DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 371 275 CG 025 503

AUTHOR Stoffey, Ronald W.

TITLE The Influence of Drug Testing Attributes, Participation, and Personality on Potential Applicant's Attitudes and Job Pursuit Intentions.

PUB DATE Aug 93

NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (101st, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, August 20-24, 1993).

PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures; *Drug Use Testing; *Employee Attitudes; Employer Attitudes; *Employment Interviews; Higher Education; Personality Studies; *Personnel Policy; *Personnel Selection

ABSTRACT

Researchers are increasingly aware of the importance of job applicants' reactions to the personnel selection process. This study examines three variables in connection with drug testing policies: (1) the potential applicant's reactions to two different drug testing policies which varied in terms of drug policy characteristics and their impact on several organizational outcome variables; (2) the extent to which employee involvement in the development of drug testing policy may enhance perceptions of fairness of drug testing; and (3) the extent to which personality, in particular normfavoring orientation, may influence perceptions of fairness of drug testing. For the study, 143 undergraduate psychology and business students read one of four recruiting brochures assigned to one of four experimental conditions. Participants who were exposed to an unfavorable drug testing policy perceived the policy as being less fair and reported lower intentions to join the company than subjects exposed to a more favorable plan. Normfavoring orientation had a significant effect on perceptions of the fairness of drug testing policy with higher normfavoring applicants perceiving drug testing policy as more fair than lower normfavoring subjects. Companies need to consider the circumstances that lead to drug testing, their administrative procedures, and the consequences of failing a drug test when designing their drug testing program. (Contains 23 references and 5 tables.) (RJM)

# The Influence of Drug Testing Attributes, Participation, and Personality on Potential Applicant's Attitudes and Job Pursuit Intentions

Ronald W. Stoffey

Kutztown University
of Pennsylvania

Paper presented at the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP)/American Psychological Association Division 14 Program, 1993 APA Convention, Toronto, Canada, August 20-24.

Abstract

A 2 X 2 experimental design was used to examine the effects of (a) type of drug testing policy (favorable vs. unfavorable) and (b) participation in drug testing policy development (employee recommended vs. management recommended) on potential job applicants' perceptions of the fairness of drug testing policy and related human resources practices, impression toward the company and job pursuit intentions. Scores on the California Psychological Inventory norm-favoring scale (v.2) was used as a covariate. Undergraduate psychology and business students (N = 143) read one of four recruiting brochures corresponding to the four experimental conditions. After reading the brochure, subjects were asked to complete a questionnaire that included manipulation checks and the dependent measures. The study found that potential job applicants exposed to an unfavorable drug testing policy perceived the policy as less fair and reported lower intentions to join the company than potential job applicants exposed to a more favorable drug testing policy. Normfavoring orientation had a significant effect on perceptions of fairness of drug testing policy - higher normfavoring applicants perceived the drug testing policy as more fair.

# The Influence of Drug Testing Attributes, Participation, and Norm-favoring Orientation on Potential Applicant's Attitudes and Job Pursuit Intentions

Organizations have recently increased the use of drug testing as a component in their overall personnel selection system (Crant and Bateman,1990). Recent studies suggest that over 50% of medium and large size organizations test for illegal drugs among applicants and current employees (Guthrie & Olian, 1989). This rise in drug testing is in response to the increase of drug abuse in the workplace and the negative impact that drug use has on organizational and individual performance (Normand, Salyards, and Mahoney, 1990). For example, NIDA estimates that two thirds of the people entering the work force have used illegal drugs and that approximately 10-23% of the work force used dangerous drugs on the job. Yet, despite the rise in drug testing, research examining attitudes toward drug testing has been limited (Stone and Kotch, 1989).

Recently, researchers have become more aware of the importance of applicant's reactions to the personnel selection process (Boudreau and Rynes, 1985). Murphy and Davidshofer (1991) note that applicants may use selection procedures as one means of gaining information about an organization. Moreover, Murphy, Thorton, and Reynolds (1990) argue that selection procedures may be more variable across organizations than other job attributes (e.g.,

benefits, compensation) especially for entry-level jobs. This suggests that the characteristics of selection procedures may have an important impact on attitudes toward the company and job pursuit intentions. In particular, the use of drug testing, as part of a company's selection system, may affect applicants attitudes and intentions to join the company, especially if applicants perceive drug testing as objectionable or unfair.

Recent research has found support for the impact of drug testing on potential applicants' attitudes and job pursuit intentions. For example, Crant and Bateman (1990) found that potential job applicants had more negative attitudes toward and expressed lower intentions to apply to a company that used drug testing than a company that did not. Stone and Kotch (1989) report that attitudes toward drug testing were influenced by both advance notice of drug testing and the consequences of detected drug use.

One purpose of the present study was to extend this line of research by examining potential applicants' reactions to two different drug testing policies that varied in terms of drug policy characteristics or attributes and their impact on several organizational outcome variables: perceptions of fairness of drug testing policy and other human resource practices, job pursuit intentions, and attitudes toward the company. Murphy, Thorton, and Reynolds (1990) note that differences between drug testing programs may be a salient factor for job applicants. That is, if

other organizational attributes are relatively invariant across organizations (e.g., pay, opportunity for advancement) variance in drug testing attributes could potentially have a large effect on attitudes and job pursuit intentions. In particular, drug testing policies that are perceived as being invasive, unfair or severely punitive, may be perceived as less favorable and hence have a greater negative impact on attitudes and intentions than policies perceived as less invasive, more fair and less punitive.

The present study also examined the extent to which employee involvement in the development of drug testing policy may enhance perceptions of fairness of drug testing. This notion is based on research in the area of procedural justice which suggests that participation or voice-giving procedures may enhance perceptions of fairness of organizational processes (Greenberg and Tyler, 1987). Research in the area of performance appraisal found that procedures that allow employees participation or "voice" in the appraisal process are viewed as being more fair than those that do not (Landy et al., 1980; Lissak, 1983; Greenberg, 1986; Kanfer et al., 1987).

Finally, the present study examined the extent to which personality, in particular normfavoring orientation (Gough, 1989), may influence perceptions of fairness of drug testing. Research using the California Psychological Inventory (CPI; Gough, 1989) suggests that individuals scoring high on the CPI v.2 scale (hi normfavoring) tend to

be seen as "well-organized, conscientious, conventional, dependable, and controlled" (p.19). Conversely, individuals scoring low on the v.2 scale (low normfavoring) tend to be seen as "rebellious, restless, pleasure-seeking, and self-indulgent" (p.19). It is reasoned that normfavoring orientation may influence the strength of an individual's reaction to organizational procedures like drug testing, especially procedures that may be viewed as an invasion of privacy or a violation of an individual's rights. In support of this reasoning, Murphy et al. (1990) found that approval of drug testing was related to overall political orientation (more conservative individuals were more likely to approve of drug testing). To date, however, no research has directly examined the effects of personality on perceptions of fairness of drug testing.

Based on the literature reviewed above, the following hypotheses were tested:

(1) Hypothesis 1. Potential job applicants exposed to an unfavorable drug testing policy will perceive the policy as less fair than potential job applicants exposed to a more favorable drug testing policy.

(2) Hypothesis 2. Potential job applicants exposed to a drug testing policy recommended by employees will perceive the policy as more fair than when exposed to a policy recommended by management.

(3) Hypothesis 3. Potential job applicants scoring higher on normfavoring will perceive the drug testing policy as more

fair than potential job applicants scoring lower on normfavoring.

(4) Hypothesis 4. There will be an interaction effect, on potential job applicants perceptions of fairness of drug testing policy, between type of policy and participation. Potential job applicants exposed to an unfavorable drug testing policy will perceive the policy as more fair when the policy was developed by employees than by management.

(5) Potential job applicants exposed to an unfavorable drug testing policy will have lower intentions to join the company than potential job applicants exposed to a favorable drug testing policy.

(6) Potential job applicants exposed to an unfavorable drug testing policy will have more negative attitudes toward the company than potential job applicants exposed to a more favorable drug testing policy.

(7) Potential job applicants exposed to an unfavorable drug testing policy will perceive other human resource practices to be less fair than potential job applicants exposed to a more favorable drug testing policy.

## Method

### Pilot study

A pilot study designed to assess the validity of the favorable versus unfavorable drug testing policy condition was conducted prior to the research using a sample of 104 undergraduate students (males = 40; females = 64) from a northeastern state university. The content of the two drug

testing policies were based on research by Murphy, Thornton, and Reynolds (1990) which found that approval of drug testing varied as a function of administration procedures (e.g., how the test was conducted, what drugs the test is used to detect, and to whom the results are made available) and the consequences of failing a drug test (e.g., automatically rejected, given opportunity to enter a drug counseling program). Using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), a significant main effect for type of drug testing policy, $F(1,102) = 16.18$, $p < .001$, was found. Subjects exposed to the favorable drug testing policy ($M = 30.35$) perceived the policy as more fair than subjects exposed to the unfavorable drug testing policy ($M = 24.49$).

Subjects

One hundred-forty three undergraduate psychology and business students (males = 45, females = 98) from a northeastern state university participated in the study. Sixty-two percent of the subjects were seniors, thirty-two percent were juniors, and six percent were sophomores. The mean age was 23.60 (SD = 6.33). When asked whether they would be gathering company information and/or preparing for job interviews within the next 12 months, 56.6% responded yes, 25.9% responded no, and 17.5 % responded that they did not know. When asked whether they would more likely obtain employment or attend graduate school after graduation, 62.2% responded full-time employment and 37.8 % responded graduate school.

The choice of college students as subjects in this study was not simply due to convenience. Reid and Murphy (1990) note that college students are an appropriate population when examining attitudes toward personnel practices. College students are generally of applicant status, possess the greatest numbers of choices, and have few contraints on employment decisions; characteristics that increase the impact of attitudes on job choice behavior.

Procedure

Subjects were informed that they were participating in a research project for a major company interested in how recruiting materials affect prospective employee's perceptions of employers. Subjects then read a brochure presenting an overview of a company's products, services, size, revenue and business environment. The brochure also described the educational backgrounds the company was seeking, career opportunities for new hires, company's values, compensation practices and selection procedures. The brochure was the same as that used by Stoffey, Millsap, Smither, and Reilly (1991).

Subjects were randomly assigned to one of the four experimental conditions corresponding to a 2 X 2 factorial design having two levels of type of drug testing policy (favorable and unfavorable) and two levels of participation in drug testing policy development (employee and management). Subjects in the employee participation condition read a paragraph stating that the drug testing

policy was developed by an employee task force with input from employee group meetings and questionnaire responses. Subjects in the management condition read a paragraph stating that the drug testing policy was developed by management. Subjects in both conditions than read either the favorable or unfavorable drug testing policy previously used in the pilot study.

Measures

After completing a questionnaire that requested demographic information, subjects completed a questionnaire containing a manipulation check, dependent and covariate measures. A 9-item Likert-type scale, previously used in the pilot study, was included to assess perceptions of fairness of the drug testing policy. A 2-item Likert-type scale was used to assess attitudes toward drug testing (e.g., "I feel that current employees should be required to pass a drug test for continued employment" and "In general, I feel that drug testing is a good idea"). Coefficient alpha reliability estimates for the perceived fairness of drug testing policy and attitudes toward drug testing measures were .95 and .75, respectively. Subjects were also asked to rate the perceived fairness of the individual components of the drug testing policies (e.g., "All applicants for employment must pass a drug test as part of the hiring process.") on a 5-point scale (1 = extremely unfair and 5 = extremely fair).

A 5-item scale (answered using a 1 = very unlikely and 5 = very likely) was used to measure job pursuit intentions (e.g., "I would seriously consider this company as a possible employer" and "If you were offered a job by this company, how likely is it that you would accept it?"). A 5-item scale was used to measure attitudes about the company. Using a 1-to-5 rating scale, subjects described their overall impression of the company as an employer (unfavorable-favorable, unattractive-attractive, undesirable-desirable, negative-positive, boring-challenging, unfair-fair). A 5-item Likert-type scale was used to measure perceptions concerning the fairness of other human resource practices (e.g.,"Based on the material I read, I would expect this company's personnel practices (e.g., performance appraisal, salary adjustments, grievance/dispute resolution, promotion) to be fair." and " Overall, I believe that the selection process in this company is fair."). Coefficient alpha reliability estimates for the three scales were: .77 for job pursuit intentions, .90 for attitude toward the company, and .82 for perceived fairness of other human resource practices. These three scales were the same as those used by Stoffey, Millsap, Smither and Reilly (1991).

To determine whether the subjects had read the brochure carefully, five true-false items were included in the questionnaire. Two of the items served as manipulation checks on the participation ("The drug testing policy was

based on the input and recommendations of an employee task force.") and drug testing policy manipulations ("Any applicant who fails the drug test may reapply for employment after one year.").

Finally, 36 items from the California Psychological Inventory (answered using 1 = true and 2 = false) were used to measure normfavoring orientation. This scale served as a covariate in the study. The coefficient Alpha reliability estimate for this measure was .71.

## Results

To assess the degree to which subjects carefully read the recruiting brochure and to validate the manipulations, subjects were asked to answer the following true-false questions: (1) "The drug testing policy was based on the input and recommendations of an employee task force" and (2) "Any applicant who fails the drug test may reapply for employment after one year." Eighty-eight percent of the subjects in the employee participation condition correctly answered question 1 (i.e., true), whereas 65% in the management condition correctly answered this item (i.e. false); chi square = 41.57, df = 1, $p < .001$. In reference to question 2, 97% of the subjects in the favorable drug testing condition correctly answered this item (i.e., true), and 97% in the unfavorable drug testing condition likewise answered correctly (i.e., false); chi square = 123.69, df = 1, $p < .001$.

The effects of type of drug testing policy (favorable and unfavorable), participation (employee and management), and normfavoring orientation on perceptions of fairness of drug testing were tested with a multiple regression analysis. Descriptive statistics for type of drug testing policy and participation are shown in Tables 1a and 1b. Results of the regression analysis are presented in Table 2.

Hypothesis 1 predicted that potential job applicants exposed to an unfavorable drug testing policy would perceive the policy as being less fair than potential job applicants exposed to a more favorable drug testing policy. In support of this hypothesis, the regression analysis showed that type of drug testing had a significant main effect on perceptions of fairness of drug testing, $t = -4.241$, $p < .001$ ($M = 28.15$ vs. $M = 34.06$).

Hypothesis 2 predicted that potential job applicants exposed to a drug policy recommended by employees would perceive the policy as more fair than when exposed to a policy recommended by management. Although the means were in the predicted direction, the regression analysis found no significant effect for participation on perceptions of fairness of drug testing policy, $t = -1.398$, $p > .05$ ($M = 31.72$ vs. $M = 30.35$).

Hypothesis 3 predicted that potential job applicants scoring high on norm favoring would perceive the drug testing policy as more fair than potential job applicants scoring low on norm favoring. Consistent with this

hypothesis, the regression analysis found a significant main effect for norm favoring orientation on the dependent variable, $t = -4.253$, $p < .001$..

The final hypothesis concerning this dependent variable predicted an interaction effect, on potential job applicants' perceptions of fairness of drug testing policy, between type of policy and participation. Contrary to prediction, there was no significant difference in mean levels on the perception of fairness of drug testing policy between potential job applicants exposed to an unfavorable drug testing policy recommended by employees than when exposed to an unfavorable policy recommended by management ($M = 28.43$ vs. $M = 27.86$).

Table 3 presents mean fairness rating for the individual components of the favorable and unfavorable drug testing policies. The data presented suggests that circumstances leading to drug testing, administrative procedures and consequences of failing a drug test all influence rating of fairness. For the favorable drug testing policy condition, confidentiality was perceived as most fair (administrative), followed by checking results with a second testing method (administrative), providing the opportunity for entering a drug counseling program (consequence), allowing applicants to reapply for employment (consequence), and requiring that all applicants pass a drug test prior to hire (circumstance). Random testing of employees who occupy safety sensitive jobs was perceived as

least fair (circumstance). For the unfavorable drug testing policy, searching employee's personal belongings (circumstance) was perceived as least fair, followed by being denied the opportunity to reapply for employment (consequence) and being tested regularly at random without advanced notice (circumstance). Both potential job applicant samples gave high mean rating of fairness for requiring that all applicants for hire must pass a drug test (circumstance). Further, the mean rating were similar for the two groups in terms of administrative procedures involving the kinds of tests used (urine sample only vs. blood and urine), and the kinds of drugs tested for (only illegal drugs vs. illegal drugs and alcohol).

Table 4 presents means and standard deviations, by experimental conditions, for the dependent variables job pursuit intentions, attitude toward company and perceptions of fairness of other human resource practices. Hypothesis 5 predicted that potential job applicants exposed to an unfavorable drug testing policy would have lower intentions to join the company than potential job applicants exposed to a favorable drug testing policy. In support of this hypothesis, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) found a significant main effect for type of drug testing policy, $F(1,142) = 4.09$, $p < .05$, on job pursuit intentions ($M = 18.77$ vs. $M = 17.51$). Contrary to hypothesis 6, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) found a nonsignificant effect for type of drug testing policy, $F(1, 142) = 2.71$, $p > .05$,

on attitudes toward the company. That is, there was no significant difference in attitudes toward the company held by potential job applicants exposed to an unfavorable drug testing policy in comparison to applicants exposed to a more favorable drug testing policy ($M = 22.80$ vs. $M = 21.51$). Finally, hypothesis 7 predicted that potential job applicants exposed to an unfavorable drug testing policy would perceive other human resource practices as less fair than applicants exposed to a more favorable drug testing policy. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) found that the hypothesized effect just fell short of significance, $F(1,142) = 3.62$, $p = .0591$, ($M = 17.59$ vs. $M = 18.59$).

Supplementary analysis found no significant correlations between subjects' age or sex and perceptions of fairness of drug testing policy. However, significant correlations were found between perceptions of fairness of drug testing policy and attitude toward drug testing ($r = .663$, $p < 001$) and normfavoring orientation ($r = -.325$, $p < .001$). Normfavoring orientation and attitudes toward drug testing were likewise significantly correlated ($r = -.363$, $p < .001$). Finally, there was no significant difference in attitudes toward drug testing, $t(141) = -.418$, $p > .05$, between subjects exposed to a favorable versus unfavorable drug testing policy ($M = 7.16$ vs. $M = 7.29$). Subjects exposed to both types of drug testing policies agreed that current employees should be required to pass a drug test for

continued employment and in general reported that drug testing is a good idea.

## Discussion

The results of the present study found support for the influence of drug testing attributes on potential job applicant's perceptions of fairness of drug testing policy and job pursuit intentions. Potential job applicants exposed to an unfavorable drug testing policy perceived the policy as being less fair and reported lower intentions to join the company than potential job applicants exposed to a more favorable drug testing policy. This finding supports research demonstrating the influence of drug testing on attitudes and job pursuit intentions (Crant and Batemen, 1990; Stone and Kotch, 1989). While previous research found that applicants' reactions to drug testing policies are influenced by the necessary and job relatedness of the testing procedures (Reid and Murphy, 1990), these factors may have their impact on applicants' reactions through their effect on perceptions of fairness of drug testing.

The current study went beyond previous research by specifically examining two different types of drug testing policies on potential applicants' reactions and intentions. The study of how different drug testing policies influence various organizational outcomes is more in keeping with the current issue facing many organizations: how to enhance perceived fairness, approval, and acceptance of drug testing

by job applicants and current employees versus whether or not to use drug testing. The data presented in Table 3 shows that circumstances that lead to drug testing, administrative procedures and consequences of failing a drug test all influence fairness ratings. The present study also found that while different drug testing policy attributes influenced perceptions of fairness of the drug testing policy, potential job applicants generally approve of drug testing. Overall, these findings suggest that in designing drug testing programs, companies need to consider all three design parameters in an effort to enhance perceptions of fairness and acceptance of drug testing programs by potential hires.

The data from the present study suggests that potential job applicants' reactions to drug testing procedures may have implications in terms of the organization's ability to attract and recruit qualified applicants. As predicted, potential job applicants exposed to the unfavorable drug testing policy reported lower intentions to join the company than potential job applicants exposed to the more favorable policy. The potential negative impact of drug testing attributes on job pursuit intentions has direct implications in terms of the utility of drug tests (Murphy, Thorton, and Reynolds, 1990), particulary if the applicant pool is of high potential or ability (Reid and Murphy, 1990). While the present study found that drug testing policy attributes influence intentions to join a company, no significant

effects were found on attitudes toward the company nor on perceived fairness of other human resource practices. This finding is contrary to previous research which suggests that reactions to selection procedures may "spill over" to the organization as a whole (Rynes, Heneman & Schwab, 1980; Schwab, Rynes & Aldag, 1987). The lack of a "spill over" effect in the present study may have been influenced by the content of the recruiting brochure used in the study. The brochure was developed by reviewing brochures from several major organizations and designed to present a favorable image of the company. In particular, the brochure was designed to emphasis the company's commitment to equal opportunity (e.g."Our approach to our people is based on a firm commitment to equal opportunity."), reflect diversity in the work place (Afro-American, Asian and Caucasian employees were depicted throughout the brochure) and professional development. In short, potential applicants in the present study may have been given sufficient positive information about other attributes of the organization, which inhibited a carry-over effect. The absence of a carry-over effect, coupled with a significant effect for unfavorable drug testing attributes on job pursuit intentions, suggests perhaps that while potential applicants evaluate organizational attributes on there own merit, the most important in terms of job pursuit intentions is the personnel selection system. Further, companies may be unable to compensate for an unfavorable selection system by

accenting more favorable attributes in their attempt to attract new hires.

Contrary to prediction, the study found no support for the effect of employee participation in drug testing policy development on perceptions of fairness of drug testing. A plausible explanation for this finding may be the distinction in the justice literature between procedural (Leventhal, 1980; Thibaut and Walker, 1975) and distributive justice (Adams, 1965; Homans, 1961). Distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of a distribution of outcomes, whereas procedural justice refers to the fairness of procedures used to determine those distributions (Greenberg, 1987). While employee participation in drug testing policy development may be viewed as being procedurally fair (i.e., represents the concerns of all recipients), the outcome from the process itself (i.e., drug testing policy) may fall short. While procedural justice may be a necessary precondition for distributive justice (Leventhal, 1976), it may not in all cases be a sufficient precondition for the perceived fairness of outcomes. Further, Leventhal (1980) argues that distributive outcomes are perceived as a more important determinant of fairness than the procedures used to determine them.

Finally, the study found that normfavoring orientation had a significant effect on perceptions of fairness of drug testing policy. Potential job applicants scoring high on norm favoring orientation perceived the drug testing policy

as more fair than potential job applicants scoring low on this measure. To date, no research has directly examined the effects of individual difference variables on perceptions of drug testing. Research examining personality variables as predictors of substance abuse has found that low tolerance for social convention was a significant but weak predictor of drug use (Newcomb, 1988). To the extent that tolerance for social convention and norm favoring orientation are similar contructs, norm favoring orientation may likewise be a valid predictor of drug use. One implication for personnel selection is that applicants low on norm favoring orientation may self-select themselves out of the hiring process. This notion is found in Schneider's (1987) attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) model which holds that individuals are attracted to organizations having a similar value orientation. During the early phases of recuitment applicants who don't "fit" with the prevailing orientation of the company may self-select out of the hiring process or following hire may leave, either voluntarily or involuntarily. This self-selection process is what accounts for a range restriction on individual difference variables within organizations or homogenity of organization climate (Schneider, 1987). One strategy that organizations may employe for communicating opposition to drug use and thereby facilitate the self-selection process would be to reinforce social conventions inconsistent with drug use during the early phases of recruitment (Reid & Murphy, 1990). Future

studies are needed to further identify other individual difference variables that may influence applicant's reactions to drug testing and how such reactions may impact on self-selection processes.

References

Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology, Vol 2. New York, Academic Press, 267-299.

Crant J.M. and Bateman, T.S. (1990). An experimental test of the impact of drug-testing programs on potential job applicants' attitudes and intentions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 127-131.

Greenberg, J. (1986). Organizational performance appraisal procedures: What makes them fair? In M.H. Bazerman, R.J. Lewiciki, and B.H. Sheppard (Eds.), Reseach on negotiation. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Folger, R., and Greenberg, J. (1985). Procedural justice: An interpretive analysis of personnel systems. Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management,3, 141-183.

Gough, H.G. (1989). California Psychological Inventory, Revised Manual. Palo Alto Calif.: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Greenberg, J., and Tyler, T.R. (1987). Why procedural justice in organizations? Social Justice Research, 2, 127-141.

Guthrie, J.P., and Olian, J.D. (1989). Drug and alcohol testing programs: The influence of organizational context and objectives. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Boston.

Homans, G.C. (1961). Social behavior: Its elementary forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace,a nd World.

Landy, F.J., Barnes-Farrell, J., and Cleveland, J.N. (1980). Perceived fairness and accuracy of performance evaluation: A follow-up. Journal of Applied Psychology, 65, 751-754.

Leventhal, G.S. (1976). Fairness in social relationships. In J.W. Thibaut, J.T. Spence, and R.C. Carson (Eds.). Contemporary topics in social psychology, Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press, 211-239.

Leventhal, G.S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? In K.J. Gergen, M.S., M.S. Greenberg, and R.H. Willis (Eds.), Social exchange: Advances in theory and research. New York: Plenum Press, 27-55.

Lissak, R.I. (1983). Procedural Fairness: How employees evaluate procedures. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Champaign.

Murphy, K.A., & Davidshofer, C.O. (1991). Psychological testing: Principles and applications, 2nd. ed. Engelwood cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Murphy, K.R., Thornton, G.C., and Reynolds, D.H. (1990). College students' attitudes toward employee drug testing programs. Personnel Psychology, 43, 615-630.

Newcomb, M.D. (1988). Drug use in the workplace: Risk factors for disruptive substance abuse among young adults. Dover, MA: Auburn House.

Normand, J., Salyards, S.D., and Mahoney, J.J. (1990). An evaluation of premployment drug testing. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 629-639

Reid, L.D. and Murphy, K.R. (1990). Drug testing and drug abuse in the workplace In K.R. Murphy and F.E. Saal (Eds.), Psychology in organizations. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ.

Rynes, S.L., Heneman, H.G., and Schwab, D.P. (1980). Individual reactions to organizaiotnal recruiting: A review. Personnel Psychology, 33, 529-542.

Schwab, D.P., Rynes, S.L. and Aldag, R.J. (1987). Theories and research on job search and choice. In K. Rowland & G. Ferris (Eds.). Research in personnel and human resource management (Vol.5) Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. Personnel Psychology, 40, 437-453.

Stoffey, R.W., Millsap, R.E., Smither, J.W., and Reilly, R.R. (1991). The influence of selection procedures on attitudes about the organization and job pursuit intentions Paper presented at the Sixth Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, St. Louis. MO.

Stone, D.L. and Kotch, D.A. (1989). Individuals' attitudes toward organizational drug testing policies and practices. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74, 518-521.

Thibaut, J., and Walker, L. (1975). Procedural justice: A psychological analysis. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Table 1a.

Cell means and standard deviations for perceptions of fairness of drug testing policy by type of drug testing policy and participation

| | Type of policy | |
|---|---|---|
| Participation | Favorable | Unfavorable |
| Employee | | |
| Mean | 35.20 | 28.43 |
| SD | 7.75 | 9.25 |
| n | 35 | 37 |
| Management | | |
| Mean | 32.91 | 27.86 |
| SD | 7.83 | 9.02 |
| n | 35 | 36 |

Table 1b.

Means and standard deviations for fairness of drug testing policy by type of policy and participation

| Independent variables | Fairness of drug policy |
|---|---|
| Type of policy | |
| Favorable | |
| Mean | 34.06 |
| SD | 7.82 |
| n | 70 |
| Unfavorable | |
| Mean | 28.15 |
| SD | 9.08 |
| n | 73 |
| Participation | |
| Employee | |
| Mean | 31.72 |
| SD | 9.15 |
| n | 72 |
| Management | |
| Mean | 30.35 |
| SD | 8.77 |
| n | 71 |

Table 2

Regression of Perceptions of fairness of drug testing policy on type of drug testing policy, participation and normfavoring orientation

| | Perceptions of fairness | |
|---|---|---|
| Independent variable | Beta | t |
| Type of policy | -.318 | -4.241** |
| Participation | -.105 | -1.398 |
| Normfavoring | -.320 | -4.253** |

note: R = .466; F(3, 139) = 12.876, p = .001. The interaction terms were not significant and were not included in the final regression analysis.

** p <.001

Table 3

Fairness of individual components of drug testing policy

| Favorable drug policy | Mean | SD | n |
|---|---|---|---|
| All tested prior to hire | 3.94 | 1.02 | 70 |
| Submit urine sample only | 3.86 | 1.01 | 70 |
| Only illegal drugs | 3.86 | 1.04 | 70 |
| Checked for false positives | 4.34 | .80 | 70 |
| Results kept confidential | 4.66 | .54 | 70 |
| Can reapply for employment | 4.01 | .91 | 70 |
| Safety sensitive jobs only | 2.99 | 1.15 | 70 |
| Opportunity to enter counseling | 4.16 | .88 | 70 |
| **Unfavorable drug policy** | | | |
| All tested prior to hire | 4.08 | .76 | 73 |
| Submit blood and urine | 3.64 | 1.23 | 73 |
| Illegal drugs and alcohol | 3.23 | 1.20 | 73 |
| Personal background check | 2.82 | 1.15 | 73 |
| Results made available human resources & hiring manager | 3.27 | 1.13 | 73 |
| May not reapply for employment | 2.18 | 1.08 | 73 |
| All employees tested at random | 2.90 | 1.23 | 73 |
| Employee is terminated | 2.59 | 1.22 | 73 |
| Personal belongings searched | 1.88 | 1.05 | 73 |

Note: scale (1= extremely unfair and 5 = extremely fair)

Table 4

Means and standard deviations for job pursuit intentions, attitude toward company and perceptions of fairness of other human resource practices by type of drug testing policy

| | Type of policy | |
|---|---|---|
| Dependent Variables | Favorable | Unfavorable |
| Job pursuit intentions | | |
| Mean | 18.77 | 17.51 |
| SD | 3.30 | 4.11 |
| n | 70 | 73 |
| Attitude toward company | | |
| Mean | 22.80 | 21.51 |
| SD | 4.77 | 4.62 |
| n | 70 | 73 |
| Fairness of other practices | | |
| Mean | 18.59 | 17.59 |
| SD | 2.88 | 3.36 |
| n | 70 | 73 |