



Organisational justice on employee performance at Kishapu District Council, Tanzania

Benedicto Paul¹
Oscar W. Tefurukwa²

otefurukwa@mzumbe.ac.tz

^{1,2}Mzumbe University, Tanzania

<https://doi.org/10.51867/asarev.3.1.11>

ABSTRACT

Employee performance in Tanzanian public organisations continues to decline when employees perceive unfair resource distribution, decision-making, and treatment. Previous studies have not yet covered all public organisations in Tanzania. This study, therefore, examined the effect of organisational justice on employee performance at the Kishapu District Council. Social Exchange Theory guided the research. The study used a quantitative, cross-sectional survey to collect data from 84 employees. Researchers applied a multivariate linear regression model, simple random sampling, and a structured questionnaire. The results showed that distributive justice has a significant effect on employee performance ($\text{Pr}(> F) = 0.007830$ **). Procedural justice also shows a statistically significant effect on employee performance ($\text{Pr}(> F) = 0.001899$ **). Interactional justice has a highly statistically significant effect on employee performance ($\text{Pr}(> F) = 0.00001255$ ***). The study concluded that employees' perceptions of organisational justice collectively have a significant effect on their performance at the council. The council should ensure transparent and equitable compensation and fair decision-making. It also needs to promote fair treatment of employees. Policy-wise, the council should include organisational justice in its human resource policies and conduct cost-benefit analyses of fair procedures and treatment during decision-making. The findings imply that organisations should follow good governance principles to increase employees' dedication and loyalty. This is vital for organisational performance. Based on the findings, performance at the Kishapu District Council can be improved. Policymakers should address equitable resource distribution and transparent compensation. Clear communication of decision-making criteria for promotions, assignments, and disciplinary action is needed. There is a need for training on effective communication and empathetic leadership to promote respect and fairness in the workplace.

Keywords: Employee Performance, Kishapu District Council, Organisational Justice, Tanzania

I. INTRODUCTION

Employees' performance is not optional in organisations (Gomes & Marques, 2025). It is no longer only a technical obligation; it is also a tactical concern. Performance is critical for achieving organisational objectives (Zeb et al., 2021). The International Labour Organisation (ILO) (2022) states that human resource management promotes the growth and development of an organisation. Employees are no longer at the periphery of strategic management. They are now central assets in attaining organisational objectives (Edema, 2025). The study by Hermanto and Srimulyani (2022) echoes this view. They argue that an organisation's success relates closely to employees' productivity and involvement. However, one ingredient, organisational justice, must be present to initiate processes that improve performance (Chen & Jin, 2014). According to Hermanto and Srimulyani (2022), organisational justice includes distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. As noted by Faq and Ismael (2022), industrialisation demands fairness in treating employees' perspectives to yield a more motivated and productive workforce. Findings by Fiaz et al. (2021), Chen and Jin (2014), and Gomes and Marques (2025) further argue that strong effectiveness and overall performance help organisations thrive despite challenges. For this focus, we define organisational justice as the perception of fair treatment of employees, procedural justice, and interactional justice (Edema, 2025). It also covers employees perceived positive attitudes toward justice in processes, outcomes, and interpersonal treatment (Fiaz et al., 2021). According to Aryono (2024), the moral underpinning of organisational justice is embedded in the culture of equality. It increases employee loyalty, dedication, support, citizenship behaviour, and job performance (Haris et al., 2023).

In every country, organisations aim to maximise employee performance. This is a key strategy for achieving organisational success (Edema, 2025). According to Hermanto and Srimulyani (2022), any organisation has objectives to accomplish. These objectives depend heavily on individual employee performance. Employee performance is a logically essential part of managerial and organisational psychology. It is a key factor in human resource management outcomes (Zeb et al., 2021). Zeb and colleagues viewed employee performance (work achievement) as the result of the quality and quantity of work an employee accomplished within their assigned responsibilities. However, despite the



importance of employee performance, difficulties remain. According to Hermanto and Srimulyani (2022) and Ekingen (2023), unfair distribution of resources, decision-making procedures, treatment of employees, and inadequate training programs are challenges. For instance, in South Africa, only about 15% of employees are engaged at work. The rest of the employees experience injustice, inadequate training programs, and insufficient performance feedback (Purnama et al., 2020; Hermanto & Srimulyani, 2022; Ekingen, 2023). Consequently, productivity and profitability may fall short. Public service delivery and employee performance can also decline (David, 2022).

New Public Management emerged in the 1980s as a response to poor public sector productivity (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992; Kettl, 2000). Tanzania has made efforts to improve employee performance. It launched OPRAS in 2004 (URT, 2004), enacted the Employment and Labour Relations Act (URT, 2004), passed the Public Service Act (URT, 2002), issued the Public Service Standing Order (URT, 2009), and introduced PEPMIS in 2024 (Dominic & Rutenge, 2024). The government also created a training policy for government servants. Despite these efforts, Mwita and Andrea (2019) and Ngeleshi and Dominic (2020) identify continuing challenges, including ineffective employee training, poor resource allocation, unclear decisions, unfair treatment, inadequate feedback, and insufficient staff competencies. These problems have led to poor employee performance and ineffective service delivery (Magige, 2023). Existing research has focused on how motivation affects employee performance (e.g., David, 2022; Msirikale, 2021). However, these studies did not address organisational justice. This study examines the effect of organisational justice on employee performance. The aim is to bridge this gap. The objectives are to assess the effects of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice at the Kishapu District Council.

1.1 Research Objective(s)

The main objective is to examine how organisational justice affects employee performance in a Tanzanian public organisation. The specific objectives are as follows:

1. The examine effect of Distributive Justice on Employee Performance;
2. The examine effect of Procedural Justice on Employee Performance; and
3. Examine the effect of Interactional Justice on Employee Performance at the Kishapu District Council in Tanzania.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2. 1 Theoretical Review

Cropanzano and Mitchell (2025) note that George C. Homans introduced Social Exchange Theory in the mid-20th century. Peter M. Blau, Richard M. Emerson, and John W. Thibaut later advanced the theory. Urbanska et al. (2019) state that the theory focuses on groups who seek "give-and-take" interactions. The value of a relationship is central. The theory says people compare benefits with costs in their associations. Rewards can be tangible or intangible, while costs involve time, effort, or emotions. Redy (2023) explains how the theory applies in different contexts. It describes social interaction in organisations. Employees give time and effort in exchange for rewards. According to Kieserling (2018), people try to minimise costs and increase benefits. Urbanska et al. (2019) argue that employees in organisations evaluate relationships by comparing what they give with what they get.

The social exchange theory is grounded in the mutual exchange code, which states that, in organisational relationships, management ought to preserve fairness in the distribution of resources, procedures, and interpersonal interactions. When these conditions exist, job satisfaction amongst employees increases, and performance eventually improves. The moment employees observe fairness in rewards, such as fair pay, recognition, and support, they are most likely to reciprocate it through good behaviours, which encompass loyalty and high productivity (Ferrón et al., 2024). Even the way organisations design processes and take well-informed decisions on how resources should be distributed, openness and equity should be the guiding principles. Through which a positive exchange is achieved, thereby improving employees' performance. One way to improve social exchange is to enhance employees' capacity to make informed decisions (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005).

Another feature is rooted in the cost-benefit analysis (distribute justice) concept, whereby interaction of the employees in the organisation is perceived as costs: time and resources, with benefits which include but are not limited to rewards, recognition and support. Similarly, it is expected that employees will remain in their workplaces when they observe that the advantages outweigh the costs (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). This is why employees stay in the workplace: they know that their time and skills are used to secure their job. For instance, some employees often stay in the same position as long as they perceive fair compensation (Redy, 2023). The behaviour is in line with the social exchange theory, which postulates that employees assess the value of their relationship with their workplace in terms of the rewards they receive relative to their loyalty to the organisation.

The social rewards principle (Interactional Justice) encompasses intangible rewards such as respect, acknowledgement, sympathy, and a feeling of belonging (Kieserling, 2018). Along the course of an organisation



practising interactional justice, such as humble communication and sympathy, employees notice benefits in social exchange (Urbanska et al., 2019). Hence, employees are more likely to reciprocate observed fair treatment in organisations and to positively increase performance and loyalty (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Through equity principles, the assessment can be based on fairness and balance in exchange relationships, as they improve employee engagement and performance when employees realise equitable exchange between their efforts and the rewards they receive (Ahmad et al., 2023).

2.2 Empirical Review

Haris et al. (2023) assert that the relationship between organisational justice and employee performance has elicited substantial attention in current empirical studies, yielding a varied collection of conclusions that permit serious scrutiny. However, Aryono (2024) postulates that distributive justice cannot significantly affect employee performance, a perspective that sharply contrasts with the findings of Yahaya et al. (2020) and Dunan and Felia (2025). Both studies assert that distributive justice absolutely affects performance. This variation underscores a continuing debate in the literature about the role of distributive justice and argues that circumstantial factors may affect its impact on employee performance.

Haris et al. (2023) extended this discussion by indicating that both distributive and procedural justice concurrently influence employee job performance in Indonesia. However, their conclusion raises concerns about possible confounding variables that may influence the relationship between these constructs. Fiaz et al. (2021) support the notion that organisational justice substantially affects employee performance, yet do not outline how the interaction among the different dimensions of justice unfolds throughout various organisational situations.

In addition, Edema's (2025) study indicates that interactional justice is the strongest predictor of employee performance in Uganda, underscoring the need to discuss which dimensions of justice are most pertinent across diverse social backgrounds. In public health facilities in Kenya, Rogers and Kuloba's (2022) study revealed that organisational justice dimensions impact the performance of the employees equally, jointly and autonomously. However, the study lacks a vigorous discussion of the mechanisms underlying established relationships.

John's (2024) study, conducted in Kenya, offers possible insights. It showed a strong correlation between employee performance and organisational justice; whereby procedural justice had the highest. One limitation of this study is that, despite a strong methodological approach, it does not adequately attend to potential mediating factors, in particular job satisfaction, which the study shows as a partial mediator. It is very important to address this to understand the multifarious associations, which might differ substantially across organisational backgrounds. On the contrary, Phiri et al. (2025) present an unambiguous view of organisational justice in the Zambian health sector, where a negative correlation between justice and job satisfaction indicates a structural issue in the public sector. The findings stress the importance of examining how deeply embedded cultural values mould perceptions of justice and employee morale. A variation of John's (2024) observation in Kenya, which is more positive about justice and job satisfaction.

Additionally, Kweyamba et al. (2025) examined the effectiveness of disciplinary procedures and the fairness of justice administration in Tanzania's public service, focusing on legislative clarity along with public servants' perspectives. Showing how well these processes maintain justice and impartiality in public service. This study is further supported by the overarching studies of Ngeleshi and Dominic (2020); David (2022); Msirikale (2021), which have investigated the effects of motivational factors on employee performance in Tanzanian public organisations; however, they did not exactly capture organisational justice according to the association of in relation to the performance of the employees.

General, although the literature stresses the influence of organisational justice throughout various public sector contexts, the gaps are obvious. There may still be a need to conduct additional studies. Studies that carefully examine the interaction among the scopes of justice and their appropriate influences, while developing unified systems that cohesively clarify their influence on employee performance.

Studies on the mechanisms that influence job satisfaction and performance, as well as related factors that can mediate their relationships, remain important for developing a more conscious understanding of organisational behaviour in this regard. Thus, this study fills a gap by investigating the effect of organisational justice on employee performance at the Kishapu District Council. Explicitly, the subsequent hypotheses directed the study: Ha: "Distributive justice has a significant effect on employee performance"; Ha: "Procedural justice has a significant effect on employee performance". Ha: "Interactional justice has a significant effect on employee performance".

2.2.1 Ha: Distributive Justice has a Significant Effect on Employee Performance

According to a study by Yahaya et al. (2020) on the effects of distributive justice and self-efficacy on employees' performance in Abuja's Federal Capital Territory Area, a positive relationship between distributive justice and self-efficacy is observed, indicating an effect on employees' performance. It implies enhancing distributive justice at the lower levels of the organisation, since rewards motivate employees every day.



Rogers and Kuloba (2022) assessed the effect of procedural, distributive and interactional justice on employee performance in public health facilities in Turbo Sub-County, Kenya. The study revealed that organisational justice dimensions mutually and independently influenced employees' performance in the public sector, particularly in public health facilities in Kenya. Further, the study shows that the three constructs of organisational justice were equally statistically significantly influenced by employees' performance. Drawing from the findings, the study suggested that managing public health facilities requires formulating and implementing policies to enhance organisational effectiveness and improve employee performance.

Alkhadher et al. (2026) have made a significant contribution by presenting the first comprehensive meta-analysis of organisational justice research inside the Arab countries. They address an important gap, as most current studies in this area have focused mostly on Western countries' backgrounds. Their conclusions underscore an inspiring dynamic: procedural justice plays a key function in shaping how distributive justice influences job satisfaction. It simply means that if employees' perceptions of the processes are positive, the outcome is perceived as fair. The opposite is also the case. The results strongly suggest that it is important to have procedures in the organisation that are fairly administered and that inform the outcome. The procedures are more important than the outcomes.

2.2.2 Ha: Procedural Justice has a Significant Effect on Employee Performance

According to Harris et al. (2023), procedural justice influences employees' job performance. Based on the hypothesis test, the significance level for procedural justice and employees' job performance was 0.000, which was less than 0.05. As ideal, Aryono's (2024) study in Indonesia found that distributive, procedural, and interactional justice influenced employee performance in contractor companies. Similarly, procedural and interactional justice positively affect employee performance. The study suggested that procedural and interactional justice jointly affect employees' performance in MMR projects. In the same spirit, the study by Fiaz et al. (2021) in Pakistan revealed that organisational justice (procedural, interactional, and distributive) meaningfully affects employee performance.

Additionally, Rogers and Kuloba's (2022) study revealed that found that organisational justice dimensions jointly and independently affect employee performance in public health facilities in Kenya. The three constructs of organisational justice were jointly statistically strongly influenced by employees' performance. Therefore, it is essential to formulate and implement policies that promote effective organisations in terms of organisational justice and performance.

2.2.3 Ha: Interactional Justice has a Significant Effect on Employee Performance

The study by Dunan and Felia (2025) examined the influence of quality of work life and organisational justice, as well as employees' preferences, at PT BCA, Tbk, in Indonesia. The study shows that both factors affected employees' performance. The data shows that the organisation, in particular the human resources office, should practice transparency in internal communication and recognise and appreciate employees' commitment by providing regular training to improve employee performance. These measures can support the working environment and serve as a motivating factor for the highest job outcomes. Extending the discussion, Alkhadher et al. (2026) conducted a study on the different aspects of organisational justice and their relationships with important job outcomes across Western and Arab cultures. They reported a strong positive relationship with these outcomes. In particular, trust emerged as the most influential factor. Simultaneously, there was an overall connection between behaviours such as organisational citizenship.

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

A cross-sectional survey was conducted to examine how different aspects of organisational justice affect employee performance at a given point in time. The focus was on three types of justice: Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, and Interactional Justice, expressly within the Kishapu District Council in Tanzania. This research aimed not only to assess how common these concepts were but also to uncover any connections between organisational justice and employees' performance in that setting. By doing so, it provided useful insights into the dynamics of the Kishapu District Council's work environment.

3.2 Study Area

For an in-depth investigation within a representative public organisation. The study was conducted at the Kishapu District Council, one of the districts in Tanzania's Shinyanga region. Kishapu District Council was selected as the case study area to provide a specific context for examining organisational justice and employee performance in a public-sector setting in Tanzania. The Controller and Auditor General (CAG) has indicated inadequate performance in 2021/2022, and in 2021/202 the performance was at only 65% (CAG, Report 2023/2024) of employees in public service



delivery at the Kishapu District Council. However, public organisations have indicated that Local government Authorities (LGAs) have a major proportion of staff with inadequate performance.

3.3 Target Population

The target population for this study comprised all employees working within various departments of the Kishapu District Council. The employees from 18 departments served as the research sample, as they are the direct beneficiaries and subjects of organisational justice practices, and as contributors to overall employee performance within the council. The total population of employees at Kishapu District Council was estimated at $N = 125$.

3.4 Sampling and Sample size

In selecting respondents for the study, probability sampling techniques were employed, specifically layered sampling. However, a sample size of 84 respondents was considered for data analysis. A simple random sampling technique was utilised to select the participants at Kishapu District Council because it improves the generalizability of research findings and ensures the validity and dependability of the study (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). A stratified sampling random technique was utilised to select the participants. This method involved dividing the target population of employees into distinct subgroups (strata) based on relevant characteristics, such as department at Kishapu District Council, as shown in Table 1 below. From each stratum, a proportional number of employees was then randomly selected. This technique ensured that each subgroup was adequately represented in the sample, thus increasing the generalizability and the representativeness of the findings across the council's various departments.

Table 1
Distribution of Targeted Population and Selected Sample

SN	Department	Population	Sample	Sampling techniques
1.	Administration and HRM	17	13	Stratified sampling
2.	Finance and Accounting	17	13	Stratified Sampling
3.	Internal Auditing	2	1	Stratified Sampling
4.	Procurement Management	7	5	Stratified Sampling
5.	ICT	2	1	Stratified Sampling
6.	Legal Service	3	2	Stratified Sampling
7.	Planning	7	5	Stratified Sampling
8.	Community Development	8	6	Stratified Sampling
9.	Infrastructure	8	6	Stratified Sampling
10.	Primary Education	9	8	Stratified Sampling
11.	Secondary Education	9	8	Stratified Sampling
12.	Natural Resource	10	9	Stratified Sampling
13.	Waste Management	2	1	Stratified Sampling
14.	Election	2	1	Stratified Sampling
15.	Agriculture and fishing	11	8	Stratified Sampling
16.	Business	4	3	Stratified Sampling
17.	Sports	2	1	Stratified Sampling
18.	Health	5	4	Stratified Sampling
19.		N=125	n =95	

Source: Field Data (2025)

A sample size of $n = 95$ was determined for the target population of $N = 125$ employees using Yamane's (1967) formula.

$$n = N / ((1 + N(e)^2))$$

Where:

n = desired sample size

N = total population size (125)

e = level of precision (or sampling error), typically set at 0.05 (5%)

Substituting the values, getting:

$$n = 125 / ((1 + 125 \times (0.05)^2)) = 95.23 \approx 95$$

Therefore, the sample size was rounded up to 95 respondents.



However, after data cleaning, 8 questionnaires were rejected, and 84 provided full information and were eligible for further analysis.

3.5 Data Collection Tools and Procedure

The structured questionnaires were used to collect primary data. In designing the questionnaire, the variables guided the researchers. The variables include organisational justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional) and employee performance. We used a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) (Likert, 1932) because the study employed a quantitative approach to capture respondents' perceptions and attitudes. The questionnaire was self-administered by the respondents, with one research assistant providing clarifications where necessary to ensure complete and exact completion.

3.6 Data Analysis

For inferential statistics, a multivariate linear regression (MVLRL) model was utilised. This model simultaneously examined the effects of the three dimensions of organisational justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional justice) on the three dimensions of employee performance (Task Performance, Adaptive Performance, and Contextual Performance) as a set. MVLRL is particularly suited to situations with multiple dependent variables, as it accounts for their correlations, delivering a more statistically powerful and precise assessment of overall effects while controlling the Type I error rate (Hair et al., 2010). The MVLRL model can be conceptually represented as:

$$\begin{pmatrix} TP \\ AP \\ CP \end{pmatrix} = B_0 + B_1(DJ) + B_2(PJ) + B_3(IJ) + E$$

Where: B_0 is a vector of intercepts for Task Performance, Adaptive Performance, and Contextual Performance. B_1 , B_2 , and B_3 are vectors of regression coefficients, representing the effects of each justice dimension on each performance dimension. E is a matrix of error terms that accounts for the variances and covariances among the dependent variables. This model was analysed in the R statistical programming environment to examine the effects of the independent variables.

3.7 Validity and Reliability

On the other hand, validity was ensured by reviewing the existing literature on organisational justice and employee performance, and by consulting academic supervisors and subject-matter experts to confirm that the questionnaire items adequately covered all relevant aspects of the constructs. In terms of reliability, Cronbach's Alpha (Cronbach, 1951) was used to assess the data collection tool, yielding a reliability coefficient of $\alpha > 0.70$ (Hair et al., 2010). The results of the reliability test, shown in Table 2, were above the predefined threshold.

Table 2

Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Results for Study Scales

Construct	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha (α)	Interpretation
Distributive Justice (DJ)	4	0.842	Good
Procedural Justice (PJ)	5	0.852	Good
Interactional Justice (IJ)	3	0.843	Good
Task Performance (TP)	6	0.789	Acceptable
Adaptive Performance (AP)	7	0.734	Acceptable
Contextual Performance (CP)	10	0.839	Good

3.8 Ethical Considerations

Throughout the research process, we followed the proper guidelines. Ethical clearance and approval to conduct the study were obtained from all relevant authorities. All potential participants were fully informed about the study's purpose. Written informed consent was obtained from each voluntary respondent, and confidentiality was guaranteed. They had and their right to withdraw at any time before the publication of the study. No personal identifiers were collected in the questionnaires, guaranteeing anonymity. All collected data were stored securely to prevent unauthorised access. The study was designed to benefit the organisation and its employees by giving insights into improving employee performance through organisational justice, while assuring no harm or discomfort to the participants. The procedure and findings were presented transparently and sincerely, without manipulation or misrepresentation of data.



IV. FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

4.1 Omnibus Multivariate Tests

The multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) tests assessed the overall effect of each predictor on the combined set of dependent variables. These tests provide the omnibus significance for each predictor. Table 3 presents the results of the omnibus multivariate tests, specifically using the Pillai test statistic within a Type III MANOVA framework for the MVLR model.

Table 3: Omnibus Multivariate Tests for MVLR Model

Type III MANOVA Tests: Pillai test statistic						
	df	Test statistic	Approx. F	Num Df	Den Df	Pr(>F)
(Intercept)	1	0.16108	3.9041	3	61	0.012859 *
DJ	1	0.17560	4.3311	3	61	0.007830 **
PJ	1	0.21527	5.5781	3	61	0.001899 **
IJ	1	0.33877	10.4173	3	61	0.00001255 ***

-Signif. Codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

The intercept shows a statistically significant multivariate effect ($Pr(>F) = 0.012859$); this indicates that, when all other predictor variables are at their reference levels or zero, the combined mean of the dependent variables is significantly different from zero. Distributive justice (DJ) has a statistically significant multivariate effect on employee performance ($Pr(>F) = 0.007830$ **), suggesting that perceived fairness in the allocation of assets positively and significantly affects employee performance. Procedural Justice (PJ) also shows a statistically significant multivariate effect on employee performance ($Pr(>F) = 0.001899$ **), indicating that the perceived fairness of procedures used to make collective decisions positively and significantly affects employee performance. Interactional Justice (IJ) has a highly statistically significant multivariate effect on employee performance. ($Pr(>F) = 0.00001255$ ***) This indicated that perceived fairness in workplace treatment significantly affects employee performance.

4.2 Multivariate Regression Results

4.2.1 Effect of Distributive Justice on Employee Performance

The results show that distributive justice has a statistically significant effect on employee performance, suggesting that perceived fairness in the distribution of assets is associated with higher performance.

4.2.2 Effect of Procedural Justice on Employee Performance

The results showed that procedural justice also has a statistically significant effect on employee performance, indicating that the perceived fairness of procedures used to make collective decisions considerably impacts employee performance.

4.2.3 Effect of Interactional Justice on Employee Performance

The results show that interactional justice has a highly statistically significant effect on employee performance. This indicated that perceived fairness in workplace treatment significantly affects employee performance.

4.3 Hypothesis testing results

Table 3

Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis	($Pr(>F) =$	Decision
H _a : Distributive justice has a significant effect on employee performance	0.007830 **).	Accepted
H _a : Procedural justice has a significant effect on employee performance	0.001899 **).	Accepted
H _a : Interactional justice has a significant effect on employee performance.	(0.00001255 ***).	Accepted

4.3 Discussion

4.3.1 Effect of Distributive Justice on Employee Performance

The findings showed that employee performance is statistically significantly impacted by distributive justice. It implies that the perceived fairness of outcomes strongly influences total employee performance in Tanzanian public organisations. The study's empirical findings align with those of Yahaya and Innocent (2020), Dunan and Felia (2025),



and Pahlevi and Elmi (2022), who similarly discovered a noteworthy and favourable impact of distributive justice on worker performance. The findings of this study, however, differed from those of Aryono (2024), who claimed that distributive justice had no bearing on worker performance in an Indonesian contractor business. The contradictions between this study and Aryono's findings were likely because his study was done in Indonesia - a country with a very different economic environment, which probably influences people's expectations around fairness and how it works in public organisations - especially compared to those over in Tanzania. This finding also fits pretty neatly with social exchange theory, which basically says that people in organisations will compare the pros and cons of what they are getting and what they are putting in. That means stuff like pay, recognition, and support, and if they think the benefits far outweigh the costs, they are more likely to stick with the organisation. Fair pay, getting noticed for your work, and having a supportive workplace are all things that employees really value - so much so that they will go the extra mile to deliver high-quality work and stay loyal to the organisation. The data suggests that organisations really ought to focus on fairness if they want good results. Moreover, if we want to boost our chances of that happening, we might need to take another look at some of our policies, rules and regulations, to see if we can improve how we allocate resources, be fairer in how we do things, be more transparent, make sure we are compensating people fairly, and offer better opportunities for development and bonuses.

4.3.2 Effect of Procedural Justice on Employee Performance

The results show that procedural justice has a really noticeable impact on employee performance. In other words, the perceived fairness of decision-making seems to have a pretty big effect on how well employees do their jobs. The findings of this study align with those of other researchers (Sarfriz et al., 2021; Rogers & Kuloba, 2022; Fiaz et al., 2021; Aryono, 2024). It appears procedural fairness can directly affect employee performance (Rogers & Kuloba, 2022). There may be common factors across these studies contributing to the similar results we are seeing, including cultural practices and the social and economic conditions under which people are working. Our study found pretty much the same thing as this social exchange theory does - basically that organisations need to make sure that decision-making is fair and transparent, in order to keep employees happy and performing well. Moreover, to go a step further, organisations should ensure that whenever big decisions are made, everyone involved has a say - whether that is authorising employees to have a say (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2025) or not. However, interestingly, we got results that went against what was found by Haris and their team in Indonesia (2023) and Ahmad & Jameel in Malaysia (2021), who found no impact of procedural justice on employee performance. The reason for this could be cultural differences between the Kishapu District Council in Tanzania and those in the other countries. Anyway, in public sector organisations getting procedural justice right is really important for boosting employee performance in the workplace.

4.3.3 Effect of Interactional Justice on Employee Performance

The findings showed that employee performance is statistically significantly impacted by interactional fairness. It implies that employee performance is significantly improved by perceived fairness in interpersonal interaction. The study's findings support those of Aryono (2024), Rogers and Kuloba (2022), and Fiaz et al. (2021), suggesting that interactional fairness is the most reliable indicator of improved worker performance. This research was consistent because organisational politics and cultural elements were similar, producing similar outcomes. The results of this study were consistent with the principles of social exchange theory, specifically the social rewards principle, which includes intangible rewards such as respect, recognition, empathy, and a feeling of belonging (Kieserling, 2018). When an organisation practices respectful interaction and compassion, employees perceive a social exchange as beneficial (Urbanska et al., 2019). Employees are more likely to reciprocate perceived fair treatment at the workplace with positive behaviour, thereby increasing their performance and loyalty (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2025). According to this study's results, Kishapu District Council should ensure implementation and promote a culture of esteem, dignity, and candid communication at the workplace, since these factors strongly affect employee performance.

V. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusion

The results demonstrate the critical significance of distributive justice in enhancing employee performance in public organisations. The strong positive correlation between employee behaviour and perceived fairness in results underscores the need for organisations to prioritise fairness in their operations. When workers believe their employer treats them fairly, they are more inclined to engage positively, which eventually leads to better performance. Therefore, to maximise worker happiness and effectiveness, Kishapu District Council officials must actively develop and maintain policies that enhance distributive justice.

Second, the data indicate that procedural justice has a substantial impact on worker performance across a range of organisational contexts. Fairness in decision-making procedures promotes employee motivation and satisfaction.



Businesses that place a high priority on open and equitable processes stand to gain from improved performance and stronger social exchange ties. However, perceptions of procedural justice and their subsequent impact on performance are significantly influenced by the cultural environment. In general, increasing procedural justice in public organisations—especially in areas like Tanzania's Kishapu District Council—is essential for boosting worker productivity and creating a favourable workplace environment.

Finally, the results highlight the critical role that interactional fairness plays in enhancing employee performance. An organisation that prioritises fair and respectful treatment of its employees, it advances a constructive work environment characterised by higher motivation, loyalty, and performance. To maximise individual potential and achieve organisational success, organisations like the Kishapu District Council must establish a workplace culture that prioritises respect, decency, and open communication. Furthermore, investing in interactional justice can create a positive feedback loop in which workers feel valued and involved, thereby enhancing performance.

5.2 Recommendations

The results demonstrate the significance of distributive justice in enhancing worker performance in public institutions. Employees are more likely to act positively at work and perform better overall if they believe the results are fair. It seems plausible that organisations ought to prioritise fairness in their operations. To improve employee satisfaction and productivity, Kishapu District Council leaders should develop policies that promote distributive justice.

Additionally, the data demonstrate that employee performance across various organisations is significantly influenced by procedural justice. Employee satisfaction and motivation are higher when choices are made consistently. Organisations with transparent, open practices frequently attain stronger employee relationships and improved performance. However, people's perceptions of procedural fairness and its consequences can be influenced by societal factors. Enhancing procedural law within public organisations is crucial to improving employee performance and fostering a positive work environment, particularly in Tanzania's Kishapu District Council.

The results also demonstrate the importance of interactional justice in enhancing worker performance. Businesses that treat their workers equally and with respect foster a positive workplace culture where employees feel inspired, devoted, and capable of more. Establishing an environment of respect, decency, and open communication helps individuals realise their potential and promotes organisational success for organisations such as the Kishapu District Council. Emphasizing interactional justice also makes workers feel valued and involved, boosting output.

Declaration of Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have influenced the work reported in this paper.

Funding Declaration

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, A. R., & Jameel, A. S. (2021). Effect of organisational justice dimensions on performance of academic staff in developing countries. *Annals of the Romanian Society for Cell Biology*, 25(3), 259–270.
- Ahmad, R., Nawaz, M. R., Ishaq, M. I., Khan, M. M., & Ashraf, H. A. (2023). Social exchange theory: Systematic review and future directions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1015921.
- Alkhadher, O. H., Gadelrab, H. F., Abbas, Z. M., Ghanim, D. A., & Aldousari, S. S. (2026). Organisational justice in the Arab world: A comparative meta-analytical review of constructs and related outcomes. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 10693971251383653.
- Aryono, M. D. (2024). The influence of fairness in distribution, procedural and interactional justice on employee performance in a contractor company. *Management Research Studies Journal*, 5(2), 72–86. <https://doi.org/10.56174/mrsj.v5i2.780>
- Chen, H., & Jin, Y.-H. (2014). The effects of organisational justice on organisational citizenship behaviour in the Chinese context: The mediating effects of social exchange relationship. *Public Personnel Management*, 43(3), 301–313. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026014533897>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications. https://www.ucg.ac.me/skladiste/blog_609332/objava_105202/fajlovi/Creswell.pdf
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16, 297–334. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555>



- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31, 874–900. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602>
- David, F. (2022). The effect of motivation on employee performance: A case study of Rukwa Regional Commissioner's Office (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Open University of Tanzania. <https://repository.out.ac.tz/3698/>
- Dominic, B. S., & Rutenge, M. M. (2024). Exploring employees' perception of the effectiveness of public employees' performance management information system: A case of the Judiciary of Tanzania. *African Journal of Empirical Research*, 5(4), 1188–1196. <https://ajernet.net/ojs/index.php/ajernet/article/view/646>
- Dunan, H., & Felia, N. (2025). The effect of quality of work life and organisational justice on employee performance at PT Bank Central Asia Tbk KCP Teluk Betung. *International Journal of Education, Social Studies, and Management (IJESSM)*, 5(1), 45–56.
- Edema, B. S. (2025). Organisational justice and employee performance in the public sector in Uganda: A correlational study. *IRJEMS International Research Journal of Economics and Management Studies*, 4(7), 154–168. <https://irjems.org/Volume-4-Issue-7/IRJEMS-V4I7P119.pdf>
- Ekingen, E. (2023). The effect of organisational justice on job performance and the mediating role of job satisfaction: A study on nurses. *Hospital Topics*, 101(2), 103–112. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00185868.2021.1969874>
- Faeq, D. K., & Ismael, Z. N. (2022). Analysing the relationships between organisational justice and job performance. *International Journal of Engineering, Business and Management*, 6(5), 14–25. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijebm.6.5.3>
- Ferrón, V. V., Senise, B. M. E., & Llamas, S. R. (2024). The reciprocity of perceived organisational support and employee engagement in SMEs during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Small Business International Review*, 8(1), 611. <https://doi.org/10.26784/sbir.v8i1.611>
- Fiaz, M., Rasool, W., Ikram, A., & Rehman, N. (2021). Organisational justice and employees' performance: A study of an emerging economy. *Human Systems Management*, 40(3), 395–406. <https://doi.org/10.3233/HSM-190728>
- Gomes, F. S. J., & Marques, M. G. T. (2025). The influence of organisational justice on work engagement, organisational commitment, and job satisfaction: A comprehensive study. *Journal of General Management*, 50(2), 138–149. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03063070221140726>
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Prentice Hall. <https://www.drnishikantjha.com/papersCollection/Multivariate%20Data%20Analysis.pdf>
- Haris, A., Budiyo, B., & Suhermin, S. (2023). The effect of distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice on engagement and village apparatus performance in Indonesia. *International Journal of Business and Management Review*, 11(10), 17–37. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/375591158>
- Hermanto, Y. B., & Srimulyani, V. A. (2022). The effects of organisational justice on employee performance using dimension of organisational citizenship behaviour as mediation. *Sustainability*, 14(20), Article 13322. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142013322>
- John, M. C. (2024). Organisational justice and employee citizenship behaviour in the civil service in Kenya (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). JKUAT-COHRED. <http://ir.jkuat.ac.ke/handle/123456789/6267?show=full>
- Kettl, D. F. (2000). *The global public management revolution: A report on the transformation of governance*. Bloomsbury Publishing PLC.
- Kieserling, A. (2018). Blau (1964): Exchange and power in social life. In *Schlüsselwerke der Netzwerkforschung* (pp. 51–54). Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden.
- Kweyamba, M. P., Gratton, J. M., & Elisei, E. R. (2025). Effectiveness of disciplinary procedures and fairness in the administration of justice within Tanzania's public service. *Revue Algérienne d'Économie et Gestion*, 19(1), 156–176.
- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 140, 1–55. https://legacy.voteview.com/pdf/Likert_1932.pdf
- Magige, T. (2023). Assessment of the factors affecting training programs on employees' performance in an organisation (Doctoral dissertation, Institute of Accountancy Arusha).
- Msirikale, J. I. (2021). The effect of motivation on employee performance in Tanzania Police Force: The case of Criminal Investigation Department in Dar es Salaam (Doctoral dissertation, The Open University of Tanzania). <https://repository.out.ac.tz/3220/>
- Mwita, K. M., & Andrea, P. T. (2019). Assessment of employee performance management in Tanzania public health facilities. *Journal of Management Research and Analysis*, 6(4), 169–173. <https://doi.org/10.18231/j.jmra.2019.035>
- Ndossy, J. N. (2025). The role of organisational justice and job satisfaction in Tanzanian local government authorities: A case of Mwanga District Council. *Science Mundi*, 5(1), 83–91. <https://doi.org/10.51867/scimundi.5.1.8>



- Ngeleshi, J., & Dominic, T. (2020). Organisational justice and job satisfaction among different employee groups: The mediating role of trust. *Business Management Review*, 23(2), Article 5. <https://doi.org/10.56279/bmrj.v23i2.5>
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government*. Addison-Wesley. <https://rudycr.com/ab/Reinventing.Government.pdf>
- Pahlevi, H. N., & Elmi, F. (2022). Organisational commitment as intervening variables on the effect of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice on job satisfaction (Case study: Sales & Distribution Division of Food FMCG Company in Indonesia). *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 7(10), 2128. <https://www.ijisrt.com>
- Phiri, K., Hampompwe, C., Mutono-Mwanza, B. G., & Mwanze, A. (2024). An investigation into the effect of organisational justice on employees' job satisfaction among government health workers in Kalomo District. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*, 5(2), 109–118. <https://doi.org/10.54660/IJMRGE.2024.5.2.109-118>
- Purnama, Y. H., Tjahjono, H. K., Assery, S., & Dzakiyullah, N. R. (2020). The relationship of organisational justice on job satisfaction and job performance in a banking company. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 9(3), 4012–4015.
- Redy, M. (2023). Implementation of social exchange theory in the urgency of compensation and job satisfaction in improving employee performance. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 10(1), 641–650. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v10i1.4969>
- Rogers, D., & Kuloba, C. (2022). Effect of organisational justice on employee performance in public health facilities in Turbo Sub-County, Kenya. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 24(1), 4–11. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142013322>
- Sarfraz, M., Hussain, Z., Syed, N., Rehman, F., Rollah Bin Abdul Wahab, S., & Salihuddin, M. (2021). Work environment and training transfer intentions: Does organisational justice moderate their relationship? *SAGE Open*, 11(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211046941>
- The International Labour Organisation (ILO). (2022). *ILO programme implementation 2020–21*. International Labour Organisation.
- The United Republic of Tanzania (URT). (2002). *The Public Service Act, No 8 of 2002*. Government Printer.
- The United Republic of Tanzania (URT). (2004). *Employment and Labour Relations Act, No. 6 of 2004*. Government Printer.
- The United Republic of Tanzania (URT). (2009). *Public Service Standing Order*. Ministry of Public Service Management.
- Urbanska, K., McKeown, S., & Taylor, L. K. (2019). From injustice to action: The role of empathy and perceived fairness to address inequality via victim compensation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 82, 129–140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2019.01.010>
- Yahaya, G., Innocent, I. O., & Tomi, S. H. (2020). Effect of self-efficacy and distributive justice on employees' performance in federal capital territory area councils, Abuja. *International Journal of Small and Medium Enterprises*, 3(1), 34–42. <https://doi.org/10.46281/ijsmes.v3i1.544>
- Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). Harper and Row.
- Zeb, A., Ur Rehman, F., Arsalan, Y., & Usman Khan, M. (2021). Does organisational justice enhance job performance through high-performance human resource practices? *WPOM-Working Papers on Operations Management*, 12(2), 16–40. <https://doi.org/10.4995/wpom.15497>