



**Issue - 05, Vol.09, pp. 10-18, Jan-Jun 2017**  
**IFSMRC African International Journal of Research in  
Management**

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

**THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN GOOD GOVERNANCE PRACTICES,  
WORKPLACE FRIENDSHIP AND EMPLOYEES' TASK  
PERFORMANCE**

**Dr. Assegid Demissie Shishigu<sup>1</sup> Yilak Alamrew Fentie<sup>2</sup> and Habtamu  
Getneten Yeniakal<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Associate Professor, University of Gondar, Ethiopia, [assegid04@gmail.com](mailto:assegid04@gmail.com),

<sup>2</sup>Lecture , Management Dpt., University of Gondar, [yalamrew@yahoo.com](mailto:yalamrew@yahoo.com),

<sup>3</sup>Lecturer, Psychology Dpt. University of Gondar, [harghabt@gmail.com](mailto:harghabt@gmail.com)

---

**ABSTRACT**

---

**Article History:**

Received 7<sup>th</sup> May, 2017

Received in revised form  
15.06.2017

Accepted 25.06.2017

Published on 30.June.2017

**Keywords:** Governance,  
workplace friendship, Task  
performance

**Corresponding Author:**  
[assegid04@gmail.com](mailto:assegid04@gmail.com)

---

*The purpose of this study was to assess Good Governance Practices, Employee's Workplace Friendship and Task Performance of the University. A sample of 338 employees (both academics and supportive) were randomly selected. Adapted standard research instruments were used. The result of the findings show that a significant number (41%) of respondents confirmed that as they did not perceive Good Governance Practices in the University. 68% of employee is not satisfied with their Workplace Friendship. On the other hand, 64% of them admitted as their own Task Performance is good. The lack of good governance practices resulted in less workplace friendship between employees and as well as did not unnecessary effect of the job performance of employees.*

**Dr. Assegid Demissie Shishigu, etal/IFSMRC/African International Journal  
of Research in Management/2017/-10**



## 1. INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of this study was to assess the associations and effect of Good Governance practices on employee's workplace friendship. According Dotan (2007) the six main reasons as to why individuals form friendships at work are Work Safety/Trust; Missing Role; Sanity Check; Work-values/Life-interests Similarity; Proximity, and Instrumentality. However, good governance is rarely mentioned as antecedents of workplace friendship and its effect job achievement.

## 2. RESEARCH METHODS

To do the research goals, a cross sectional survey of employees carried out at the University of Gondar. The population of this study comprises Academic staff and permanent employees working at (Human Resource, Finance, Registrar, and Library) directorates of the University. With this regard, there is 1560 Academic staff and 484 Supporting staff in total 2044 was taken as the target population. The sample size was 770. To select these 770 samples, first proportional stratified sampling technique was employed by dividing the population into different directorate and colleges of the university. The simple random sampling technique was used to

select each respondent from the respective strata/group. At the end 338 workable questionnaires were collected. To measure *Good Governance Practices* instrument adapted from the Sustainable Governance Indicators (SGI), developed by Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries (2009) used. This instrument has 26 questions to check the reliability of the instrument, Cronbach's Alpha (.937) was tested.

The second research tool used to measure *Workplace Friendship* Adapted from: Nielsen, et al. (2000), with bold items remaining after Morrison's (2006) factor analyses. The Cronbach's Alpha test result was (0.835).

Instrument used to measure *Employee's Task Performance* was adapted from the instrument developed by Babinand Boles (1996). The Cronbach's Alpha test result was (.882). All items of these instruments were rated on a five-point Likert type scales ranging from '1' "strongly disagree" to '5' "strongly disagree." However, for the sake of simplification of the data analysis, the Likert scales "strongly disagree and disagree" and as well as Strongly Agree and Agree are combined and scales "Disagree, Neutral and Agree" are used for data analysis.

**Table 1: Reliability Statistics**

Variables	Cronbach's	N of
-----------	------------	------



	Alpha	Items
Good governance Practices	.937	26
Workplace Friendship	.835	10
Employee Task performance	.882	5

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 3.1 Good governance

According to Sheng, (2009), governance is the method of decision-making and the course of action by which decisions are put into effect or not implemented. Even if, governance encompasses each organization in the society, mostly governance is used in corporate governance, local governance, national governance and international governance (United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific; Smith, 2007).

Good governance is being clear about the duties of the administrating body, employees' and managers' responsibilities. It is also making sure that responsibilities will be implemented, or it means performing it effectively, OPM and CIPFA, (2004), www.opm.co.uk.

Good governance is also promoting values of the organizations and putting these values of carryng out. It builds the capacity of bringing effective leadership, making sure that appointed

employees has the required skills, knowledge and experience to perform the job (Ibid). According to Plumptre & Graham( 1999) , one of the root causes of all sin within institutions is bad governance. Instead, good governance understands formal and informal accountability, taking an active and planned move toward to responsibility to staff, and engaging effectively with institutional stakeholders, OPM and CIPFA (2004):www.opm.co.uk. Good governance implies many different things in different contexts (Khan, 2004; Poluha and Rosendahl, 2002).

### 3.2 Workplace Friendship

Friendship is an intentional, personal relationship typically providing closeness and support (Fehr .1996). While, Workplace Friendship is voluntary place of work relations that involve shared trust, commitment, reciprocal liking and common interests and values rather than being only mutual friends (Berman et al., 2002). Workplace friendship is focused on acquaintance occurred in the workplace (Song, 2005). According to Fine (1986), Workplace friendship increases supports that help persons to achieve their job, lessen work stress, and provide increased cooperation and energy. Hamilton (2007) also pointed that if workplace friendship prevails, individuals might feel at ease with their workplace friends and reduces feelings of insecurity and doubt.



Riordan and Griffeth (1995) suggest that employees' perceptions of opportunities for friendships in the workplace can have direct effects on job, motivation and satisfaction as well as indirect effects on productivity. Furthermore, Riordan and Griffeth (1995) claim that managing workplace friendship and social issues within the organization is potential to manifest competitive advantage that needs to be considered seriously. Many research works showed that workplace friendship increases motivate employees, institutional participation, maintains organizational objectives, establish helpful and inventive climates and worker productivity (2004); promotes supportive behaviors (Buunk, et al. 1993); improves worker well being, (Kramer 1996, Marelich 1996); encourages critical friendships to promote reflective practice, (Farrell 1998); enables the spread of trust, respect, co operation and energy (Riordan & Griffeth 1995). Pahl (2000) has pointed that friendship is becoming a gradually more important social glue. However, while societies are held together by very different social bonds than in past centuries, kinship obligations, civic/organizational responsibilities.

### **3.5 Good governance and workplace friendship**

Bullivant et al. (2006) suggest that delivering the strategy to plan, manages risk of itself and employees, doing things within the law, delivers safe, quality services and has an appropriate hold on resources of all kinds for which it is accountable and applying proper care to resources and opportunities belonging to employees but for which it is responsible are the responsibilities of good governance. As Sheng, (2009) point out Governance is the process of decision-making and by which decisions are implemented (or not implemented). Hence, employees' participation in decision making, their best use of resources and having opportunities to improve their well-being is a key groundwork of good governance (Graham et al. 2003; Sheng, 2009). Good governance of the public sector, can be achieved by increasing the capacity of its leadership and the employees within it (CIPFA; and IFAC, 2013). According to Soonhee, (2002) allowing employees to participate in decision making have led to an increase in job satisfaction including relationship coworkers. Good governance safeguards the welfare of employees as well as, the stimulated of good employee behavior (Collier, 2005).

Leader – Member exchange (LMX) may have implications for the relationship quality among an employee and he/his team members (Graen &



Uhl-Bien, 1995; Seers (1989). Peoples who had high-quality team–member exchange contact are more likely to contribute by supporting one another and to share information, ideas, and feedback (e.g., Seers, 1989; Seers, Petty, & Cashman, 1995).

### 3.6 Good governance and Performance

Governance’ laws, rules, judicial decisions, and administrative practices determine employees’ job performance (Lynn, Heinrich, and Hill 2001). According to Uwuigbe Olubukunola Ranti,( 2011), significant relationship was also noticed between directors’level of governance disclosure and performance. His findings indicate that inadequate business participation, reduced responsiveness, need of awareness about the management, lack of democracy, corruption, poor sense of ownership, double responsibility and lack of members’ awareness were found to be the reasons for weak employees work performance (*Dayanandan, R., 2013*). Poor governance of public organizations is related to ineffectiveness and inefficiency of service delivery (Public Complaint Bureau, (2012) cited in Mohd Hamran Mohamad, Zulkiflee Daud and Khulida Kirana Yahya, 2014).

## 4. DATA ANALYSIS AND

## DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Descriptive statistics of the variables

From the total respondents 64.4% were male. 84.9% of them have first degree and above and 78.1% of respondents were served in the University for two and more years. Out of the respondent 56.5% were Academics staffs.

The result of table 2 shows that 138(41%) of respondents confirmed that as they did not perceive good governance in the University. Only 99(29%) of them agreed on the existence of good governance, while the remaining 101(30%) respondents were indifferent or preferred to be neutral. Table 2 also reveals that 232(68%) of the respondents is not satisfied with their Workplace Friendship, while 59(18%) of them conformed their enjoyment of preferable Workplace Friendship. On the other hand, 216(64%) of the respondent admitted as their own task performance is good, other 52(15%) of them did not want to tell about the task performance level. But other 40(12%) of they confirm that their task performance levels was poor (table 2).

**Table 2: Frequency distribution of Independent and dependent variables**

	Disagree		Neutral		Agree	
	F	%	F	%	F	%



1	Good Governance Practices	138	41	101	300	99	29
2	Workplace friendship	59	18	47	14	23	68
	Opportunities	35	10	33	10	27	80
	Prevalence	83	25	61	16	19	57
3	Task Performance	40	12	52	15	21	64

**Relationship of Good Governance Practices with Workplace Friendship and Task performance**

As table 3 shows the results of correlation analysis, the relationship between practices of good governance ( $r=-.202$ ) with Workplace Friendship and ( $r=-.096$ ).at ( $p<0.01$ ), level with employees job performance. On the other hand Workplace Friendship and employees job performance have perfect association( $r=.791$ ).

This implies the absence of good leadership practices results low Workplace Friendship among co workers and as well as have unnecessary effect of the job performance of employees.

**Table 3: Spearman’s rho Correlations result of the independent and dependent variables**

	1	2	3	4
Good Governance Practices				
Work place friendship	-.202*			
Friendship opportunities	-.229*	.933*		
Friendship prevalence	-.179*	.934*	.764*	
Task Performance	-.096	.791*	.739*	.758*

**\*\*.** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); **\***. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**The effect of Good Governance Practices on Workplace Friendship and Task Performance**

As it is confirmed by the result of regression analysis in Table 4; The table shows that ( $R^2 = .002$ ), adjusted  $R^2 = -.001$ ,at ( $P < .383$ ). That is only -1 percent variance in the current level of Workplace Friendship is accounted for the manifestation of Practices of good governance.

The table also reveals the regression analysis that ( $R^2 = .009$ ), adjusted  $R^2 =$ ,



at .003, ( $P < .211$ ). That is only .3 percent variance on the current level of employees job performance is accounted for the manifestation of Practices of good governance. The result of this data analysis in dictates the absence of Good Governance Practices resulted insignificant but negative effect on improvement of Workplace Friendship of employees. In addition to that lack of Good Governance Practices also helps to improve the employees job performance.

**Table 4: regression result of Good Governance Practices on friendship and job performance**

<i>Predicting Workplace Friendship by Good Governance Practices</i>				
Model	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	Sig.
1	.048 <sup>a</sup>	.002	-.001	.383
<i>Predicting employees' task performance by Good Governance Practices</i>				
Model	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	Sig.
1	.093 <sup>a</sup>	.009	.003	.211

**Conclusion**

Respondents confirmed as they did not perceive good governance of the University. A significant number of employees confirmed that as they did not perceive Good Governance Practices in the University. Most of the respondents are not satisfied with their

Workplace Friendship. However, many of them admitted as their own task performance is best.

The findings of this study also reveal that absence of good leadership practices results low Workplace Friendship among co-workers and as well as have unnecessary effect of the job performance of employees and have resulted insignificant but negative effect on improvement in Workplace Friendship of employees, and also did not help to improve the employees task performance.

**Reference**

Armstrong, M. (2006). *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice* 10<sup>th</sup> edition, Cambridge, UK, University Press

Agere, Sam (2000). *Promoting good governance*. Common wealth Secretariat.

Agho and Price (1992). *Discriminates validity of measures of job satisfaction, positive affectivity and negative affectivity*, Health Care Management, Florida A & M University, Ware-Phaney BL 103, Tallahassee, FL 32307, USA

Amutuhaire, T. (2010). Terms of Service and Job Retention among Academic Staff in Makerere University, Master's Thesis, MUST, Kampala. Tetey, 2006 cited in Dr. Oyagi N. Bernard

Babin, B. J., & Boles, J. S. (1996). The effects of perceived co-worker involvement and supervisor support on





---

***African International Journal of  
Research in Management***

---

- service provider role stress, performance, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Retailing*, 72:67-76.
- Bassett, G. (1994). The case against job satisfaction. *Business Horizons*, 37: 61-68.
- Brief, A. P. (1998). *Attitudes in and around organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bhuiyan, S. N., & Menguc, B. (2002). Evaluation of Job Characteristics, Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction in an Expatriate, Guest Worker, Sales Setting. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 22: 1-12
- Boles, J.S., Wood, J.A., & Johnson, J. (2003). Interrelationships of role conflict, role ambiguity and work family conflict with different facets of job satisfaction and the moderating effects of gender. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 23, 2: 99-113
- Brown, D. and McIntosh, J. (1998). If You're Happy and You Know It... Job Satisfaction in the Low Wage Service Sector, Discussion Paper 405, Centre for Economic Performance, London.
- Chiang, H. (2005). An empirical study of corporate governance and corporate performance. *The Journal of Law and Economics*, 31,1: 122-140.
- Cole, M. S., Schaninger, W. S., & Harris, S. G. (2002). The workplace social exchange network. *Group and Organization Management*, 27, 142-167
- Collier, P. M. (2005). *Management Accounting Risk and Control Strategy*. CIMA Publishing: Oxford Combined Code Reviewed.
- Churchill, G. A., Ford, N. M. and Walker, O. C. (1974). Measuring the Job Satisfaction of Industrial Salesmen', *Journal of Marketing Research*, 11,3:254-60
- Dayanandan R. 2013), Good Governance Practice for Better Performance of Community Organizations - Myths and Realities!!, *Journal of Power, Politics & Governance*, 1. 1:10-26
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 219-247
- Graham J., Amos B., Plumptre T., (August 2003), Principles for Good Governance in the 21st Century, Policy Brief No. 15 - Institute On Governance, Ottawa, Canada, [www.iog.ca/publications/policy briefs](http://www.iog.ca/publications/policy%20briefs)
- HILLA DOTAN,( 2007) Workplace Friendships: Origins And Consequences For Managerial Effectiveness, Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings, Recanati Graduate School of Business Administration, Tel-Aviv





---

***African International Journal of  
Research in Management***

---

- University, Ramat Aviv, Tel-Aviv 69978, Israel
- Hornby, A.S. and Cowie, A. P. (1995). Oxford Advance Dictionary of Current English 5th Edition Oxford University Press
- Jenkins, J.M. (1993). Self-monitoring and turnover: the impact of personality on intent to leave. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14:83-91
- John, K., & Senbet, L. (2004). Corporate Governance and Board Effectiveness. *Journal of Banking and Finance*. 22: 371-403
- Johnson, G.J., & Johnson, W.R. (2000). Perceived over qualification, positive and negative affectivity, and satisfaction with work. *Journal of Social Behaviors and Personality*, 15,2:167-185.
- Kaliski, B.S. (2007). Encyclopedia of Business and Finance, Second edition, Thompson Gale, Detroit, p. 446
- Khan, M.H., (2004). *State formation in Palestine: viability and governance during a social transformation*: Volume 2 of Political economy of the Middle East and North Africa.
- Kharbanda, S. (2012). *Employees' position during Transfer of understanding- A Corporate Governance perspective*, Christ University, Uttar Pradesh
- Koeske, G. F., Kirk, S. A., Koeske, R. D., & Rautkis, M. D. (1994). Measuring the Monday Blues: Validation of Job Satisfaction Scale for the Human Service. *Social Work Research*, 18 :27-35.
- Locke, E.A. (1976). *The nature and causes of job satisfaction*. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (pp.1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally,
- Lynn, Laurence E. Jr., Carolyn J. Heinrich, and Carolyn J. Hill. (2001). *Improving Governance: A New Logic for Empirical Research*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press
- Mohd Hamran Mohamad, Zulkiflee Daud and Khulida Kirana Yahya, (2014). Impact On Employees' Good Governance Characteristics, The Role Of Transformational Leadership As Determinant Factor international *Journal of Science, Environment and Technology* 3, 1:320 – 338
- OPM and CIPFA, (2004), 252b Gray's Inn Road, London, web: [www.opm.co.uk](http://www.opm.co.uk). OPM (Office for Public Management Ltd); CIPFA (The Chartered Institute of Public the Independent Commission on Good Governance in Public Services
- Plumptre and Graham, 1999 Tim Plumptre & John Graham Institute On Governance and Good Governance: International and Aboriginal Perspectives [s://www.google.com.et/search?](http://www.google.com.et/search?)
- Seers, A. (1989). Team-member exchange quality: A new construct for role-making research. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 43, 118-135.
- Seers, A., Petty, M. M., & Cashman, J. F.



---

***African International Journal of  
Research in Management***

---

- (1995). Team-member exchange under team and traditional management. *Group and Organization Management*, 20, 18-38
- Sheng, Y. K., (2009), what is Good Governance? United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, <http://www.unescap.org/resources/what-good-governance>
- Soonhee, K. (2002) "Participative Management and Job Satisfaction: Lessons for Management Leadership," *Public Administration Review* 62, no. 2 (032002): 231.
- Spector, P. E. (2007). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*. California: Sage Publications.
- United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (1997). *Governance for Sustainable Human Development*, policy paper on governance and how it relates to human development Re-conceptualizing Governance, UNDP
- Uwuigbe Olubukunola Ranti,(2011).*Corporate Governance And Financial Performance Of Banks: A Study Of Listed Banks In Nigeria*
- Wood, V.R., Chonko, L. B., & Hunt, S. (1986). Social Responsibility and Personal Success: Are they Incompatible? *Journal of Business Research*, 14: 193-212