

An Assessment of Workplace Behaviour and Its Impact on Employee Productivity among Academic Staff of Public Tertiary Institutions in Oyo State, Nigeria

Mustapha Adeyemi Olawoyin

Department of Public Administration, Lead City University, Ibadan, Nigeria

This study investigated the influence of workplace behaviour—comprising ethics, management styles, organisational culture, and psychological factors—on employee productivity within public tertiary institutions in Ibadan, Oyo State. Recognising gaps in existing literature, particularly the limited examination of these variables within the context of public tertiary education, the study adopted a descriptive survey design and collected data from 108 staff members selected through simple random sampling across three major institutions. A structured questionnaire, based on validated instruments, was administered to capture the variables of interest. The study used descriptive and inferential statistics, like multiple regression analysis, for data interpretation. Findings revealed a statistically significant composite relationship between workplace behaviour and employee productivity ($F = 3.563$, $p = 0.009$), with the model explaining 12.2% of the variance in productivity. In the study, workplace ethics appeared as the only significant predictor. Although management style, organisational culture, and psychological factors showed positive associations with productivity, they were not statistically significant. The study concludes that while a combination of behavioural factors contributes to productivity, ethics is the most influential. Thus, what exists as an ethical code in the organisation is far from the reality on the ground. As such, promoting a transformational leadership style, a culture of flexibility, making decisions, and prioritizing employee well-being is recommended. Theoretically, the study affirms Kantian ethics as a valuable lens for understanding workplace behaviour. Overall, the research contributes to organisational behaviour literature and provides actionable insights for improving productivity in Nigeria's public education sector.

Keywords: Workplace behaviour, workplace ethics, organisational culture, management style, psychological factors

Introduction

Workplace environments play a crucial role in shaping employee productivity, particularly within educational institutions. Factors such as workplace ethics, management styles, organisational culture, and psychological well-being directly influence the efficiency and effectiveness of employees. These elements are essential for fostering job satisfaction, promoting ethical behaviour, and motivating staff members. Studies have shown that workplace ethics, which include integrity, teamwork, and loyalty, serve as key drivers for high productivity levels by cultivating a supportive and collaborative atmosphere (Egbara & Ofodu, 2024). However, unethical practices, such as a lack of integrity or

poor management, can lead to disengagement, low morale, and diminished performance, resulting in negative consequences for the organisation (Salau et al., 2021). In addition to ethics, management styles significantly impact employee motivation and performance. Transformational leadership, which encourages personal development and aligns individual goals with organisational objectives, has been linked to higher productivity and engagement. Conversely, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles have been found to decrease job satisfaction and reduce productivity due to insufficient guidance and support (Musaibah et al., 2023; Moses, 2023). Organisational culture, too, plays a pivotal role in shaping the work

environment. A culture that emphasises shared values and goals can foster collaboration, innovation, and overall performance (Sumarjo et al., 2025).

Furthermore, psychological factors such as stress, burnout, and motivation are key drivers of productivity in the workplace. Intrinsic motivation, emotional well-being, and autonomy are closely tied to performance, with stress and burnout having the opposite effect (Oyelami et al., 2025; Ahmed et al., 2025). It is evident that these factors—ethics, management style, culture, and psychological well-being—are interwoven in their influence on workplace productivity. The interaction of these variables within public tertiary institutions, where differential challenges on leadership, ethics, culture, and psychological factors exist between public and private institutions in Nigeria is examined in this study. It is well established fact that, limited resources, hierarchical structures, and rigid work practices can impede the successful application of ethical codes, leadership practices, and positive organisational culture in public institutions in Nigeria (Olufemi & Ademola, 2026; Adebayo, 2025; Adedeji & Olayinka, 2025; Chijioke & Adamu, 2025). This research is critical in addressing the gaps in existing literature, particularly in the context of public educational institutions in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. By examining how workplace ethics, management styles, organisational culture, and psychological factors interact and influence employee productivity, this study aims to contribute valuable insights for improving workplace practices and enhancing productivity in public tertiary institutions.

Statement of Problem

Despite the growing recognition of how workplace behaviour affects employee productivity, a significant gap remains in understanding how workplace ethics, management styles, organisational culture, and psychological factors influence productivity, particularly in public tertiary institutions in Ibadan, Oyo State. Although few studies have thoroughly analysed how they interact and impact employee performance, the variables have not been examined within the context of tertiary educational setting in Ibadan. Most studies focus on individual traits, such as ethics or leadership styles, while overlooking their

interconnections. For example, the importance of ethical behaviour in boosting productivity has been acknowledged (Egbara & Ofodu, 2024), but the relationship between ethics, management styles, and organisational culture has not been examined.

Moreover, while organisational culture is recognised as vital for employee behaviour (Okogbe & Okogbe, 2025), there is a paucity of research examining the impact of cultural norms in public tertiary institutions on productivity. Research conducted by Sumarjo et al. (2025) indicates that a favourable organisational culture enhances production; nevertheless, this phenomenon is little examined within the realm of higher education in Ibadan. Emotional issues, including stress and burnout, continue to be insufficiently addressed in the educational context, despite their acknowledged influence on productivity (Ahmad et al., 2025). This study seeks to address these deficiencies by analysing the cumulative influence of workplace ethics, management styles, culture, and emotional aspects on employee productivity in public tertiary institutions in Ibadan.

Hypotheses

H0₁: There is no composite relationship between workplace behaviour (Workplace Ethics, Management Styles, Organisational Culture, and Psychological factors) and employee productivity.

H0₁: There is no relative relationship between workplace behaviour (Workplace Ethics, Management Styles, Organisational Culture, and Psychological factors) and employee productivity.

Conceptual Review

Workplace Ethics

Workplace ethics consist of the moral principles that govern behaviour inside a business, impacting employee performance and organisational success (Egbara & Ofodu, 2024). Fundamental ethical principles encompass integrity, loyalty, collaboration, and self-discipline. Enhancing productivity and job satisfaction is inspired by teamwork, which is an essential ethical principle, also promoting collaboration, the exchange of ideas, and problem-solving mechanisms (Badmus & Ogunlana, 2022). Ethical conduct fosters a culture of respect and accountability, hence improving employee engagement and performance (Egbara & Ofodu, 2024).

Work ethics include values such as perseverance and determination, which promote responsibility and improve job success (Jahanian et al., 2021). Employees exhibiting a robust work ethic display increased accountability and productivity, hence enhancing organisational success (Jahanian et al., 2021). Organisational learning, the capacity to assimilate and utilise knowledge for enhancement, further augments performance by fostering ongoing development and innovation (Jahanian et al., 2021). The correlation between work ethics and performance is extensively documented, with ethical behaviours, including transparency and mutual respect, fostering a more productive environment. The study conducted by Joshi et al. (2024) revealed that work ethics are instrumental to workplace satisfaction, as positive work ethics promote teamwork, collaboration and organisational performance. Institutions that prioritise work ethics are more likely to achieve greater output, but bad work ethics compromise organisational objectives (Ibe et al., 2025).

Management Styles and Employee Productivity

The relationship between leadership styles and staff productivity is a central emphasis in management studies. Transformational leadership motivates people to prioritise the organisation's interests over personal ones, cultivating a sense of ownership among employees. Conversely, authoritarian leadership may prove successful during crises but frequently results in diminished morale and long-term productivity (Shinde & Giri, 2025). The efficacy of leadership styles hinges on organisational culture, the nature of the task, and workforce preparedness for change.

Research in Uganda indicates that, while authoritarian leadership is prevalent in numerous African firms, transformational leadership exerts a more substantial influence on employee performance (Julius, 2024). Nonetheless, socio-economic and cultural constraints hinder the implementation of transformational leadership style in some regions (Muhamad et al., 2023). Colonial governance's hierarchical systems in Africa impede the shift towards more dynamic leadership models (Isaac et al., 2023). Job satisfaction is shaped by leadership styles that influence performance; satisfied employees exhibit

superior organisational results. Liu, Ali, Pan and Xiao (2024) revealed that transformative leadership has a positive influence on job satisfaction in an environment of trust and innovation. Therefore, understanding leadership dynamics is an essential component of employee well-being and organisational performance.

Organisational Culture and Employee Productivity

Organisational culture encompasses the practices, beliefs, and behaviours that characterise the work environment inside an organisation. It profoundly influences employee conduct by establishing explicit protocols for work performance and interpersonal relations. Alharbi and Alyahya (2020) assert that corporate culture is essential in directing suitable behaviour, which directly influences the attainment of organisational goals. The congruence of individual and organisational values promotes employee performance, as shared values promote collaboration and job execution, as seen by Dorkenoo et al. (2021).

The conceptual framework of organisational culture encompasses both formal and informal standards that affect employee conduct and determine organisational operations. Melletus and Meruo (2020) assert that these norms can either facilitate or obstruct employee involvement, hence influencing performance outcomes. A robust organisational culture unifies people and fosters a collaborative work environment that promotes high performance (Mohammed, 2019). The influence of ideas on employee behaviour is crucial, as these beliefs affect employees' perceptions of their positions and direct their actions (Alharbi & Alyahya, 2020). Organisational culture cultivates a workplace where individuals' aspirations and organisational goals are synchronised (Sumarjo et al., 2025).

Psychological Factors and Employee Productivity

Workplace stress is associated with several health problems, including anxiety, depression, and cardiovascular illnesses (Gilek, 2023). Burnout, a protracted result of stress, adversely affects performance and collaboration. The leadership style and organisational culture significantly influence the moderation of stress and burnout.

Transformational leadership, by cultivating a supportive atmosphere, can alleviate stress, whereas toxic cultures characterised by micromanagement intensify stress. The equity theory posits that personnel motivated by equitable salary and treatment exhibit increased productivity. Furthermore, organisational commitment, especially affective commitment, is significantly associated with increased motivation and performance (Oyelami, Onayemi, & Agbo, 2025).

Emotional intelligence (EI) also augments productivity. Job performance is contingent upon good stress management, conflict resolution mechanisms, and the maintenance of positive relationships, all of which are characteristics of emotional intelligence (Puri & Mehta, 2020). Enhanced employee well-being fosters heightened productivity. Majumdar (2022) asserts that prioritising mental health and well-being activities, such as stress management, can improve employee performance. Burnout diminishes motivation and productivity, particularly when stemming from emotional tiredness and diminished personal achievement (Gómez-Polo et al., 2022). The Job Demands-Resources paradigm posits that demands contribute to burnout, while the provision of resources such as autonomy and support can alleviate these consequences. Mitigating burnout by efficient stress management and support systems is essential for sustaining productivity (Oyelami, Onayemi, & Agbo, 2025).

Empirical Review

Numerous studies underscore the substantial influence of workplace ethics on employee performance across diverse sectors. Egbara and Ofodu (2024) discovered that integrity, loyalty, and teamwork positively influence productivity within the Enugu State Civil Service, enhancing client satisfaction, workload management, and overall competence. Jahanian et al. (2021) demonstrated that work ethics and organisational learning account for 45% of the variance in employee productivity within the Social Security Organisation of Qazvin Province. Joshi et al. (2024) identified a positive association between ethical standards, such as transparency and accountability, and employee performance in the educational sector. Ahmed et al. (2021) indicated that unethical behaviour adversely impacts employee performance and happiness, especially in Nigeria's

public sector. Ibe et al. (2025) underscored that compliance with ethical standards and favourable dispositions improves institutional performance, including proficient graduates and high-quality research.

Leadership styles significantly influence staff productivity. Shinde and Giri (2025) discovered that transformational and participative leadership styles correlate positively with employee performance, while autocratic leadership may have adverse long-term effects. Okee and Namuyonga (2024) established that transformational and transactional leadership styles favourably impacted performance in Uganda's manufacturing sector. Biloa (2023) affirmed that democratic and laissez-faire leadership promotes motivation and development, in contrast to autocratic leadership, which results in frustration and suboptimal performance. Liu et al. (2024) demonstrated that transformative leadership improves job satisfaction and performance within Ethiopian sports groups.

Studies indicate that company culture profoundly influences employee conduct and performance. Okogbe and Okogbe (2025) discovered that fundamental values, conventions, and beliefs within banks in Delta State impacted staff productivity. Sumarjo et al. (2025) showed that organisational commitment mediates the relationship between culture and performance, with a positive culture enhancing both aspects. Likewise, Egwu and Nwosu (2025) emphasised that favourable corporate cultures—prioritising collaboration and safety—enhance productivity. Anekwe and Igwe (2025) discovered that recruitment culture and staff engagement are crucial for enhancing efficiency in UK banks.

Psychological factors, such as emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, and workplace stress, are essential to productivity. Ahmad et al. (2025) established that workplace stress and burnout adversely impact employee well-being and productivity, with leadership style and organisational culture affecting stress levels. Oyelami et al. (2025) observed that emotional intelligence and leadership styles substantially influence performance. Sharma (2025) examined a hybrid workplace culture, highlighting the significance of work-life balance and leadership in shaping productivity and job happiness. Yan et al. (2020) showed that psychological climate and self-efficacy significantly influence employee

performance, with well-being serving as a mediator in these connections. Xue et al. (2022) showed that enhancing job satisfaction can alleviate work-related stress and diminish turnover intentions, underscoring the significance of psychological aspects in employee retention.

Theoretical Framework

Social Exchange Theory

Social Exchange Theory (SET) emerged in the mid-20th century to explain social interactions through the exchange of resources and rewards. Blau (1964) emphasised that social exchanges are driven by the expectation of returns, with individuals offering resources like time and effort to gain benefits such as recognition and support (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Resources can vary in importance and tangibility, with socio-emotional rewards like respect boosting self-esteem (Davlembayeva & Alamanos, 2025). People engage in exchanges when the perceived benefits outweigh the costs, and they expect fairness in the form of reciprocity; positive actions should be reciprocated with positive responses (Davlembayeva & Alamanos, 2025). In workplaces, SET plays a key role in explaining ethical behavior. Ethical actions, such as helping and supporting others, foster cooperation and trust within social groups. Employees who are treated fairly often reciprocate with productivity, while negative treatment can lead to counterproductive actions (Ogunfowora, Maerz, & Li, 2026). SET also predicts that unethical behaviors may arise from reciprocal dynamics, where employees act unethically to benefit exchange partners or retaliate against mistreatment (Ogunfowora, Maerz & Li, 2026).

Management styles directly impact social exchanges, as leaders who exhibit fairness and provide support inspire trust and positive reciprocity. High-quality leader-member exchanges foster loyalty, performance, and cooperation (Chen & Sriphon, 2022). Conversely, leaders who fail to support their employees cultivate transactional relationships that limit commitment and trust. Organisational culture also plays a role in social exchanges; when employees feel valued and supported, they reciprocate with better performance and positive attitudes (Colorado State University, 2021). Cultural differences further shape responses to social exchanges. In collectivist

cultures, organisational support reinforces group identity, while in individualistic cultures, personal autonomy makes fairness and individual support crucial drivers of positive behavior (Colorado State University, 2021). Psychological factors, including trust, self-esteem, and fairness perceptions, influence how individuals respond to exchanges, with fairness boosting self-esteem and socio-emotional benefits (Davlembayeva & Alamanos, 2025). In conclusion, SET offers a valuable framework for understanding workplace behavior, emphasising the role of fair exchanges, trust, leadership, and cultural influences. By fostering positive exchanges through ethical leadership and supportive organisational cultures, managers can promote ethical behaviour, employee engagement, and long-term cooperation.

Methodology

A descriptive survey study was performed to assess workplace behaviour and its impact on employee productivity among the personnel of public tertiary institutions in Ibadan, Oyo State. The population consisted of personnel from the University of Ibadan, the Federal School of Statistics, and the Polytechnic, Ibadan. The study population comprises academic staff from the University of Ibadan (1,524) (University of Ibadan, 2024), the Federal School of Statistics (43) (Head Count, Researcher, 2025), and the Polytechnic of Ibadan (300) (InsideOyo.com, 2024), resulting in a total of 1,867 staff members. To arrive at a sample size and sampling technique, Cochran and proportionate sampling method was engaged. Using Cochran's formula, the adjusted sample size for a population of 1,867, with a 9% margin of error and a 95% confidence level, is approximately 112. The proportionate distribution of the sample size of 112 respondents includes 91(81.6%) from the University of Ibadan, 18(16.0%) from the Polytechnic of Ibadan, and 3(16.0%) from the Federal School of Statistics, preserving the proportional breakdown. This guarantees that the sample accurately reflects the population proportions among the three institutions.

The sample of the study was obtained by simple random sampling, guaranteeing each participant an equal opportunity for inclusion, thereby minimising selection bias and enhancing the sample's representativeness. Data were gathered directly

from respondents in their natural work settings with a standardised questionnaire to improve authenticity and relevance. The questionnaire comprised measures derived from recognised instruments: organisational culture items were sourced from Van der Post, de Coning, and Smit (1997), workplace ethics items from Rusoke (2021), management styles from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire by Bass and Avolio, and psychological factors from the Nordic Questionnaire for Psychological and Social Factors at Work (QPS Nordic). Employee productivity metrics were extracted from the literature. Multiple regression analysis was employed to examine the

relationship between workplace ethics and employee productivity.

Findings

H0₁: There is no composite relationship between workplace behaviour (Workplace Ethics, Management Styles, Organisational Culture, and Psychological factors) and employee productivity.

H0₁: There is no relative relationship between workplace behaviour (Workplace Ethics, Management Styles, Organisational Culture, and Psychological factors) and employee productivity.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.349a	.122	.087	1.462	.122	3.563	4	103	.009

a. Predictors: (Constant), Psychological Factors, Workplace Ethics, Organization Culture, Management Style

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	30.479	4	7.620	3.563	.009b
	Residual	220.289	103	2.139		
	Total	250.769	107			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Productivity; b. Predictors: (Constant), Psychological Factors, Work Place Ethics, Organisation Culture, Management Style

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	12.891	4.869		2.648	.009
	Workplace Ethics	-.411	.190	-.205	-2.167	.033
	Management Style	.212	.117	.179	1.821	.072
	Organization Culture	-.047	.103	-.045	-.458	.648
	Psychological Factors	.147	.088	.170	1.678	.096

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Productivity

The research investigated the correlation between workplace behaviours—namely workplace ethics, managerial styles, organisational culture, and psychological factors—and employee productivity among the personnel of public tertiary institutions in Ibadan, Oyo State. The comprehensive model summary reveals that these workplace behaviour factors account for approximately 12.2% of the variance in employee productivity, with an adjusted R-squared value of 8.7%. This indicates that, although the model is statistically significant, a substantial portion of productivity variability

remains unexplained by these factors alone. The F-test for the model indicates a significant result ($F = 3.563$, $p = 0.009$), signifying that the collective impact of the predictors on production is statistically significant. This results in the dismissal of the initial null hypothesis ($H0_1$), which asserted the absence of a composite link between workplace conduct and employee productivity.

Analysing the contributions of distinct components yields a more intricate understanding. Workplace ethics is the sole statistically significant predictor among the variables, exhibiting a negative

unstandardised coefficient ($B = -0.411$) and a p -value of 0.033. This indicates that diminished perceptions or practices of workplace ethics correlate with reduced employee productivity. The adverse correlation highlights the essential need for ethical standards and equitable procedures in cultivating a thriving workplace. The management style exhibits a positive correlation with production; however, this link is not statistically significant at the traditional 5% threshold ($p = 0.072$), suggesting a potential yet ambiguous beneficial effect. Psychological factors exhibit a positive yet non-significant influence ($p = 0.096$). Organisational culture exhibits a negligible and statistically insignificant negative correlation with productivity ($p = 0.648$), suggesting no substantial evidence that the culture assessed in this study influences employee productivity within these institutions. Consequently, the second null hypothesis (H02), asserting no correlation between specific workplace behaviour characteristics and employee productivity, is only partially rejected. Only workplace ethics demonstrates a substantial relative influence, whilst the other components do not show statistically significant individual impacts.

Discussion of Findings

The regression analysis and reviewed empirical literature yield significant insights into the relationship between workplace factors and employee productivity. The regression model demonstrated statistical significance ($p = 0.009$), suggesting that the predictors—workplace ethics, management style, organisational culture, and psychological factors—jointly affect employee productivity. The model accounted for only 12.2% of the variance in productivity, indicating that, although these variables are relevant, other unmeasured factors may also significantly influence the outcomes. Workplace ethics were identified as a statistically significant predictor ($p = 0.033$) with a negative coefficient, indicating that lapses or deficiencies in workplace ethics result in reduced employee productivity. This finding is consistent with the empirical literature. Ahmed et al. (2021) found that unethical behaviour negatively affects performance and satisfaction within Nigeria's public sector. Ibe et al. (2025) confirmed that ethical norms enhance institutional efficiency.

The negative coefficient in the regression likely indicates an inverse relationship between ethical violations and productivity, aligning with existing literature that emphasises the importance of ethics in performance (Egbara & Ofodu, 2024; Joshi et al., 2024).

The management style exhibited a positive yet marginally significant correlation with productivity ($p = 0.072$), indicating that specific leadership approaches may contribute to improved employee performance. This aligns with the findings of Shinde and Giri (2025) and Okee and Namuyonga (2024), which indicate that transformational and participative leadership styles significantly enhance performance. Liu et al. (2024) demonstrated that effective leadership enhances job satisfaction and productivity, particularly in sectors where employee motivation is crucial. Conversely, organisational culture did not serve as a significant predictor of productivity ($p = 0.648$). This contradicts multiple studies, including Sumarjo et al. (2025) and Okogbe and Okogbe (2025), which emphasise the significant impact of positive organisational culture on employee performance. A possible explanation for this discrepancy may involve measurement limitations within the context of this study or insufficient cultural cohesion among the sampled institutions. Another possible factor could be differences in context and the tension between local culture and organisational culture. Psychological factors, such as stress, workplace conflicts, emotional support from colleagues, anxiety, job security, motivation and mental well-being, exhibited a marginally significant effect ($p = 0.096$), indicating a potential positive influence on employee productivity. This is consistent with the findings of Ahmad et al. (2025) and Oyelami et al. (2025), which indicate that emotional intelligence and mental well-being have a direct impact on performance. Sharma (2025) and Yan et al. (2020) highlighted the significance of self-efficacy and job satisfaction in reducing stress and improving productivity.

The findings highlight the complex nature of workplace behaviour, demonstrating that ethical codes, leadership, culture, and psychological wellness are crucial, yet their effects are influenced by the socio-organisational contexts of public institutions. Employees indicated strong compliance with ethical standards and respect for

authority; however, they also noted concerns regarding the misuse of office resources and absenteeism. Leadership practices that align with transformational traits received positive evaluations. The organisational culture was characterised by excessive centralisation and rigidity, potentially constraining staff autonomy and hindering innovation. Psychological factors, including emotional demand, autonomy, and work-life balance, significantly impacted staff perceptions of productivity. This study empirically validates the composite influence of workplace behaviour on productivity in the Nigerian public sector, thereby contributing to the existing literature. This indicates that administrators of public tertiary institutions should adopt a comprehensive strategy to enhance productivity. Although ethical compliance is essential, an excessive focus on strict codes that neglect leadership empathy, institutional adaptability, and employee psychological health may lead to adverse outcomes. The observed negative relationship between workplace ethics and productivity indicates a potential misalignment between established norms and employee experiences, necessitating a reevaluation of ethical enforcement approaches.

Conclusion

The influence of workplace behaviour on employee productivity within public tertiary institutions in Ibadan, Oyo State was examined by the study. The interrelationships between four key workplace behaviour variables: workplace ethics, management styles, organisational culture, and psychological factors, and how these factors collectively impact employee productivity were specifically focused on. As such, it was revealed that workplace behavior significantly influences employee productivity in higher institution of learning. According to the findings, workplace ethics was the main predictor of productivity, emphasising the importance of ethical practices in shaping employee performance. The study also identified the need for a re-evaluation of ethical practices within these institutions, as discrepancies between formal codes and actual practices were observed. While management styles, organizational culture, and psychological factors were positively associated with productivity, they did not reach statistical significance, suggesting that their

influence may be less direct compared to workplace ethics. Generally, valuable inputs on the application of workplace behaviour theories within public institutions were accentuated in the study.

Recommendations

Institutions ought to reassess the formulation and implementation of workplace ethics. Ethical policies ought to be participatory and context-sensitive rather than rigid and top-down, ensuring alignment with institutional objectives and employee experiences.

Leadership training must prioritise the development of departmental heads' abilities to inspire, mentor, and creatively challenge their staff. This is likely to enhance employee motivation and commitment.

Management should decentralise decision-making processes and promote diverse perspectives. This can empower employees, boost morale, and increase productivity by fostering greater inclusion.

Implementing programmes to monitor and manage job stress, emotional burnout, and work-life balance to enhance employee well-being. This encompasses mental health support services and policies that advocate for flexible work practices.

Incorporate psychological support within human resources policies. In addition to productivity metrics, it is essential to prioritise employee well-being as a strategic focus. Institutions ought to formulate customised wellness strategies informed by insights from psychological audits.

References

- Adebayo, J. (2025). Adherence to organisational ethics as a factor for facilitating performance efficiency. *African Journal of Sustainable Development*, 6(1), 101–114.
- Adedeji, O., & Olayinka, F. (2025). Ethical behaviour and public organisational performance. *Nigerian Journal of Social Psychology*, 14(2), 58–67.
- Ahmad, N. R., Ullah, I., Aziz, M. U., & Iqbal, F. (2025). Investigating stress, burnout, and organizational factors contributing to psychological well-being at work. *Review of*

- Education, Administration, and Law (REAL)*, 8(1), 29-40.
- 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.
- Ajiboye, A., & Olanrewaju, M. (2014). Work ethics, values, attitudes, and performance in the Nigerian public service: Issues, challenges, and the way forward. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 4(2), 143–159.
- Alharbi, A., & Alyahya, M. (2020). The role of organizational culture in shaping employee behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 32(1), 45-58.
- Badmus, N. B., & Ogunlana, E. K. (2022). Influence of work ethics on service delivery by library personnel in Federal Universities in South West Nigeria. *Samaru Journal of Information Studies*, 22(1), 124-138.
- Bilola, X. S. (2023). The impact of leadership style on employee job performance. *Open Journal of Leadership*, 12, 418-441.
- Chen, J. K. C., & Sriphon, T. (2022). Authentic Leadership, Trust, and Social Exchange Relationships under the Influence of Leader Behavior. *Sustainability*, 14(10), 5883.
- Chijioke, S., & Adamu, M. (2025). Impact of leadership strategy & typology on public sector organisational performance: A resource management perspective. *Public Administration Research*, 14(3), 98–112.
- Christopher, F., Moses, N., Muhindo, M., & Muhammad, M. (2022). Rewards and employee performance in an organization: A case study of African College of Commerce and Technology in South Western Uganda. *International Journal of Academic Pedagogical Research*, 6(4), 414–428.
- Colorado State University. (2021, July 2). *Research provides insights into cultural factors behind positive employee attitudes and behaviors*. College of Business. Retrieved February 22, 2026, from <https://biz.source.colostate.edu/when-workers-feel-supported-by-employers-eastern-collectivist-cultures-attitudes-and-behaviors-benefit-more-than-western-individualistic-ones/>.
- Davlembayeva, D., & Alamanos, E. (2025) *Social Exchange Theory: A review*. In S. Papagiannidis (Ed). TheoryHub Book. Retrieved on the 22 of February, 2026 from <https://open.ncl.ac.uk/>, ISBN: 9781739604400.
- Dorkenoo, K., Kwan, P., & Alhassan, S. (2021). The influence of organizational values on employee performance: A case study of selected firms in Ghana. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 11(1), 1-16.
- Egbara, E. A., & Ofodu, H. I. (2024). Workplace ethics in Enugu State civil service: Periscoping the effect on employees' performance. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Research*, 10(9), 72-87.
- Gilek, M. (2023). *The role of employee voice on mental health and well-being: The case of Poland*. In *Employee Voice in the Global North: Insights from Europe, North America and Australia*. pp. 141-165. Springer.
- Ibe, J.-V., Edeifo, S., & Wilson-Uadekun, L. (2025). *Work ethics and attitudinal change for greater productivity in tertiary education in Nigeria*. *International Journal of Social Science Research and Anthropology*, 7(6), 113-126.
- InsideOyo. (2024, January 16). *Infrastructural decay, shortage of staff, others - Poly Ibadan ASUP listed challenges threatening institution*. Retrieved February 22, 2026, from <https://insideoyo.com/infrastructural-decay-shortage-of-staff-others-poly-ibadan-asup-listed-challenges-threatening-institution/>.
- Isaac, O., Kazaara, A. G., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). Assessment of the effect of workplace conflict on employees' performance and organizational productivity: A case study of Tororo General Hospital. 7(3), 279–289.
- Jahanian, R., Faregha, S., & Salimi, M. (2021). Predicting employee productivity based on work ethics and organizational learning. *International Journal of Ethics & Society*, 2(4), 48-56.
- Liu, Y., Ali, A. A., Pan, J., & Xiao, Y. (2024). The effect of leadership styles on employees' performance in Ethiopian sports organizations with mediating and moderating roles. *Scientific Reports*, 14, 30875.
- Melletus, M., & Meruo, I. (2020). The effect of organizational culture on employee

- productivity at Nigerian Breweries Plc. *Nigerian Journal of Management Sciences*, 8(1), 56-70.
- Mohammed, A. (2019). The adverse effects of negative organizational culture on employee performance in the Nigerian banking sector. *Journal of African Business*, 20(1), 147-162.
- Moses, T. (2023). On-the-job training and its implication on staff performance in Uganda: A case study of Kasanda District Local Government. 7(4), 155–163.
- Muhamad, S., Iumba, A., & Bakaaki, P. (2023). Organizational culture, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in the renewable energy industry. 8(6), 146–151.
- Musaibah, N., Kazaara, A. G., Kazaara, A. I., & Deus, T. (2023). The organizational factors affecting employee performance in non-governmental organizations in Uganda: A case study of the Uganda Women Parliamentary Association, 7(3), 221–231.
- Ogunfowora, Babatunde & Maerz, Addison & Li, Yanhong (2026). Social Exchange Theory and (Un)Ethical Behaviors at Work. Retrieved on the 22nd of February, 2026 from *Social Exchange Theory and (Un)Ethical Behaviors at Work*.
- Okee, J. M., & Namuyonga, R. (2024). *Impact of leadership styles on employee performance: A case study of manufacturing firms in Uganda*. *Metropolitan Journal of Business & Economics*, 4(2), 452-462.
- Olufemi, O., & Ademola, S. (2026). Leadership ethics and public trust in Nigeria's public sector organisations. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 10(1), 2171–2187.
- Oyelami, B. O., Onayemi, T. O., & Agbo, J. J. (2025). Psychological factors affecting employee motivation and productivity: A review of selected literature. *Journal of Biology, Agriculture and Healthcare*, 15(1), 33-42.
- Rusoke, D. L. (2021). *Work ethics and employee performance in government-owned entities: A case study of Uganda Civil Aviation Authority Entebbe International Airport* (Master's dissertation). University of Kisubi.
- Salau, O. P., Faiola, H. O., & Akinbode, J. O. (2021). Induction and staff attitude towards retention and organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 16(4), 47-52.
- Sharma, R. (2025). Psychological insights of hybrid workplace culture. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Commerce, Management & Social Science*, 8(1), 289-300.
- Shinde, R. A., & Giri, T. C. (2025). *The impact of leadership styles on organizational performance*. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 7(2), 1-9.
- Sumarjo, W., Haerofiatna, H., & Wahyudi, W. (2025). The role of organizational culture in improving employee performance through organizational commitment. *Journal of Management Science*, 8(1), 21-28.
- Sumarjo, W., Haerofiatna, H., & Wahyudi, W. (2025). The role of organizational culture in improving employee performance through organizational commitment. *Journal of Management Science*, 8(1), 21-28.
- University of Ibadan. (2024). Pocket statistics 2022-2023 [Pocket statistics]. Retrieved February 22, 2026, from <https://ui.edu.ng/sites/default/files/2024-01/Pocket%20Statistics%202022-3.pdf>.
- Van der Post, W. Z., de Coning, T. J., & Smit, E. v. d. M. (1997). An instrument to measure organizational culture. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 28(4), 147–158.
- Wesevich, M. (2022). Servant leadership and its influence on organizational performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 45(3), 325-340.
- Xue, J., Wang, H., Chen, M., Ding, X., & Zhu, M. (2022). Signifying the relationship between psychological factors and turnover intention: The mediating role of work-related stress and moderating role of job satisfaction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 847948.