

Human Factor, Organizational Justice and Perceived Organizational Effectiveness: An Empirical Analysis from Ghana and Uganda

Moses Acquah, University of North Carolina-Greensboro, USA
acquah@uncg.edu

Eddy K. Tukamushaba, Makerere University, Uganda
ek_tukamushaba@yahoo.com

This paper examines the effect of the human factor, organizational justice (OJ), and their interaction on perceived organizational effectiveness (OE) in two Sub-Saharan African economies. The findings indicate that OJ is positively related to OE in both Ghana and Uganda. There are, however, differences on the impact of the human factor on OE in Ghana and Uganda. In Ghana, helping qualities and human capabilities were positively related to OE, while moral capital was negatively related to OE. While in Uganda, moral capital and human capabilities were positively related to OE, helping qualities was negatively related to OE. The interaction effects further indicated that OJ moderates the relationship between the human factor and OE in both countries but in different ways. The findings clearly indicate that while the human factor influences OE, its role is also dependent on organizational justice perceptions at the workplace.

INTRODUCTION

It is commonly believed that employees are the most important asset of an organization. This is because the long-term viability of any organization critically depends on the skills, expertise, competencies and proactive behaviors of its employees. Adjibolooso (1995) has therefore argued that the effectiveness and performance of organizations in developing countries is dependent on the possession of the human factor qualities by its employees. The *human factor* (HF) describes the knowledge base, skills, expertise, capabilities, behavioral qualities and characteristics embodied in employees, which facilitate the functioning of organizations and socio-economic institutions on a sustainable basis (Adjibolooso, 1999). The HF construct has been used to explain the lack of progress and development, and success of organizations, institutions and nations in Africa and other developing countries. However, most of these studies have focused on conceptual and theoretical development, and the provision of anecdotal evidence about the lack of the human factor qualities and its consequences in developing countries.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the effect of the HF on organizational effectiveness using data from two Sub-Saharan African economies – Ghana and Uganda – to validate the theoretical propositions and anecdotal evidence presented in the literature. We argue that the impact of the HF on perceived organizational effectiveness is dependent on employees' perception of organizational justice issues. Organizational justice describes an individual's perception of fairness within organizational settings. The organizational justice literature proposes that employee perceptions about fairness in organizational procedures, outcomes, and interpersonal exchanges may influence their work-related attitudes and behaviors, and how they react to the performance of organizational activities (e.g., Moon et al, 2008; Shapiro & Kirkman, 2001). Thus we expect not only organizational justice to influence perceived organizational effectiveness, but also organizational justice to moderate the relationship between the human factor and organizational effectiveness.

This study makes several contributions to the literature. First, we take the initial step to empirically validate the relationship between the human factor and organizational effectiveness in Sub-Saharan African environment. Second, although organizational justice has been extensively studied in Western economies, much of what we know about fairness or justice issues at the workplace in emerging economies comes from Asia (e.g., Lam et al, 2002; Moon et al., 2008) and most of them have examined the link between justice and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB). This paper attempts to extend the study of fairness issues at the workplace in emerging economies to the Sub-Saharan African context by investigating how it affects perceived organizational effectiveness. Third, we examine how the interaction between human factor and organizational justice influence organizational effectiveness. In exploring this interaction effect, the aim is to integrate the skills and capabilities paradigm and the social exchange paradigm which has not been previously investigated.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES

The Human Factor and Organizational Effectiveness

People are the most important asset of nations, organizations and institutions. Therefore, the role of employees who have the knowledge base, skills, experience, and expertise, and who have the capabilities to use them for the betterment of their nations and organizations cannot be overemphasized. These knowledge base, skills, experience, expertise, and capabilities, in addition to good citizenship behavioral qualities and characteristics of employees have been termed the human factor (HF) by Adjibolosoo (1995). Accordingly, the HF is defined as “a spectrum of personality characteristics and other dimensions of human performance that enable social, economic and political institutions to function and remain functional over time. Such dimensions sustain the workings and applications of the rule of law, political harmony, a disciplined labor force, just legal systems, respect for human dignity and the sanctity of life, social welfare and so on” (Adjibolosoo, 1995, p. 33). Adjibolosoo (1995) argues that the HF does not refer to the mere development of human resources and the acquisition of human capital through education and training but also the human ability to effectively utilize and apply the acquired knowledge and information and the demonstration of the qualities of human personality to successfully accomplish set goals and objectives.

He categorizes the HF into six dimensions: spiritual capital, moral capital, human capital, aesthetic capital, human abilities, and human potential (Adjibolosoo, 1995, p. 33-38). *Spiritual capital* refers to the aspects of human personality that is usually in tune with the universal laws and principles of human life. It equips the individual to see beyond what the five senses are able to grasp and furnishes him or her with deeper insights into the non-material world. *Moral capital* refers to the habits and attitudes of the human heart that are based on universal principles regarding right or wrong. It refers to the qualities individuals possess that lead them to conform or not to conform to ethical principles and standards of conduct. *Aesthetic capital* refers to the possession of a strong sense of and love for beauty. It includes a strong passion for imagination and creativity. *Human capital* refers to the possession of know-how and acquired qualifications and skills (i.e., technical, conceptual, intellectual, analytical and communications); human experiences, knowledge, and intelligence. *Human abilities* refer to the capability or capacity of an individual to undertake activities competently or effectively perform tasks requiring mental and physical effort. They involve the effective and efficient utilization and application of the acquired human capital. *Human potentials* refer to the human talents that may or may not be harnessed and employed for human utilization. These may be referred to as yet undeveloped and unused dimensions of HF.

Adjibolosoo (2000, p. 5) states that “long-lasting human prosperity and success require the balance nurturing and development of each of these integrated components of the HF in every person. Failure to develop each component of the HF will result in poor human performance and living standards”. Thus, the various dimensions must be simultaneously developed and integrated or at least be present in employees for the benefit of an organization. This should be welcomed since human resource development and/or human capital acquisitions are *necessary* but not *sufficient* conditions for HF

development, unless they are utilized and applied for the benefit of an organization (Acquaah, 2004). In this study we focus on the HF dimensions of moral capital, aesthetic capital, human capital, and human abilities because of the difficulties of operationalizing the spiritual capital and human potentials dimensions. Many studies have documented the prevalence of corruption, unproductive work ethic, behaviors and attitudes which manifest themselves in significant amount of shirking, lateness and absenteeism in organizations and institutions in Sub-Saharan Africa (e.g., Adjibolooso, 1999). These attitudes and behaviors cause employee productivity to decline and lead to organizational ineffectiveness. Thus, organizations with employees who possess the HF qualities will be able to use those employees to improve productivity, efficiency and effectiveness. Organizations with employees who possess the behavioral qualities which underlie the HF dimensions of moral capital and helping qualities such as integrity, following organizational rules and regulations, reliability in performing job responsibilities, loyalty to organization, willingness to help co-workers with work-related problems, tolerance for other points of view, etc will help minimize if not eliminate the level of corruption in those organizations and improve the effectiveness with which those organizations undertake their activities. Most of the behavioral qualities embodied in moral capital and helping qualities are very similar to some behavioral dimensions of OCB, which has been shown to facilitate organizational effectiveness (e.g., Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1997; Waltz and Niehoff, 2000).

Both the human capital literature and the resource-based view of the firm (RBV) have also documented the importance of the possession and exploitation of human capital and competencies for the benefit of organizations (e.g., Barney, 1991). Research has shown that human capital attributes in the form of educational qualifications, skills, and experiences improve organizational outcomes (e.g., Hitt et al, 2001). Therefore, organizations with employees endowed with the knowledge, skills, expertise and experiences for organizing their strategic activities will find them valuable because they are more likely to help the organization to achieve its goals and become more effective. However, in Sub-Saharan African economies, the possession of qualifications, skills and experiences by employees does not necessarily imply that it can be leveraged to effectively create value in organizations since most of the initially acquired skills and experiences become outmoded or emaciated over the years for lack of effective use. Thus, employees' human capital per se is not sufficient to effectively create value in organizations unless the employees have the ability and willingness to leverage the human capital by utilizing the acquired knowledge, skills, expertise, and experiences in solving firm-specific problems and fostering the goals and objectives of the organization. The ability and willingness to effectively leverage human capital is what we call human abilities or competence. Thus:

Hypothesis 1 (H1): Human factor will be positively related to perceived organizational effectiveness.

Organizational Justice and Perceived Organizational Effectiveness

Organizational justice refers to employees' perception of fairness as it relates to the workplace (Greenberg and Colquitt, 2006; Moorman, 1991). It is the degree to which fair procedures and processes exist and are adhered to in an organization, and the extent to which individuals perceive their leaders as being fair and sincere and having logic or rational for what they do (Choi, 2008). Researchers have conceptualized and operationalized organizational justice into three types: distributive, procedural and interactional (Moorman, 1991). *Distributive justice* refers to the perceived fairness of the distribution of outcomes (e.g., pay raises, promotions, and selection for further studies/training) in an organization (Moorman, 1991). *Procedural justice* refers to the perceived fairness with which an allocation decision regarding the distribution of outcomes are made in an organization (Konovsky, 2000), while *interactional justice* refers to the quality of interpersonal treatment an individual (employee) receives from an authority figure and the enactment of procedures (Coyle-Shapiro et al, 2004; Moorman, 1991). The general findings in the extant literature on organizational justice indicate that while distributive justice is more strongly related to personal outcomes, procedural justice is more strongly related to organizational outcomes (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Employees are more likely to alter their behavior towards an

organization in the conduct of their activities if they believe that the organization is fair or unfair in the allocation of resources as well as rewards rather than when they believe that a decision outcome is fair or unfair. Moreover, Choi (2008) has demonstrated that justice perceptions of an organization have a stronger relationship with employees' organization-directed reactions than event justice perceptions. Thus, we focus on procedural and interactional justice. Although, procedural justice and interactional justice are usually treated as distinct constructs (Coyle-Shapiro et al., 2004), several researchers consider interactional justice as part of procedural justice (e.g., Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002) so they are combined in this study.

Organizational justice or fairness issues are very important in African economies because fairness issues are non-existent at the organizational institutional and national levels. Although most of the research on organizational justice have been conducted in Western economies, Greenberg (2001) argues that culture affect both the formation of justice perceptions and the effects of these perceptions on employee attitudes and behaviors. Most African cultures are relatively high on masculinity and power distance per Hofstede's dimensions (Hofstede, 1980) with power in organizations and institutions unequally distributed and seniority at the workplace revered. Employees are therefore expected to accept decisions made by authorities without formal legitimate procedures leading to unfairness in the mechanisms or procedures used to determine issues such as pay raises, promotions, work assignments, and selection for further training and development. These perceptions of unfairness therefore generate behaviors and attitudes that may have detrimental effects on organizational effectiveness. Social exchange theory and the norm of reciprocity asserts that employees perform both their in-role and extra role activities to reciprocate fair treatment they receive from organizational leaders by making the effort to improve the effectiveness of the organization (Eisenberger, et al, 1990). Thus, when employees perceive that the procedures used to determine rewards are fair and consistent across the employee population, it would suggest to the employees that the organization values their welfare, and that will lead them to demonstrate behaviors helpful to the achievement of the organization's strategic goals and objectives. Therefore, we posit that when employees perceive that organizational procedures and the interpersonal treatment they receive as those procedures are enacted are fair, they will exhibit behaviors that would be beneficial to organizations. Thus the following hypothesis:

H2. Organizational justice will be positively related to perceived organizational effectiveness.

The Moderating Role of Perceived Organizational Justice

Since employees' fairness perceptions of an organization may affect their behavior towards the performance of in-role and extra-role activities, it is likely that employees' perceptions of an organization's justice will moderate the relationship between the HF and organizational effectiveness. When employees perceive an organization to be fair, they may react positively to the organization and would be more willing to exercise their HF qualities to improve the organization's effectiveness and performance. On the other hand, when employees view an organization to be unfair in the way it treats them, they are more likely to react negatively and exhibit behaviors and attitudes that are characteristics of HF decay such as shirking, absenteeism, bribery, corruption, etc. Thus, employees may exhibit strong positive reactions to utilizing their HF qualities when they are fairly treated in an organization and strong negative reactions to utilizing their HF qualities when they perceive that there is a high level of injustice at the workplace. It has been shown that individuals' perception of "justice from and relationships with organizations are associated with outcomes relevant to the organization" (Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002, p. 928). In addition, Choi (2008) has shown that when employees perceive their organizations to be generally fair, this perception moderated the relationship between event justice perceptions and employees reaction to the organization in terms of commitment and OCB. In Africa, where many employees perceive that they are not fairly treated in areas such as pay raises, promotion, work assignments, selection for further training and development, and relationship with their supervisors or bosses, they are more likely to generate behaviors and attitudes that create strong negative reactions to the

utilization of HF qualities for the benefit of their organizations. So, employees' organizational justice perceptions could be said to moderate the relationship between employees' deployment of their HF qualities and organizational effectiveness. Thus:

H3. Organizational justice (OJ) will moderate the relationship between human factor and organizational effectiveness, such that the relationship will be stronger when OJ is high than when OJ is low.

METHODS

Research Design and Procedure: Three hundred survey questionnaires were personally distributed to employees in various public sector and private organizations in each country. A maximum of ten questionnaires were distributed to each organization in each country with half of the questionnaires given to individuals occupying managerial and/or supervisory positions while the other half were distributed to subordinate employees. Two hundred sixty-eight questionnaires were returned from the employees in Ghana (response rate is 89.33%), while 200 questionnaire were returned from employees in Uganda (response rate is 66.7%), for a total of 468 questionnaires from the two countries for an overall response rate of 78.0%.

Measures

Human factor: The human factor (HF) was measured using the 24 item measure suggested in Acquah (2004). The employees were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree on the statements about their colleagues or fellow employees on a 7-point Likert scale with 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree. Because the psychometric properties of these items have not been determined, we conducted a factor analysis of the 24 items. The factor analysis yielded four factors: *moral capital, helping qualities, human capital, and human capabilities*. Moral capital was measured with ten items (e.g., they have high levels of integrity; they are conscientious). Helping qualities was measured with four items (e.g., they are willing to help others for work-related problems). Human capital was measured with five items (e.g., most of them have technical, vocational or university-level education and qualification), while human capabilities were measured with five items (e.g., they utilize their knowledge, skills and expertise in solving company problems).

Organizational effectiveness: This was measured with eight items that were based on organizational objectives commonly found in the literature on organizational effectiveness: improved company performance, meeting set goals and strategic direction, focus on survival of company, supporting creativity, effective and efficient allocation of resources, improved utilization of resources, growth, and emphasizing efficiency in operations. For each item, respondents indicated the extent of the (a) importance of objective, and (b) achievement of that objective, by their organization on 7-point Likert scales from 1 = not important to 7 = extremely important for the importance objectives, and 1 = completely not achieved to 7 = completely achieved for the achievement scale. Organizational effectiveness (OE) for each respondent was then operationalized as the average of the scores of importance times achieved.

Organizational justice: Organizational justice (OJ) was measured with five items assessing procedural justice and three items assessing interactional justice taken from Moorman (1991). A factor analysis of the eight items separately by country produced two distinct factors – *procedural justice* with five items (e.g., the procedures used to determine my promotion is fair) with $\alpha = 0.92$ for Ghana and $\alpha = 0.84$ for Uganda, and *interactional justice* with three items (e.g., my immediate supervisor gives me an opportunity to express my views) with $\alpha = 0.82$ for Ghana and $\alpha = 0.83$ for Uganda. However, the two factors were highly correlated ($r = 0.68$ for Ghana, and $r = 0.60$ for Uganda) so we combined the two factors to create an overall measure of organizational justice (see Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002).

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Hierarchical regression analyses were used to test the hypotheses. Previous studies have shown that demographic characteristics can influence employees' behavior and attitudes towards the performance of their work. We therefore controlled for age (years), gender (male = 1, female = 0), organization type (public sector vs. private), and organizational tenure (months). Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics, correlations and the reliabilities of the variables in each country. In Models 1 and 4, we examined the effects of the control variables on organizational effectiveness. In Ghana, age, tenure, gender, and organizational type were significantly related to OE. In Uganda, only tenure and organizational type were significantly related to OE. In Models 2 and 5, we include the HF components of moral capital (MC), helping qualities (HQ), human capital (HC), and human capabilities (CA), and organizational justice (OJ). We posited in Hypothesis 1 that HF will be positively related to OE. In Ghana, the results indicated that HQ and CA are significantly and positively related to OE, while MC and HC are significant and negatively related to OE. However, in Uganda, the results indicate that MC and CA are positively related to OE; HQ is significant and negatively related to OE, while HC is not significant. Thus, Hypothesis 1 is partially supported. Hypothesis 2 proposed that OJ will be positively related to OE. The results from both Ghana and Uganda supported this hypothesis.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix of Variables

| Variables | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------|-------|--------|------|
| GHANA | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Perceived Org Effectiveness | 0.89 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. HF – Moral Capital | 0.14 | 0.91 | | | | | | | | |
| 3. HF – Helping Qualities | 0.41 | 0.56 | 0.83 | | | | | | | |
| 4. HF – Human Capital | -0.04 | 0.25 | 0.54 | 0.71 | | | | | | |
| 5. HF – Human Capabilities | 0.14 | 0.57 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.79 | | | | | |
| 6. Organizational Justice | 0.18 | 0.68 | 0.52 | 0.20 | 0.35 | 0.92 | | | | |
| 7. Organization Type ^a | 0.25 | -0.14 | -0.06 | -0.58 | -0.31 | -0.06 | | | | |
| 8. Age (Years) | -0.13 | -0.14 | 0.02 | 0.25 | 0.06 | 0.02 | -0.29 | | | |
| 8. Tenure (Months) | 0.01 | -0.30 | 0.09 | 0.33 | -0.05 | -0.18 | -0.33 | 0.71 | | |
| 10. Gender ^b | 0.28 | 0.17 | 0.12 | -0.05 | 0.14 | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.14 | |
| Mean | 26.85 | 4.50 | 4.75 | 5.25 | 4.56 | 4.40 | 0.52 | 37.38 | 89.34 | 0.63 |
| Standard Deviation | 8.11 | 1.13 | 1.12 | 0.79 | 0.96 | 1.23 | 0.50 | 8.84 | 60.56 | 0.48 |
| Minimum | 10.13 | 2.10 | 1.75 | 3.40 | 2.20 | 2.03 | 0.00 | 21.00 | 3.00 | 0.00 |
| Maximum | 46.50 | 6.40 | 6.75 | 7.00 | 6.80 | 6.60 | 1.00 | 58.00 | 414.00 | 1.00 |
| The values in diagonals are Cronbach alphas. ^a Private organizations=1, public sector organizations=0. ^b Male=1, Female=0. Significance levels: For $r > 0.12, p < 0.05$; $r > 0.16, p < 0.01$; and $r > 0.20, p < 0.001$ | | | | | | | | | | |
| Variables | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| UGANDA | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Perceived Org Effectiveness | 0.86 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. HF – Moral Capital | 0.42 | 0.89 | | | | | | | | |
| 3. HF – Helping Qualities | 0.32 | 0.82 | 0.83 | | | | | | | |
| 4. HF – Human Capital | 0.29 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.84 | | | | | | |
| 5. HF – Human Capabilities | 0.38 | 0.74 | 0.77 | 0.71 | 0.86 | | | | | |
| 6. Organizational Justice | 0.42 | 0.62 | 0.65 | 0.55 | 0.56 | 0.88 | | | | |
| 7. Organization Type ^a | 0.17 | 0.06 | 0.04 | -0.14 | -0.01 | 0.05 | | | | |
| 8. Age (Years) | -0.10 | -0.11 | -0.08 | -0.14 | -0.12 | -0.04 | -0.08 | | | |
| 9. Tenure (Months) | 0.20 | -0.04 | -0.07 | -0.15 | -0.15 | -0.08 | -0.17 | 0.64 | | |
| 10. Gender ^b | -0.12 | -0.01 | 0.03 | -0.01 | 0.02 | 0.02 | -0.16 | 0.22 | 0.14 | |
| Mean | 30.68 | 5.16 | 4.92 | 5.45 | 4.85 | 4.97 | 0.49 | 34.69 | 78.11 | 0.59 |
| Standard Deviation | 9.66 | 1.02 | 1.25 | 1.08 | 1.20 | 1.26 | 0.50 | 9.06 | 72.22 | 0.49 |
| Minimum | 1.875 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.60 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 21.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Maximum | 49.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 1.00 | 67.00 | 360.00 | 1.00 |
| The values in diagonals are Cronbach alphas. ^a Private organizations=1, public-sector organizations=0. ^b Male=1, Female=0. Significance levels: For $r > 0.14, p < 0.05$; $r > 0.18, p < 0.01$; and $r > 0.22, p < 0.001$. | | | | | | | | | | |

Models 3 and 6 present the results of the interaction between HF and OJ to test hypothesis 3. The results from the Ghana data indicated that the interactions between MC and OJ (MCxOJ), HQ and OJ (HQxOJ), and CA and OJ (CAxOJ) were significant and positively related to OE, while the interaction between HC and OJ (HCxOJ) is significant and negatively related to OE. It should be noted that the HC variable became insignificant with the inclusion of the HCxOJ in the model, implying that the impact of HC on organizational effectiveness is dependent on OJ. The results from the Uganda data showed that while HQxOJ is significant and positively related to OE, MCxOJ is significant and negatively related to OE. Both CAxOJ and HCxOJ were not significant. Thus, the Ghana results provide stronger support for the hypothesis than the Ugandan results.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between human factor (HF), organizational justice (OJ) and organizational effectiveness (OE). Using data from Ghana and Uganda, this study has generated some initial evidence that HF and OJ perceptions are related to perceptions of OE. Moreover, the relationship between HF and OE is moderated by OJ. First our findings indicate that HF is related to OE in the two countries. However, the association between the various components of HF and OE is different in the two countries. In Ghana, only HQ and CA have a positive association with OE. MQ and HC were surprisingly negatively associated with OE. These findings suggest that the possession of educational qualifications and technical skills, expertise and experiences or what we call HC alone is not sufficient to improve organizational effectiveness unless they are utilized and applied for the benefit of an organization (Acquaah, 2004; Adjibolooso, 1995). This explains the positive relationship between CA – which focuses on the utilization of the knowledge, skills, expertise, and abilities to the benefit of an organization –, and OE and the negative relationship between HC and OE.

The Ugandan findings show that MC and CA were positively related to OE, while HQ is negatively related to OE. Although, HC is negative, it is not statistically significant. The positive relationship between CA and OE and the negative but insignificant relationship between HC and OE corroborate the claim the HC is necessary but not sufficient to develop the HF unless they are leveraged to solve firm-specific problems and advance the strategic direction of an organization. The consistent relationship between HC and CA on OE in Ghana and Uganda is not matched by the relationship between MC and HQ on OE which diverged in the two countries.

Furthermore, OJ is positively related to OE in both Ghana and Uganda even after controlling for the various components of the HF in addition to respondents age, tenure, organization type and gender. The findings indicate that employees in the both countries who perceive that their organization treat them fairly are more likely to contribute to the effectiveness of their organizations. The result is consistent with fairness theory (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001), which suggests that when procedures are deemed to be unfair, employees are more likely to see the authority or entity (organization) as responsible for their unfavorable outcomes and thus leads them to react more negatively to current events in the organization. Therefore, when employees perceive that their organizations are fair, they may be motivated to engage in activities that will promote organizational effectiveness. Our findings suggest that one way of improving OE is to develop fair decision-making procedures at the organizational level.

The findings further show that OJ also moderates the relationship between some components of the HF and OE. While perceptions that an organization is fair strongly moderate all the HF components and OE in Ghana, it is only so with MC and HQ in Uganda. The findings in Ghana indicate that employees' perception of their organization's justice (a) assuage the effect of MC on OE, (b) augment the impact of both HQ and CA on OE, and (c) amplify the negative effect of HC on OE. However, the findings from Uganda show that employees' perception of fairness of their organization rather mitigate the effect of MC on OE. On the contrary, high organization fairness perceptions of employees improve the effect of HQ on

OE. This implies that when employees perceive their organization as fair they are more likely to engage in helping behaviors that leads to OE. The evidence from the moderating hypothesis from the two countries indicates that high perception of entity fairness by employees does not always boost the impact of HF on OE, but organizations in the two countries should foster the impression of fairness, create a fairness climate and actively promote fairness in all management practices.

In conclusion, the study shows that HF, OJ and the interaction between HF and OJ have different impact on organizational effectiveness in Ghana and Uganda. Future research should examine these relationships in other African economies so as to deepen our understanding of the impact of the HF and OJ issues on organizational outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Acquaah, M. (2004). Human factor theory, organizational citizenship behaviors and human resources management practices: An integration of theoretical constructs and suggestions for measuring the human factors. *Review of Human Factor Studies*, 10(1), 118-151.
- Adjibolosoo, S. B-S. K. (2000). The human factor in nation building. *Review of Human Factor Studies*, 5(1&2): 1-16.
- Adjibolosoo, S. B-S. K. (1999). *Rethinking development theory and policy: A human factor critique*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Adjibolosoo, S. B-S. K. (1995). *Human factor in developing Africa*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17, 99-129.
- Choi, J. (2008). Event justice perceptions and employees' reactions: Perceptions of social entity justice as a moderator. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 513-528.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A-M., Kessler, I., & Purcell, J. (2004). Exploring organizationally directed citizenship behavior: Reciprocity or 'It's my Job'? *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(1), 85-106.
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 51-59.
- Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (2001). Fairness theory: Justice as accountability. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 1-55). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Greenberg, J. (2001). Studying organizational justice cross-culturally: Fundamental challenges. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 12, 365-375.
- Greenberg, J., & Colquitt, J. A. (2006). *The handbook of organizational justice*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hitt, M. A., Bierman, L., Shimizu, K., & Kochhar, R. (2001). Direct and moderating effects of human capital on strategy and performance in professional service firms: A resource-based perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 13-28.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Cultures consequences: international differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills. Sage.
- Konovsky, M. A. (2000). Understanding procedural justice and its impact on business organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 489-511.
- Lam, S. S. K., Schaubroeck, J., & Aryee, S. (2002). Relationship between organizational justice and employee work outcomes: A cross-national study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 1-18.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York: Plenum Press
- Moon, H., Kamdar, D., Mayer, D. M., & Takeuchi, R. (2008). Me or we? The role of personality and justice as other-centered antecedents to innovative citizenship behaviors within organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 84-94.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855.

- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Human Performance*, 10, 133-151.
- Rupp, D. E., & Cropanzano, R. (2002). The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89: 925-946.
- Shapiro, D. L., & Kirkman, B. L. (2001). Anticipatory injustice: The consequences of expecting injustice in the workplace. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 152-178). Lexington, MA: New Lexington.
- Walz, S. M., & Niehoff, B. P. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: Their relationship to organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 24, 301-319.

Table 2: Results of Regression Analysis of the Relationship between Human Factor, Organizational Justice and Perceived Organizational Effectiveness

| Variables | Ghana (N = 268) | | | | Uganda (N = 194) | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------|
| | Model 1 β (t-value) | Model 2 β (t-value) | Model 3 β (t-value) | VIF | Model 4 β (t-value) | Model 5 β (t-value) | Model 6 β (t-value) | VIF |
| <i>Controls</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Constant | 27.49*** (11.39) | 29.30*** (13.50) | 28.49*** (13.71) | | 30.53*** (10.09) | 29.48*** (10.76) | 28.73*** (10.12) | |
| Age | -0.22** (-3.07) | -0.24*** (-3.60) | -0.30*** (-4.65) | 2.64 | 0.07 (0.66) | 0.10 (1.16) | 0.11 (1.27) | 1.83 |
| Tenure | 0.03** (2.77) | 0.03** (2.68) | 0.05*** (4.63) | 3.59 | -0.03* (2.14) | -0.03* (-2.26) | -0.03* (-2.25) | 1.86 |
| Gender | 4.61*** (4.84) | 3.64*** (4.15) | 3.59*** (4.54) | 1.16 | -2.22 (-1.57) | -2.20+ (-1.75) | -2.27+ (-1.73) | 1.18 |
| Organization Type | 4.11*** (4.24) | 3.08** (2.95) | 2.45* (2.46) | 1.95 | 2.45+ (1.78) | 1.87 (1.47) | 1.81 (1.39) | 1.18 |
| <i>Hypothesized Variables</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Human Factor – Moral capital | | -1.93** (-3.17) | -1.31* (-2.24) | 3.43 | | 3.43** (3.11) | 3.23** (2.89) | 3.60 |
| Human Factor – Helping qualities | | 3.86*** (7.05) | 2.18*** (3.66) | 3.51 | | -2.51** (-2.60) | -2.11* (-2.15) | 4.17 |
| Human Factor – Human capabilities | | 1.38* (2.31) | 1.24* (2.09) | 2.70 | | 1.74+ (1.85) | 1.58+ (1.68) | 3.53 |
| Human Factor – Human capital | | -2.74*** (-3.32) | -1.02 (-1.22) | 3.47 | | -0.49 (-0.58) | -0.38 (-0.43) | 2.52 |
| Organizational Justice (OJ) | | 0.98* (2.09) | 1.48** (3.19) | 2.59 | | 2.14** (3.99) | 2.52*** (3.65) | 2.08 |
| <i>Interactions</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Moral capital x OJ | | | 2.18*** (3.95) | 2.73 | | | -1.34+ (-1.74) | 5.30 |
| Helping qualities x OJ | | | 0.93* (1.95) | 3.86 | | | 1.19+ (1.65) | 7.52 |
| Human capabilities x OJ | | | 1.31** (2.60) | 2.59 | | | 0.46 (0.56) | 6.06 |
| Human capital x OJ | | | -2.97*** (-6.00) | 2.39 | | | -0.08 (-0.13) | 2.59 |
| Adjusted R ² | 0.160 | 0.366 | 0.485 | | 0.051 | 0.247 | 0.255 | |
| Model F | 13.70*** | 18.13*** | 20.33*** | | 3.60** | 8.04*** | 6.09*** | |

+ $p < 0.10$; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0$