

Research Article

GOOD GOVERNANCE, AND BUSINESS RESILIENCY IN GANASSI: BASIS FOR INTERVENTION PROGRAM

* Soraimah A. Marohombsar, MBA and Dr. Korsiney N. Cabasis

St. Michaels College, Quezon Avenue, Iligan City, Philippines.

Received 13th February 2024; Accepted 14th March 2024; Published online 25th April 2024

ABSTRACT

In the Philippines it is crucial to find leaders who can promote governance. Local Government Units (LGUs) play a role, in delivering services to citizens for the well-being of society. This study, carried out during the year 2021-2022 looks at how municipal governance connects with business resilience in Ganassi, Lanao del Sur. Based on the United Nations eight pillars of Good Governance the research examines how governance practices impact business resilience. By using systems thinking and crisis management theories it delves into how governance affects resilience during crises such as pandemics and natural disasters. Through surveys and statistical analysis the study reveals relationships between aspects of governance and factors influencing business resilience. The results indicate that while some governance elements are linked positively to resilience others do not show connections. Notably institutional control and external support have limited influence on business resilience. These findings highlight the importance of tailored strategies to strengthen governance mechanisms and enhance business resilience in Ganassi. This research contributes to improving governance practices guiding policy actions and enriching conversations, about governance and business resilience.

Keywords: Governance, Business Resilience, Local Government Units.

INTRODUCTION

Philippine residents today face a challenge: identifying leaders who will accept ownership and responsibility for fostering good leadership among the country's future generations. While all people are qualified to hold office in a democracy, few, on the other hand, are equipped to fulfill a bureau's obligations in an efficient and effective manner.

Local government units (LGUs) are mandated by the Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG) to provide political, social, and economic goods and services to their citizens as primary bearers of the responsibility for the citizen in the Philippines. LGUs are expected to take the necessary steps in mitigating poverty and to ensure effective service delivery while maintaining good and a positive state-society relations. They are often the first line of connection to the communities they serve.

After serving as an elected representative in local government for many years, the researcher is passionate about contributing to the improvement of government practices. It is the researcher's desire to help design and promote better governance so that community people may assume leadership positions. Consequently, the main purpose of this study is to evaluate and gauge the importance of the municipal government's good governance on the business resilience of the municipality's enterprises. Does the framework for good governance highlight the government's duty to how businesses should manage risk and how it should serve as a critical instrument for assuring stakeholders' value?

This study will be conducted during the academic year 2021-2022.

*Corresponding Author: Soraimah A. Marohombsar, MBA, St. Michaels College, Quezon Avenue, Iligan City, Philippines

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research employed a design. By utilizing this combined method the study benefitted from establishing connections, between variables and assessing how independent variables impact ones. A survey questionnaire was utilized as the primary method for gathering information and data for this study. It is easier to conduct and gather information from a large number of participants.

In this study, descriptive statistics was used to describe the demographic attributes of the respondents. Mean was also used to determine the level of good governance of Ganassi and the level of LGU of Ganassi implementation immediate delivery of services during pandemic. In addition, Mean was used to gauge the Business Resiliency of the business sector in Ganassi.

DISCUSSION

Summary table of Respondents' Good Governance in Ganassi

Subscale	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Qualitative Interpretation
Participation	4.25	4.88	4.56	.109	Excellent
Rule of Law	4.14	4.86	4.57	.167	Excellent
Transparency	4.17	5.00	4.59	.169	Excellent
Responsiveness	4.17	4.83	4.59	.151	Excellent
Consenses Oriented	4.20	5.00	4.56	.175	Excellent
Equity Inclusiveness	4.13	4.88	4.60	.125	Excellent
Effectiveness	3.75	5.00	4.58	.252	Excellent
Efficiency					
Accountability	4.00	5.00	4.55	.295	Excellent
Good Governance (Total)	4.42	4.76	4.58	.064	Excellent

In times of catastrophe such as the recent COVID-19 pandemic and the economic and social repercussions, public control matters in the system on how the official manage the country. Governance measures have played a critical role in places' immediate actions, and the will endure to be crucial both to the recovery and to building a "new normal" once the crisis has conceded. The world crisis caused by Covid-19 has reformed the way of life of people around the world, it also affects all areas of society directly or indirectly, which is fronting a global crisis with different national responses instigated by governments. Numerous months into the pandemic, the first after-effects of Covid are start to be sensed by citizens, who are questioning the management carried out so far.

Good governance is that commonly referred to in industry circles as corporate governance. Good governance places a lot of importance on transparency, accountability. It centers on efficiency, productivity and profit intensification. When all structures are brought together under a single instrument that promotes peace, security, and stability, the result is socio-political and economic prosperity. This is what good governance is all about. In development literature, the term "Good Governance" is becoming more prevalent. Governance has been around for a long time and isn't a new concept. It's been around since the dawn of time. The term "governance" refers to both the decision-making process and the implementation of those decisions. This approach instead looks at how decisions are made and implemented, along with the structures that are put in place to implement those decisions. The act of ruling or governing is what is meant by the term "government." In the hands of men who are fallible, definite, and concrete, it is the idea of state. Government is a group of people who work together to accomplish a common goal.

The government acts as a representative of the state. According to the constitution, these people hold positions of authority, prestige, privilege, and trust in exchange for compensation in the form of salaries and other forms of monetary reward. Because of their reluctance to be held accountable, the governing elite in Africa have a double-barreled definition of good governance. Despite this, conflict prevention mechanisms rely on it. Proactive conflict resolution is one of the hallmarks of good governance. In fact, it is defined as the positive and progressive management of government affairs in a way that benefits all and aims to deliver public goods in the greatest interest of the majority of the population. There are a number of indicators that can be used to characterize this concept, such as maintaining law and order, accountability, democratization, openness, rule of law, responsiveness of government, a free press and a free and virile civil society, a credible opposition, competition for power, and respect for minority rights (Best, 2016).

Good governance is defined by the following characteristics: Good governance necessitates the involvement of both men and women. It is possible to participate either directly or indirectly, either through a representative or through advocacy. In making decisions, representative democracies may or may not consider the needs of those who are most marginalized. To be able to participate, the general public must be well-informed and well-coordinated. This is where civil society organizations and the freedom of association come into play. Good governance necessitates a high level of accountability. For both government and non-governmental organizations, as well as the private sector. They need to answer to their constituents and the general public. The decisions and actions of the government will have an effect on a certain group of people. Transparency and the rule of law must accompany accountability. Rule of law: This refers to a legal system in which the rules are applied consistently and equitably to all. Human rights and the rights of minorities must be protected. As long as the judiciary and police force remain impartial and uncorrupted, this will work. Good

governance requires institutions and processes to be responsive to the needs of all stakeholders and to act quickly when a crisis arises so that it can be averted. It requires the government to respond quickly in the event of an emergency or crisis. This requires that all groups in society be given the opportunity to improve and maintain their well-being, regardless of their socioeconomic status. It means welcoming everyone and treating everyone the same.

Everyone should be able to take advantage of the advantages that come with having a government. Making decisions and enforcing them in accordance with the law is what we mean by "transparency." It facilitates the flow of information. People who are going to be affected by the policy should have access to the information they need in an easily understandable format. With limited resources, institutions and organizations must produce results that meet the needs of today's society in order to be effective and efficient. The idea encompasses conservation of natural resources as well as responsible resource use.

Summary Table of Respondents' Business Resiliency

Subscale	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Qualitative Interpretation
Institutional Control	4.11	5.00	4.60	.190	Excellent
Planning for Preparedness	3.67	5.00	4.66	.391	Excellent
Philosophy and Integrity	4.20	5.00	4.61	.181	Excellent
External Support and Linkages	4.00	5.00	4.55	.336	Excellent
Communication and Media	4.25	5.00	4.64	.229	Excellent
Business Resiliency (Total)	4.31	4.80	4.61	.113	Excellent

The globe is becoming more technologically advanced and interdependent, risks are being shared across local, regional, and national borders, and we are more culturally diverse than ever before. As a result, communities are increasingly facing catastrophes and crises that threaten their social and economic stability.

Somers (2019) describes resilience as a reaction to an event and argues that resilience is demonstrated after an event or crisis has occurred. As a result, he concentrated on quantifying latent resilience, also known as resilience potential, to assess resilience during business as usual. However, this overlooks the positive role that resilience can play in assisting companies to avert catastrophes. This could involve the monitoring and detection of early warning signs that assist organizations in avoiding or preventing a crisis or decline.

Weick and Sutcliffe (2011) discussed high reliability as a key characteristic of resilience and present a series of nine audits to measure resilience. Each resilience audit consists of questions based on high reliability and organizational theory. Likewise, Smith et al. (2005) advocated the use of Weick and Sutcliffe's resilience audits to organizational managers to create mindfulness and to diagnose areas that need specific attention. However, the audits have yet to be fully quantitatively tested. Lastly, Fiksel (2003) discussed the resilience approach and note that resilient organizations recognize that it is impossible to prevent all crises and disasters all of the time. Instead, they monitor their organization as a system with inputs and outputs, the characteristics of which can provide information about the health of the system. Attributes of Business Resilience There is a growing body of literature that reports on many components of disaster preparedness, risk reduction, and recovery frameworks, both in terms of the community and the enterprises within it. Disasters are an important factor for enterprises, and as a macro-environmental force,

the frameworks should be realistic in terms of components. They must also describe the context of the business under study. In this study, post-disaster recovery of enterprises in Davao City was searched for relevant literature to support the framework developed, which will be provided in the paper's subsequent analysis. Institutional control, planning and preparedness, philosophy and integrity, external assistance and links, and communication and media are some examples.

Is there significant relationship between good governance and Business Resiliency?

Variables		Spearman Rho Correlation	p-value
Institutional Control	Participation,	-.031	.771
	Rule of Law,	.133	.307
	Transparency,	.112	.392
	Responsiveness,	-.150	.250
	Consensus Oriented,	.176	.174
	Equity and Inclusiveness,	-.060	.646
	Effectiveness and Efficiency	-.011	.932
	Accountability	.220	.088
Planning and Preparedness	Participation,	-.033	.802
	Rule of Law,	.371	.003**
	Transparency,	-.140	.282
	Responsiveness,	.066	.614
	Consensus Oriented,	-.146	.261
	Equity and Inclusiveness,	-.017	.897
	Effectiveness and Efficiency	-.071	.586
	Accountability	.242	.060
Philosophy and Integrity	Participation,	.220	.089
	Rule of Law,	.071	.588
	Transparency,	-.066	.612
	Responsiveness,	.121	.353
	Consensus Oriented,	-.115	.377
	Equity and Inclusiveness,	.052	.689
	Effectiveness and Efficiency	-.093	.475
	Accountability	.217	.094
External Support and Linkages	Participation,	.143	.273
	Rule of Law,	-.171	.187
	Transparency,	.049	.706
	Responsiveness,	.040	.758
	Consensus Oriented,	.068	.601
	Equity and Inclusiveness,	-.070	.591
	Effectiveness and Efficiency	-.031	.811
	Accountability	-.227	.078

Further, there exit a negative correlation between the aspect of Philosophy and Integrity as a factor of good governance and Participation with a p-value of .089, Rule of Law with a p-value of .588, Transparency with a p-value of .612, Responsiveness with a p-value of .353, Consensus Oriented with a p-value of .377, Equity and Inclusiveness with a p-value of .689, Effectiveness and Efficiency with a p-value of .475, and Accountability with a p-value of .094. Thus, the aspect of Philosophy and Integrity as a factor of good governance is not associated with the resilience of a business's performance operations. Changes in any of these factors have no effect on the other factors. This is due to the fact that good governance is attributed to public officials and employees, who have the responsibility of safeguarding not only their own integrity but also

the integrity of the government in general. They owe it to the Filipino people as a whole to act with honesty and fairness. Because of their high moral standards, they cannot be bribed, bought, influenced, coerced, or otherwise coerced into doing something that is against their beliefs. In contrast to government officials, the business world is independent and has no ties to those who run the country.

There exist negative relationship between External Support and Linkages as a factor of good governance and Participation with a p-value of .273, Rule of Law with a p-value of .187, Transparency with a p-value of .706, Responsiveness with a p-value of .758, Consensus Oriented with a p-value of .601, Equity and Inclusiveness with a p-value of .591, Effectiveness and Efficiency with a p-value of .811, and Accountability with a p-value of .078. When it comes to good governance and business resilience, external support and links are not linked. As a result, the policies that govern these functions are decided by the Governments. Good governance is needed to ensure that the policies are implemented effectively and consistently. It is in the business sector's best interests to implement the policies necessary to fulfill their role as a development partner. Although, the business sector project investment's success depends on the effectiveness of its institutional framework and its ability to carry out its stated goals yet they are independent in running their affairs.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, it can be assumed that the level of good governance in Ganassi is excellent, with outstanding performance in the areas of participation, rule of law, transparency, responsiveness, consensual orientation, effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability. The respondents were considered to have excellent performance in the areas of institutional control, planning for preparedness, philosophy and integrity, external support and linkages, communication and media, as well as other areas related to business resilience. When it comes to institutional control and participation, planning and preparedness, philosophy and integrity, external support and linkages, as well as communication and media participation, there is a negative relationship between good governance and business resilience. The null hypothesis is accepted.

REFERENCES

Abdelhadi, M. (2016). Governance: a true path for the relationship of the state and local communities after revolutions. The Arab Democratic Center. Retrieved from: <http://democraticac.de/?p=26699>

Adler, P. S., & Borys, B. (1996). Two types of bureaucracy: Enabling and coercive. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 61-89.

Afalo, W. & Sharafi, A. (2013). The role of governance in improving the Algerian Local Administration. Master Thesis. Algeria: Guelma University

Ahmed, M. & Hassan, A. (2012). Readiness of local administrations to adopt e-governance: a case study in the office of the province of Ninwah. *Journal of Administration and Economics*, 93(1), 281-298.

Alonso, P., & Lewis, G. B. (2001). Public service motivation and job performance evidence from the federal sector. *American Review of Public Administration*, 31, 363-380.

Berman, E. M., Bowman, J., West, J., & Van Wart, M. R. (2006). *Human resource management in public service: Paradoxes, problems and processes* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Boswell, W. R., & Boudreau, J. W. (2000). Employee satisfaction with performance appraisals and appraisers: The role of perceived appraisal use. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 11, 283-299.

- Boswell, W. R., & Boudreau, J. W. (2002). Separating the developmental and evaluative performance appraisal uses. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 16, 391-412.
- Bright, L. (2005). Public employees with high levels of public service motivation who are they, where are they, and what do they want? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 25, 138-154.
- Cardy, R. L., & Dobbins, G. H. (1994). *Performance appraisal: Alternative perspectives*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing.
- Carroll, S. J., & Schneier, C. E. (1982). *Performance appraisal and review systems: The identification, measurement, and development of performance in organizations*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- Carson, K. P., Cardy, R. I., & Dobbins, G. H. (1991). Performance appraisal as effective management or deadly management disease: Two initial empirical investigations. *Group and Organization Studies*, 16, 143-159.
- Cawley, B. D., Keeping, L. M., & Levy, P. E. (1998). Participation in the performance appraisal process and employee reactions: A meta-analytic review of field investigations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 615-633.
- Cho, Y. J., & Lee, J. W. (2011). Performance management and trust in supervisors. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 32, 236-259.
- Census of Population (2020). "BARMM". Total Population by Province, City, Municipality and Barangay. PSA. Retrieved 8 July 2021.
- Cooke, R. A., & Szumal, J. A. (2019). Measuring normative beliefs and shared behavioral expectations in organizations: The reliability and validity of the organizational culture inventory. *Psychological Reports*, 72, 1299-1330.
- Crampton, S. M., & Wagner, J. A. (1994). Percept-percept inflation in micro organizational research: An investigation of prevalence and effect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 67-76.
- Culbert, S. A., & McDonough, J. J. (1986). The politics of trust and organization empowerment. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 10, 171-188.
- Daley, D. M. (1992). *Performance appraisal in the public sector: Techniques and applications*. Westport, CT: Quorum.
- Daur, J. & Abed, M. (2013). The extent of adherence of banks operating in Palestine to the requirements of advanced corporate governance: a field study. *Journal of Al-Azhar University, Humanities*, 15(1). Retrieved from: <http://www.alazhar.edu.ps/journal123/detailsr.asp?seqq1=2451>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York, NY: Plenum.
- deLancerJulnes, P. (2001). Does participation increase perceptions of usefulness? An evaluation of a participatory approach to the development of performance measures. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 24, 403-418.
- Deming, W. E. (1986). *Out of the crisis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Center for Advanced Engineering Study.
- Dickinson, T. L. (2019). Attitudes about performance appraisal. In *Personnel selection and assessment: Individual and organizational perspectives* (pp. 141-161), Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 618-634.
- Dierendonck, D., & Dijkstra, M. (2012). The role of the follower in the relationship between empowering leadership and empowerment: A longitudinal investigation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(S1), E1-E20.
- Divya, T. (2021). *Resilience theory (a complete guide)*
- Dorfman, P. W., Stephan, W. G., & Loveland, J. (1986). Performance appraisal behaviors: Supervisor perceptions and subordinate reactions. *Personnel Psychology*, 39, 579-597.
- Durant, R. F., Kramer, R., Perry, J. L., Mesch, D., & Paarlberg, L. (2006). Motivating employees in a new governance era: The performance paradigm revisited. *Public Administration Review*, 66, 505-514.
- Eid, G. (2015). *Fundamentals of good administration /governance*. Retrieved from: <http://economy2day.com,7-2-2016> (Arabic version).
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 51-59.
- Elicker, J. D., Levy, P. E., & Hall, R. J. (2006). The role of leader-member exchange in the performance appraisal process. *Journal of Management*, 32, 531-551.
- Erdogan, B. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of justice perceptions in performance appraisals. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 555-578.
- Fernandez, S., & Moldogaziev, T. (2013). Using employee empowerment to encourage innovative behavior in the public sector. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 23, 155-187.
- Fields, D. L. (2002). *Taking the measure of work: A guide to validated scales for organizational research and diagnosis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fletcher, C. (2001). Performance appraisal and management: The developing research agenda. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74(4), 473-487.
- Folger, R. (1987). Distributive and procedural justice in the workplace. *Social Justice Research*, 1, 143-159.
- Folger, R., Konovsky, M. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1992). A due process metaphor for performance appraisal. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 14, 129.
- Friedrich, R. J. (1982). In defense of multiplicative terms in multiple regression equations. *American Journal of Political Science*, 26, 797-833.
- Gabris, G. T., & Ihrke, D. M. (2000). Improving employee acceptance toward performance appraisal and merit pay systems: The role of leadership credibility. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 20, 41-53.
- Gaertner, K. N., & Gaertner, G. H. (1985). Performance-contingent pay for federal managers. *Administration & Society*, 17, 7-20.
- Ghadban, H. (2012). *The role of corporate governance in the revitalization of the financial markets in developing countries*. Algeria: University of Mohammed Khider, Biskra (Arabic version).
- Giles, W. F., & Mossholder, K. W. (1990). Employee reactions to contextual and session components of performance appraisal. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 371-377.
- Good Governance Learning Network's (GGLN), (2012). *AN INTRODUCTORY GUIDE TO CONDUCTING GOOD GOVERNANCE SURVEYS*
- Gomez, C., & Rosen, B. (2001). The leader-member exchange as a link between managerial trust and employee empowerment. *Group Organization Management*, 26, 53-69.
- Goniewicz K, Khorram-Manesh A, Hertelendy AJ, Goniewicz M, Naylor K, Burkle FM. (2020). Current response and management decisions of the European Union to the COVID-19 outbreak: a review. *Sustainability*. 2020;12(9):3838. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12093838>.
- Greenberg, J. (1986a). Determinants of perceived fairness in performance evaluation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 340-342.

- Greenberg, J. (1986b). The distributive justice of organizational performance evaluations. In H.W. Bierhoff, R.L. Cohen, & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Justice in social relations* (pp.337-352). New York: Plenum Press .
- Habbush, M. (2019). The commitment of the Palestinian public shareholding companies the rules of corporate governance-analytical study of the views of the internal auditors, external auditors and directors of public companies, unpublished Master Thesis, School of Graduate Studies, Faculty of Commerce, the Islamic University, Gaza.
- Hedge, J. W., & Borman, W. C. (1995). Changing conceptions and practices in performance appraisal. In A. Howard (Ed.), *The changing nature of work* (pp. 451-481). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hedge, J. W., & Teachout, M. S. (2000). Exploring the concept of acceptability as a criterion for evaluating performance. *Group & Organization Management*, 25, 22-44.
- Iverson, R. D. (1996). Employee acceptance of organizational change: The role of organizational commitment. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 7, 122-149.
- Isabel, M., Luis, R. & José, V.)2013(. *Evolutions in E-governance: evidence from Spanish Local Governments*, Wiley Online Library, 23(5). Retrieved from: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/eet.1622/abstract>
- Jaccard, J., Wan, C. K., & Turrissi, R. (1990). The detection and interpretation of interaction ef-fects between continuous variables in multiple regression. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 25, 467-478.
- Keeping, L. M., & Levy, P. E. (2000). Performance appraisal reactions: Measurement, modeling, and method bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 708-723.
- Kellough, J. E., & Lu, H. (2019). The paradox of merit pay in the public sector persistence of a problematic procedure. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 13, 45-64.
- Kellough, J. E., & Nigro, L. G. (2002). Pay for performance in Georgia state government employee perspectives on Georgia gain after 5 years. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 22, 146-166.
- Kikoski, J. F. (1998). Effective communication in the performance appraisal interview: Faceto-face communication for public managers in the culturally diverse workplace. *Public Personnel Management*, 28, 301-323.
- Kim, S. E., & Rubianty, D. (2011). Perceived fairness of performance appraisals in the federal government does it matter? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 31, 329-348.
- Korsgaard, M. A., & Roberson, L. (1995). Procedural justice in performance evaluation: The role of instrumental and non-instrumental voice in performance appraisal discussions. *Journal of Management*, 21, 657-669.
- Kunreuther, R. (2019, October 7). Federal employee performance appraisal: The good, bad and ugly. FedSmith. com. Retrieved from <http://www.fedsmith.com/2019/10/07/federalempl-yee-performance-appraisal-good-bad/>
- Kin and Holzer (2015) *Public Employees and Performance Appraisal: A Study of Antecedents to Employees' Perception of the Process*.
- Landy, F. J., & Farr, J. L. (1980). Performance rating. *Psychological Bulletin*, 87, 72-102.
- Lawler, E. E. (1967). The multitrait-multirater approach to measuring managerial job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 51, 369-381.
- Lee, K. (2002). Linking corporate governance to firm behavior and performance: the case of Korean chaebols viewed as a leveraged CMS firm. *Managerial Finance*, 28(10), 19–32.
- Levy, P. E., & Williams, J. R. (2004). The social context of performance appraisal: A review and framework for the future. *Journal of Management*, 30, 881-905.
- Liden, R. C., & Graen, G. (1980). Generalizability of the vertical dyad linkage model of leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 23, 451-465.
- Lind, E. A., Kanfer, R., & Earley, P. C. (1990). Voice, control, and procedural justice: Instrumental and noninstrumental concerns in fairness judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 952-959.
- Locke, J., Hume, D. & Rousseau, J. (2011). *The social contract*. Ahmed Trans. Cairo: The General Authority for Cultural Palaces, original work published in 1762 (Arabic version).
- Lovrich, N. P., Jr. (1987). Merit pay and motivation in the public workforce: Beyond technical concerns to more basic considerations. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 7(2), 54-71.
- Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. (1999). The effect of the performance appraisal system on trust for management: A field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 123-136.
- Meyer, H. H., Kay, E., & French, J. R. P. (1965). Split roles in performance appraisal. *Harvard Business Review*, 43, 123-129.
- Mofijur M, Fattah IR, Alam MA, Islam AS, Ong HC, Rahman SA, et al. (2020). Impact of COVID-19 on the social, economic, environmental and energy domains: lessons learnt from a global pandemic. *Sustain Product Consum*. 2020;26: 343–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2020.10.016>.
- Moussavi, F., & Ashbaugh, D. L. (1995). Perceptual effects of participative, goal-oriented performance appraisal: A field study in public agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Re-search and Theory*, 5, 331-343.
- Moynihan, D. P. (2019). Learning under uncertainty: Networks in crisis management. *Public Administration Review*, 68, 350-365.
- Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. N. (1991). *Performance appraisal: An organizational perspective*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. N. (1995). *Understanding performance appraisal: Social, organizational, and goal-based perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nafe, R. & Saeid, A. (2016). Assessing financial performance of the departments of the municipalities of Babylon and Karbala: a comparative applied study. *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences*, 22(89), 22-52 (Arabic version).
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (2019). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 527-556.
- Nigro, L. G. (1981). Attitudes of federal employees toward performance appraisal and merit pay: Implications for CSRA implementation. *Public Administration Review*, 41, 84-86.
- Othman, A. & Matarneh, A. (2016). Corporate governance and its affection on organizational performance in the Jordanian industrial companies. *Al Kut Journal for Economic and Administrative Sciences*, 21(1), 315-331.
- Park, S. M. (2012). Toward the trusted public organization: Untangling the leadership, motiva-tion, and trust relationship in U.S. Federal Agencies. *American Review of Public Administra-tion*, 42, 562-590.
- Park, S. M., & Rainey, H. G. (2019). Leadership and public service motivation in U.S. Federal Agencies. *International Public Management Journal*, 11, 109-142.
- Pearce, J. L., & Perry, J. L. (1983). Federal merit pay: A longitudinal analysis. *Public Administration Review*, 43, 315-325. Perry, J. L., Petrakis, B. A., & Miller, T. K. (1989). Federal merit pay, round II: An analysis of the performance management and recognition system. *Public Administration Review*, 49, 29-37.

- Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review*, 50, 367-373.
- Petter, J., Byrnes, P., Choi, D. L., Fegan, F., & Miller, R. (2002). Dimensions and patterns in employee empowerment: Assessing what matters to street-level bureaucrats. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 12, 377-400.
- Potter, P. W. (2006). Procedural justice and voice effects. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 10(1), 33-62.
- Rainey, H. G. (2003). *Understanding and managing public organizations* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Reinke, S. J. (2003). Does the form really matter? Leadership, trust, and acceptance of the performance appraisal process. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 23, 23-37.
- Roberson, Q. M., & Stewart, M. M. (2006). Understanding the motivational effects of procedural and informational justice in feedback processes. *British Journal of Psychology*, 97, 281-298.
- Rizq, A. (2019). Good governance: an option for administrative and financial reform. Cairo: The Second Arab Forum. Cairo. Retrieved from: <http://www.aradoportal.org.eg>.
- Roberts, G. E. (1994). Maximizing performance appraisal system acceptance: Perspectives from municipal government personnel administrators. *Public Personnel Management*, 23, 525-549.
- Roberts, G. E. (1998). Perspectives on enduring and emerging issues in performance appraisal. *Public Personnel Management*, 27, 301-320.
- Roberts, G. E. (2003). Employee performance appraisal system participation: A technique that works. *Public Personnel Management*, 32, 89-98.
- Roberts, G. E., & Pavlak, T. (1996). Municipal government personnel professionals and performance appraisal: Is there consensus on the characteristics of an effective appraisal system? *Public Personnel Management*, 25, 379-408.
- Rubin, E. V. (2019). The role of procedural justice in public personnel management: Empirical results from the Department of Defense. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19, 125-143.
- Rubin, E. V. (2011, June). Appraising performance appraisal systems in the federal government: A literature review, preliminary findings, and prospects for future research. Paper presented at the Public Management Research Conference, Syracuse, NY.
- Rubin, E. V., & Kellough, J. E. (2012). Does civil service reform affect behavior? Linking alternative personnel systems, perceptions of procedural justice, and complaints. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22, 121-141.
- Ryan, R. M., Mims, V., & Koestner, R. (1983). Relation of reward contingency and interpersonal context to intrinsic motivation: A review and test using cognitive evaluation theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 736-750.
- Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: The differential effects of perceived organizational support and leader member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 219-227.
- Shehu, M. Dollani, P. Gjuta, D. (2013). Citizen Participation and Local Good Governance ; Case Study - Kukes Region . *Albanian Journal of Agricultural Sciences* . Vol. 12 Issue 4, p675-684. 10p.
- Shah, A. (2014). Responsibility with accountability: a FAIR governance framework. *Journal of Economics and Business*, 32(2), 343-377.
- Shibley, M. & Manhal, M. (2012). The effect of the principles of good governance in developing a transparent system for senior management: a field study in the General Company for Ports of Iraq. *Journal of Economic Sciences*, 8(29), 113-139 (Arabic version).
- Standard and Poor's Governance Services (2002). *Standard and Poor's Corporate Governanc*, the McGraw-Hill Companies Inc. 55 Water Street, New York, NY 10041 U.S.A. Retrieved from: <http://www.kantakji.com/media/3339/w116.pdf%20e%20Scores>.
- Tabuga, Domingo, Diokno-Sicat, and Valerie, Ulep (2020). *Innovating Governance: Building Resilience against COVID-19 Pandemic and Other Risks*
- The Corporate Governance Center & the Program of Democracy and Human Rights. (2010). *Concepts and policies of governance in the Arab and Western literature*. Cairo: University of Cairo.
- The Millennium Development Goals Report. (2015). The United Nations, New York. Retrieved from: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Development/GoodGovernance/Pages/GoodGovernanceIndex.aspx> Transparency International. (2016). Retrieved from: <http://www.transparency.org.2016>.
- Tiffin, J., & McCormick, E. (1962). *Industrial psychology* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (2005). *Accomplishing our mission: Results of the merit principles survey 2005*. Washington, D.C : U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board.
- Wouters, M., & Wilderon, C. (2019). Developing performance-measurement systems as enabling formalization: A longitudinal field study of a logistics department. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 33, 488-516.
- Wright, R. P. (2004). Mapping cognitions to better understand attitudinal and behavioral responses in appraisal research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 339-374.
- Yang, K., & Kassekert, A. (2010). Linking management reform with employee job satisfaction: Evidence from Federal Agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 20, 413-436.
- Yahyaoui, N. & Bouhadid, L. (2014). Governance and its role in improving the financial performance of the Algerian institutions: a case study of the new Canning Factory (NCA) in Rouiba, ABPR, 5 (Arabic version).
- Yahyaoui, N. & Buslimah, H. (2012). Corporate governance as a mechanism to reduce the administrative and financial corruption. The National Forum on corporate governance as a mechanism to curb LFBM corruption. Algeria: University of Mohammed Khider, Biskra
