 with a SD of 1.009. A majority of the applicants, 89, rated the resumes method as “favorable” and 26 rated the same method as “most favorable”; 9 individuals rated it as the “least favorable” method.

With respect to the work-sample test method, 85 of the applicant’s rated this method’s effectiveness for identifying qualified people for the job as “neutral”, with 27 rating this method as “favorable”. The Mean and SD of the work-sample test are 3.26 and 0.83,1, respectively. The biographical information has a Mean of 3.15 and a SD of 0.739. Eighty-nine of the applicants rated this method as “neutral” for classifying competent individuals for the job and 29 rated it as “favorable”. The average responses of the written ability test method has a Mean of 3.85 and a SD of 0.951, with 72 of the applicants rating this method as “favorable” and 37 applicants as “most favorable”. The personal references method has average responses with a Mean of 2.74 and a SD of 1.391; 43 applicants rated this method as “quite favorable”. The average responses of the personality test method has a Mean of 3.44 and a SD of 1.105. Forty-two applicants rated the effectiveness of personality test as “neutral” for classifying competent individuals for the job and 39 as “favorable”. The personal contacts method was rated by 53 applicants as “favorable” and 38 as “neutral”. The average response of the personal contacts has a Mean of 2.89 and a SD of 1.244.

Most of the applicants, 77, rated the effectiveness of the job knowledge test for identifying qualified people for the job as “favorable” and 45 rated it as “most favorable”; the average responses of the job knowledge test have a Mean of 4.10 and a SD = 0.733. The average responses to the situational judgment test have a Mean of 3.72 and a SD = 0.943, with 63 of the applicants rating the effectiveness of this method for identifying qualified people for the job as “favorable”.

The fairness of this method if you are not qualified for the job based on these personnel selection methods is rated in Table 2.

**Table 2. Rating the fairness of this procedure if you did not get the job based on this personnel selection method**

| <b>Selection Methods</b>       | <b>M</b> | <b>SD</b> | <b>Least Favorable</b> | <b>Quite Favorable</b> | <b>Neutral</b> | <b>Favorable</b> | <b>Most Favorable</b> |
|--------------------------------|----------|-----------|------------------------|------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Interviews                     | 3.56     | .98       | 11                     | 5                      | 37             | 82               | 14                    |
| Resumes                        | 2.94     | .895      | 1                      | 55                     | 51             | 36               | 6                     |
| Work-sample Test               | 3.33     | .955      |                        | 27                     | 70             | 28               | 24                    |
| Biographical Information Blank | 3.20     | .797      | 1                      | 24                     | 76             | 40               | 8                     |
| Written Ability Test           | 3.56     | .954      | 3                      | 17                     | 46             | 60               | 23                    |
| Personal References            | 2.93     | 1.151     | 10                     | 55                     | 39             | 26               | 19                    |
| Personality Test               | 3.69     | 1.046     |                        | 19                     | 54             | 30               | 46                    |
| Personal Contacts              | 2.88     | 1.404     | 34                     | 32                     | 23             | 38               | 22                    |
| Job Knowledge Test             | 3.90     | .950      | 9                      | 5                      | 6              | 101              | 28                    |
| Situational Judgment Tests     | 3.41     | 1.059     | 11                     | 8                      | 63             | 43               | 24                    |

The average responses for an interview have a Mean of 3.56 and a SD of 0.975. Eighty-two applicants rated this fairness of this method as 'favorable' and 37 individuals rated it as "neutral". The resumes method has average responses with a Mean of 2.94 and a SD of 0.895. The number of individuals who rated the fairness of the resumes method as "quite favorable" was 55. The average responses of the work-sample test has a Mean of 3.33 and a SD of 0.955. But if the applicants did not get the job based on this method, 70 of them still rated the fairness of this method as "neutral" and 24 of them few rated the work-sample test as "most favorable".

The biographical information blank was rated as "neutral" by applicants, and average responses of this method has a Mean of 3.20 and a SD of 0.797. The applicants (60) rated The fairness of the written ability test was rated as "favorable" by 60 applicants, however 3 of the applicants rated this method as "least favorable"; the average responses of the written ability test has a Mean of 3.56 and a SD of 0.954.

The average response of the personal references methods has a Mean of 2.93 and a SD of 1.151, with 55 of the individuals rating the fairness of personal references if they did not get the job based on this method as "quite favorable". Only 10 applicants rated this method as "least favorable". The personality test method has average responses with a Mean of 3.69 and a SD of 1.046. Most of the applicants, 54, rated the fairness of this method as "neutral". The average responses of the personal contacts methods are with Mean = 2.88 and SD = 1.404.

The fairness of the personal contact method was rated as "favorable" by 38 of the applicants. The job knowledge test method had average responses with a Mean of 3.90 and a SD of 0.950. Most of the applicants, 101, still rated the fairness of this method as "favorable" if they did not get the job based on the job knowledge test.

The average responses to the situational judgment test are a Mean of 3.41 and a SD of 1.059. Sixty-three applicants rated the fairness of this method as "neutral", and 43 applicants rated it as "favorable"; 8 applicants rated it as "quite favorable".

## 5. Discussion

The current study aimed to explore Pakistani job applicants' reactions to 10 personnel selection methods. Our research findings are summarized in Tables 1 and 2. Interviews were considered to be the most popular and most favorable method to identify the qualified person for the job.

While the interview method is the most favorable job test method, others received good responses but criticism as well. The resumes method was ranked second after the interview, but it had the most ratings in the "favorable" group. The work-sample test method scored the highest in the "neutral" group, but being "neutral" means it could not be considered as a strong method (e.g., rated "favorable" or "most favorable". The biographical information blank method also came out as "neutral". The written ability test method was considered as "favorable", and since a large number of people supported it, it could be considered as a good method (although not as good overall as the resumes method). The personal references method scored highest in "quite favorable", but it was not considered by a large group of applicants as a good method of selection.

Likewise, the personality test was rated highest in the "neutral" group, indicating that the personality test is rarely considered to be an appropriate method of personnel selection. The personal contacts method got the highest rating in the "favorable" group and it seems that this method of selection is mostly preferred during the hiring procedure. The job knowledge test method was frequently rated as "favorable" but ranked second after resumes in the "favorable" group; the situational judgment test method received the highest number of ratings in the "favorable" group.

In Table 2, based on the fairness of every method if a person did not get the job, rankings are as follows: interviews were considered as "favorable" but not "most favorable" because,

according to applicants, bias is present in this method. Ultimately, however, this had the second highest rating in the “favorable” group. Resumes were considered “quite favorable”, as a resume has to go through a number of checks during the selection method thus might be time-consuming and ineffective. The work-sample test was considered “neutral” as it was supposed to test the candidate’s knowledge, but it is directly dependent on the examiner’s judgment and fairness. Biographical information was considered as “neutral” because it is very judgmental and considers employee history, which may ignore employee knowledge and skills. A written ability test was considered “favorable”, as it portrays an individual’s knowledge and skills are tested but was not “most favorable” as it lacks face to face candidate interaction. The personal references method was considered “quite favorable”, as this method is considered as an complete selection method, as the selection might be biased and not reflect a fair judgment of the candidate. The personality test was considered “neutral” because it neglects skills and other requirements. The personal contacts method was considered as “favorable” because it is very helpful in referring someone for direct selection. The job knowledge test was considered “favorable” because it allows one to get a job merely based on the knowledge required for the job. Lastly, the situational judgment test method was “neutral” because every candidate is supposed to find a solution to every mistake according to him/her, which might or might not be suitable to the selection requirements.

### **5.1. Implications for selection practices**

To consider the perspective of applicants in future research, we found the factors that affect the selection practices for organizations in Pakistan and multinational organizations which hire Pakistanis. Our research work suggests that the design of selection procedures should be the same as those used in Western countries, or at least the 10 selection methods that are described in the study must be tracked. The organizations that recruit other nationals in Pakistan must make sure that candidate responses to these procedures follow those used in the Western world. Further, a study should be done to identify the differences in other professional in other businesses, and in other nations in which the Urdu language is spoken or used.

### **5.2. Study strengths, limitations and implications for future research**

The recommendations that have been made have to be considered under certain limitations. First, the majority of applicants in this study were young and a criticism of using young people or students is that they may not be familiar with selection techniques (Truxillo, Bodner et al., 2009). In addition, this study consists of a sample of graduates, undergraduates and employed grown-up in a nation where candidate perspective research values are diverse as compared to other nations. It was found, however, that a majority of our respondents were familiar with different selection methods. In future, the experienced and senior employees should also be participants of these kinds of studies. Also, the convenience sampling methodology was used, which may not have the same qualities of coverage as other methodologies such as mixed method. The findings also do not represent the entire population of Pakistani applicants. To get a high sample size, we used the snowball technique to collect data, which prevented us from computing a response rate; future research should include the usage of larger and stratified samples. Possible reasons about the question as to why candidate responses to personnel selection procedures differ in Pakistan as compared to other countries must be examined. A study must be conducted to know the proper reasons contributing to the expansion of explanatory mechanisms behind the “reaction generalization” versus “situational specificity” hypotheses (Truxillo, Bauer, McCarthy et al., 2018). As is also known from additional studies using this strategy, this is a cross-sectional investigation of responses so we cannot be sure of the causation of responses. Finally, we need to focus on assuming that this research can be generalized across the Urdu-speaking world—which consists of various countries, cultures, and contexts—and also benefits the research to be performed in such countries to verify the local job requirements of people who are looking for work.

### Funding

The authors received no direct funding for this research.

### Author details

Qandeel Hassan<sup>1</sup>  
E-mail: [syeda.qandeel28@gmail.com](mailto:syeda.qandeel28@gmail.com)  
Ghulam Abid<sup>2</sup>  
E-mail: [dr.ghulamabid@gmail.com](mailto:dr.ghulamabid@gmail.com)  
Jamil Ahmad<sup>1</sup>  
E-mail: [Jamil\\_nbp@yahoo.com](mailto:Jamil_nbp@yahoo.com)  
Muhammad Ali<sup>3</sup>  
E-mail: [mali@ibapu.edu.pk](mailto:mali@ibapu.edu.pk)  
Ahmed Hussain Khan<sup>1</sup>  
E-mail: [ahmedh.khan64@gmail.com](mailto:ahmedh.khan64@gmail.com)  
Rabbia Zafar<sup>1</sup>  
E-mail: [rabbiazafar8@gmail.com](mailto:rabbiazafar8@gmail.com)

<sup>1</sup> School of Business Administration, National College of Business Administration & Economics, Lahore, Pakistan.

<sup>2</sup> Department of Business Administration, Kinnaird College for Women, Lahore, Pakistan.

<sup>3</sup> Institute of Business Administration, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.

### Citation information

Cite this article as: Applicants reaction towards the personnel selection methods in Pakistan, Qandeel Hassan, Ghulam Abid, Jamil Ahmad, Muhammad Ali, Ahmed Hussain Khan & Rabbia Zafar, *Cogent Business & Management* (2020), 7: 1816418.

### References

- Anderson, N. (2004). Editorial – The dark side of the moon: Applicant perspectives, negative psychological effects (NPEs), and Candidate decision making in selection. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12(1–2), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0965-075X.2004.00259.x>
- 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., & Hu, U. R. (2009). Applicant perspectives in selection. *Going beyond Preference Reactions*, 17(4) <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2009.00477.x>
- Anderson, N., Liu, X., & Potoc, K. (2016). Applicant reactions to selection methods in China. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 24, 3. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12148>
- 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., Craig, J. M., & Ferrara, P. (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>
- Bilgic, 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>
- Chan, D., & Schmitt, N. (2004). An agenda for future research on applicant reactions to selection procedures: A construct-oriented approach. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12(1–2), 9–23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0965-075X.2004.00260.x>
- 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>
- Ford, D. K., Truxillo, D. M., & Bauer, T. N. (2009). Rejected But Still There: Shifting the focus in applicant reactions to the promotional context. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 17(4), 402–416. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2009.00482.x>
- Furnham, A., & Jackson, C. J. (2011). Practitioner reactions to work-related psychological tests. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26(7), 549–565. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941111164472>
- Gilliland, S. W. (1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems: An organizational justice perspective. *The Academy of Management Review*, 18(4), 694–734. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1993.9402210155>
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399–432. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639001600208>
- 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. (1980). *Culture's consequences*. Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organisations: Software of the minds*. McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), 1–26. <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>
- Jonsdottir, J. H., & Hafsteinson, L. G. (2008). Sanngirni att aEferEa sem notaEar eru viE starfsmannaval: ViEbrogE Islendinga: Fairness reactions to personnel selection methods in Iceland. *Journal of Psychology*, 13, 109–125.
- Khilji, S. E. (1995). *International human resource management in Pakistan* [Unpublished MPhil thesis]. University of Cambridge.
- Khilji, S. E. (1999b). *An empirical study of human resource management in Pakistan: The case of Pakistan* [Unpublished PhD Thesis]. University of Cambridge.
- Khilji, S. E. (2003). 'To adapt or not to adapt' exploring the role of national culture in HRM- A study of Pakistan. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 3(1), 109–132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/147059580331006>

- Lyons, B. D., & Marler, J. H. (2011). Got image? Examining organizational image in web recruitment. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26(1), 58–76. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941111099628>
- 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>
- 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>
- Murphy, K. R. (1986). When your top choice turns you down: Effect of rejected offers on the utility of selection tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 99(1), 133–138. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.99.1.133>
- Newman, K. L., & Nollen, S. D. (1996). Culture and congruence: The fit between management practices and national culture. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27(4), 753–779. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490152>
- 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>
- Potoc̃nik, K., Anderson, N. R., & Latorre, F. (in press). Selecting for innovation: Methods of assessment and the criterion problem. In I. Nikolaou and J. K. (Eds.), *Ostrom Recent and new developments in recruitment and selection*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Ryan, A. M., & Ployhart, R. E. (2000). Applicants' perceptions of selection procedures and decisions: A critical review and agenda for the future. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 565–606. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600308>
- Salgado, A. F. (2001). Some landmarks of 100 years of scientific personnel selection at the beginning of the new century. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(June), 3–8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00159>
- 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, A. F., Vandenberghe, C., & Brancart, S. (1999). Les reactions des candidates enver les techniques de selection du personnel : Une etude dans un contexte francophone [Reactions of job applicants to personnel selection techniques: An investigation in a French-speaking context]. *Le Travail humain*, 62(4), 347–361. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40660241>
- Tayeb, M. (1997). Islamic revival in Asia and human resource management. *Employee Relations*, 19(4), 352–364. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01425459710170086>
- Truxillo, D. M., Bauer, T., McCarthy, J., Anderson, N. R., & Ahmed, S. (2018). Applicant perspectives on employee selection systems. In D. Ones, N. R. Anderson, C. Viswesvaran, & H. K. Sinangil (Eds.), 508–532. *Handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- 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(6), 1020–1031.
- Truxillo, D. M., Bauer, T. N., & Sanchez, R. J. (2001). Multiple dimensions of procedural justice : Longitudinal effects on selection system fairness and test-taking self-efficacy. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(4), 336–349. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00185>
- 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(4), 346–361. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2009.00478.x>



© 2020 The Author(s). This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license.

You are free to:

Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format.

Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially.

The licensor cannot revoke these freedoms as long as you follow the license terms.

Under the following terms:

Attribution — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made.

You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use.

No additional restrictions

You may not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits.



***Cogent Business & Management* (ISSN: ) is published by Cogent OA, part of Taylor & Francis Group.**

**Publishing with Cogent OA ensures:**

- Immediate, universal access to your article on publication
- High visibility and discoverability via the Cogent OA website as well as Taylor & Francis Online
- Download and citation statistics for your article
- Rapid online publication
- Input from, and dialog with, expert editors and editorial boards
- Retention of full copyright of your article
- Guaranteed legacy preservation of your article
- Discounts and waivers for authors in developing regions

**Submit your manuscript to a Cogent OA journal at [www.CogentOA.com](http://www.CogentOA.com)**

