

Original Research Article

WORK ETHICS AND BEHAVIOUR OF STAFF IN WORKPLACE: A STUDY OF BAYELSA STATE HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT BOARD (HMB)

Yidougha Esido (PhD)

Niger Delta University, Wilberforce Island, Bayelsa State, Nigeria.

Correspondence should be addressed to Yidougha Esido (PhD): yidoughaesido@gmail.com

Article No: 026 | **Accepted:** 01 August 2026 | **Published:** 10 August 2026

Abstract: This study examined the work ethic and behavior of staff in the Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board (HMB) and their impact on service delivery. The specific objectives were to assess the common behavioral patterns of staff, examine the factors influencing staff work ethic and behavior within the Board, determine the impact of staff work ethic and behavior on patient care and hospital performance, and investigate the dimensions of staff work ethic in HMB. The study adopted a descriptive survey research design. Primary data were collected from staff of the Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board using a structured questionnaire, while the data were analyzed using descriptive statistics comprising frequencies, percentages, mean, and standard deviation with the aid of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The findings revealed that staff generally demonstrated positive workplace behaviors, including politeness, empathy, compliance with organizational rules, and prompt response to emergencies. The study further established that leadership style, working conditions, regular training, supervision, and organizational accountability significantly influenced staff work ethic and behavior. In addition, positive work ethics and behavior were found to improve patient satisfaction, teamwork, hospital productivity, and institutional reputation while reducing medical errors. The study also revealed that staff exhibited diligence, honesty, integrity, and confidentiality, although accountability for personal actions required further improvement. The study concluded that strengthening positive work ethics, supportive leadership, continuous staff development, and accountability mechanisms would enhance staff performance, improve service delivery, and promote effective healthcare management in the Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board.

Keywords: Work Ethic, Staff Behavior, Service Delivery, Hospital Performance

INTRODUCTION

Workplace ethics and employee behaviour are fundamental to the effective functioning of every organization. They shape employees' attitudes toward work, influence decision-making, and determine the quality of relationships among staff, management, and clients. An organization that promotes ethical values such as honesty, accountability, discipline, fairness, and professionalism is more likely to achieve improved productivity, public confidence, and sustainable growth. Ethical conduct also creates a positive organizational climate that encourages responsibility, transparency, and commitment to institutional goals. According to Ijeoma (2023), the promotion of ethical standards in the workplace is essential for organizational effectiveness and national development because it strengthens employee commitment and enhances service delivery.

The concept of work ethic has attracted considerable scholarly attention over the years. Joseph and Jeremy (2018) describe work ethic as the collection of values, attitudes, and behaviours that determine how individuals approach their jobs and responsibilities. The historical foundation of the concept is commonly linked to Max Weber's *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1905), in which he argued that certain religious beliefs, particularly those associated with Calvinism, encouraged disciplined labour, thrift, self-control, and commitment to productive work. Weber maintained that these values contributed significantly to the development of modern capitalism. Chavach (2016) explains that Weber's Protestant work ethic emphasized diligence, frugality, moral discipline, moderation, and dedication to one's occupation.

Although contemporary interpretations of work ethic have become increasingly secular, the central principles identified by Weber remain relevant. Modern scholars view work ethic as a value system that recognizes work as an important aspect of personal responsibility and organizational success. Meriac, Woehr, and Banister (2010) define work ethic as a multidimensional construct that reflects individuals' beliefs regarding the importance of hard work, responsibility, honesty, and commitment in achieving personal and organizational objectives.

Several researchers have attempted to measure work ethic using different assessment instruments. Mirels and Garrett (1971) developed the Protestant Work Ethic Scale to assess dimensions such as hard work, achievement orientation, asceticism, and negative attitudes toward leisure. Although the instrument significantly advanced research on work ethic, critics observed that it paid limited attention to other important attributes such as personal responsibility, moral conduct, self-reliance, and delayed gratification. Earlier instruments developed by Goldstein and Eichorn (1961) and Blood (1969) also focused primarily on the Protestant ethic perspective. To provide a broader and less religious interpretation of work values, Wollack, Goodale, Wijting, and Smith (1971) introduced the Survey of Work Values, which conceptualized work ethic as a multidimensional construct applicable across different occupational settings. Despite its broader perspective, scholars have argued that the instrument presents a relatively wide interpretation of work ethic.

In contemporary organizations, work ethic encompasses the values and standards that influence employees' commitment to their duties. It includes punctuality, integrity, accountability, diligence, teamwork, respect for organizational rules, professionalism, and dedication to assigned responsibilities. Employee behaviour, on the other hand, refers to the observable actions and interactions of workers in the workplace, including communication patterns, cooperation with colleagues, discipline, responsiveness to clients, and compliance with organizational procedures. Positive employee behaviour contributes to organizational efficiency, whereas unethical conduct such as absenteeism, lateness, negligence, and indiscipline undermines institutional performance.

The importance of work ethic and staff behaviour is particularly evident in healthcare organizations, where the quality of services depends largely on the professionalism and commitment of healthcare personnel. Ethical conduct among healthcare workers promotes patient safety, quality healthcare delivery, effective teamwork, and public confidence in health institutions. Conversely, poor work attitudes may lead to delayed treatment, medical errors, reduced patient satisfaction, and declining organizational performance.

The Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board (HMB) is responsible for coordinating and supervising public secondary healthcare facilities across the eight Local Government Areas of Bayelsa State. The Board oversees the activities of doctors, nurses, pharmacists, laboratory scientists, administrative officers, and other healthcare professionals who collectively provide essential medical services to the population. Effective service delivery within these hospitals depends not only on the availability of infrastructure and medical equipment but also on the ethical conduct and professional behaviour of the workforce.

Despite government investments aimed at strengthening healthcare infrastructure and improving service delivery, concerns persist regarding employee work attitudes within hospitals managed by the Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board. Reports from hospital administrators and patients have highlighted recurring issues such as lateness to duty, absenteeism, inadequate commitment to work, poor interpersonal relationships with patients, and other forms of unprofessional conduct. These behaviours negatively affect operational efficiency, increase patient waiting time, weaken staff morale, and diminish public confidence in government-owned healthcare facilities. If these challenges remain unresolved, they may undermine the Board's capacity to achieve its mandate of delivering accessible and quality healthcare services to residents of the state.

Although previous studies have examined various aspects of healthcare management, including human resource management and information and communication technology within healthcare institutions, relatively few have focused specifically on the work ethic and behavioural patterns of staff in hospitals under the Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board. A clearer understanding of these issues is necessary for developing effective strategies that promote professionalism, improve employee commitment, reduce workplace deviance, and enhance the quality of healthcare services. Consequently, this

study investigates the work ethic and behaviour of staff in the Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board, the factors influencing these behaviours, and their implications for patient care and overall hospital performance.

Objectives of the Study

The broad objective of this study is to examine the work ethic and behaviour of staff in the Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board and determine their influence on service delivery.

The specific objectives are to:

1. Examine the common behavioural patterns of staff in hospitals under the Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board.
2. Identify the factors influencing staff work ethic and behaviour within the Board.
3. Determine the effects of staff work ethic and behaviour on patient care and hospital performance.
4. Investigate the various dimensions of work ethic exhibited by the staff of the Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Conceptual Review

Work Ethics

Work ethic refers to the acceptable standards of behaviour, values, and attitudes that employees are expected to demonstrate in carrying out their responsibilities within an organisation. These ethical standards provide guidance on how employees should conduct themselves in the workplace to promote professionalism, accountability, and organisational success. Every workplace comprises individuals from different cultural, educational, and social backgrounds who must work collectively toward achieving shared organisational objectives. Consequently, organisations establish codes of conduct, rules, policies, and operational procedures that regulate employees' behaviour and ensure discipline, cooperation, and efficiency. According to David and Resnim (2015), adherence to workplace ethics enables employees to work harmoniously, enhances organisational reputation, and contributes significantly to productivity and service delivery. Ethical behaviour also creates a positive work environment where employees derive satisfaction from their jobs rather than perceiving work as a burden.

Closely related to work ethic is organisational behaviour, which focuses on how individuals and groups behave within an organisation. Robbins and Judge (2019) describe organisational behaviour as the study of employees' actions, attitudes, and interactions within the workplace. They distinguish between organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB), which consists of voluntary actions that promote organisational effectiveness, and counterproductive work behaviour (CWB), which includes behaviours that hinder organisational performance. According to Robbins and Judge (2019), several organisational factors shape employees' work ethic and behaviour. These include leadership and

supervision, employee motivation and reward systems, the work environment, organisational culture, and individual employee characteristics. The interaction of these factors determines whether employees exhibit positive or negative workplace behaviours.

Generational differences have also been identified as important determinants of work ethic. Robbins and Judge (2019) observed that Baby Boomers are generally perceived to possess stronger work ethics than younger generations because they tend to demonstrate greater organisational loyalty and long-term commitment. In contrast, members of Generation X are often characterised by greater job mobility and a lower level of organisational attachment. Their findings further revealed that employees who are satisfied with their jobs generally demonstrate stronger work ethics than individuals who experience workplace dissatisfaction. Likewise, employment status and length of service may influence employees' commitment to organisational values and responsibilities. Despite these criticisms, the literature also identifies several positive qualities associated with millennials. Hobart and Sendek (2014) noted that many millennials are ambitious, achievement-oriented, collaborative, optimistic, technologically competent, and receptive to innovation. Their confidence in their abilities is often attributed to family environments that encouraged participation in decision-making and personal expression from an early age. As a result, millennials generally respect authority but are more likely to question traditional organisational hierarchies than previous generations. Although these attitudes may sometimes be interpreted as disrespect, they may equally reflect their preference for participatory leadership and open communication within organisations.

To facilitate the measurement of work ethic, several assessment instruments have been developed. Jeremy (2019) identified the Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile (MWEP), originally developed by Miller, Woehr, and Hudspeth (2001), as one of the most comprehensive instruments for assessing work ethic across different occupational settings. Ness, Mellinsky, Buff, and Seifert (2010) utilised the MWEP to compare graduating university students with working professionals. Their findings indicated that both groups exhibited relatively similar overall work ethic scores. However, university students demonstrated stronger preferences for leisure alongside a greater willingness to work hard, whereas working professionals attached greater importance to time management and viewed work as a more central aspect of their daily lives.

Although the Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile has been widely adopted in work ethic research, scholars have criticised its considerable length, which may discourage respondents from completing the instrument. To address this limitation, Meriac, Woehr, Gorman, and Thomas (2013) developed the Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile–Short Form (MWEP-SF). The revised instrument reduced the original sixty-five items to twenty-eight while retaining the seven major dimensions of work ethic contained in the original scale. According to the developers, the shortened version maintains strong psychometric properties and correlates highly with the full instrument, thereby providing researchers with a more efficient yet reliable measure of employees' work ethic across different organisational contexts.

Importance of Work Ethic and the Work Ethic of Millennials

Understanding employees' work ethic is important because it provides valuable insight into their attitudes toward work, level of commitment, and overall contribution to organisational success. Employers increasingly consider work ethic a critical attribute when recruiting and retaining competent personnel because employees who demonstrate integrity, diligence, responsibility, and commitment are more likely to improve organisational productivity and service quality. Hill and Fouts (2005) argued that individuals with strong work ethics are highly valued by employers because they consistently display behaviours that enhance efficiency, accountability, and organisational performance. They further noted that work ethic differs among individuals due to variations in personal values, socialisation, educational experiences, and generational backgrounds.

Generational differences have become an important area of work ethic research, particularly with the emergence of millennials in the modern workforce. Through an extensive review of existing literature and focus group discussions, Alexander and Sysko (2013) examined the growing perception of entitlement among millennials. They observed that managers from the Baby Boomer and Generation X cohorts frequently encounter differences in workplace values and expectations when supervising younger employees. According to their findings, millennials contribute several positive qualities to organisations, including teamwork, commitment to interpersonal relationships, appreciation for work-life balance, dedication to organisational values, and willingness to work hard when they receive prompt recognition and rewards. These characteristics make them adaptable employees who value collaboration and meaningful work. Despite these strengths, Alexander and Sysko (2013) also identified several challenges associated with millennial employees. Some members of this generation have been described as displaying narcissistic tendencies, unrealistic expectations, and a relaxed attitude toward work responsibilities. Similar observations were reported by Hobart and Sendek (2014), who suggested that these characteristics may create difficulties for managers accustomed to more traditional workplace values. Consequently, differences in expectations between older and younger employees may generate misunderstandings and workplace conflicts if organisations fail to establish effective communication and appropriate management strategies.

Technology has also played a significant role in shaping the work attitudes of millennials. Hershatter and Epstein (2010) observed that digital technology has become an integral part of millennials' everyday lives, leading many scholars to describe them as "digital natives." Unlike previous generations, often referred to as "digital immigrants," millennials have grown up with widespread access to information and communication technologies, making them highly comfortable with digital tools in both their personal and professional activities. Their familiarity with technology enables them to adapt quickly to technological innovations and modern workplace practices.

The increasing integration of technology into millennials' lives has contributed to contrasting perceptions of their work behaviour. Hershatter and Epstein (2010) noted that

some managers describe millennials as "Generation Whine" because they often require continuous guidance and support when carrying out routine tasks. Others, however, refer to them as the "Greatest Generation" because of their optimism, creativity, and strong desire to contribute positively to society despite contemporary economic, environmental, and political challenges. These contrasting perspectives illustrate the diversity that exists within the millennial generation and suggest that workplace behaviour cannot be generalised solely on the basis of age. Although research on generational differences in work ethic has expanded considerably across many countries, empirical studies remain relatively limited in certain national contexts. Existing studies indicate that millennials often possess workplace values that differ from those of earlier generations, resulting in both positive and negative behavioural outcomes. Consequently, understanding these behavioural differences has become increasingly important for organisations seeking to improve employee engagement, motivation, and performance. Within educational institutions, students can also demonstrate a work ethic through their academic responsibilities. Although they may not be formally employed, university students engage in structured activities that closely resemble workplace demands, including attending lectures, completing assignments, participating in group projects, and meeting academic deadlines. Hu and Schaufeli (2009) argued that these academic responsibilities provide an appropriate context for examining work ethic because they require discipline, commitment, responsibility, and effective time management, which are essential characteristics of successful employees in professional organisations.

Workplace Ostracism

Workplace ostracism refers to situations in which an employee is intentionally or unintentionally ignored, excluded, or isolated by colleagues or supervisors within an organisation. Such exclusion deprives the affected individual of opportunities for interaction, participation, and inclusion in organisational activities, thereby affecting both psychological well-being and job performance. Ibrahim and Olaleye (2025) describe workplace ostracism as the rejection or exclusion of an employee from workplace relationships and interactions. Similarly, Williams (2019) conceptualises workplace ostracism as the experience of being ignored or excluded without direct confrontation or explicit hostility. This perspective highlights the passive nature of ostracism, where harm is inflicted through deliberate omission rather than overt aggression. Research has shown that workplace ostracism manifests in different forms across organisations (Nwankwo, 2018; Okonkwo & Ezech, 2019). One of the most common manifestations involves excluding employees from formal organisational processes such as departmental meetings, decision-making activities, project teams, and information-sharing networks (Okonkwo & Ezech, 2019). Such practices deprive employees of essential information required to perform their duties effectively and may ultimately hinder their professional growth and career advancement.

According to Nwankwo (2018), toxic organisational environments frequently exhibit systematic patterns of exclusion whereby certain employees are deliberately denied access to important meetings, communication channels, and organisational resources. Such exclusion weakens employees' effectiveness while simultaneously strengthening the

influence of those responsible for the exclusion. Okonkwo and Ezech (2019), together with Nwachukwu and Chughtai (2022), argue that these practices often create artificial performance gaps that may later be used to justify further marginalisation or unfair treatment of targeted employees. Beyond formal organisational activities, workplace ostracism also occurs through subtle interpersonal behaviours. Jones and Kelly (2018), Robinson, O'Reilly, and Wang (2013), Scott, Sagenczyk, Schippers, Purvis, and Cruz (2017), and Williams and Sommer (2021) identified behaviours such as ignoring colleagues during conversations, avoiding eye contact, excluding individuals from informal social interactions, and deliberately giving them the silent treatment as common forms of workplace ostracism. Although these behaviours may appear insignificant individually, their repeated occurrence can communicate rejection and create feelings of loneliness, isolation, and low self-worth among affected employees.

Advances in communication technology have introduced another dimension of workplace ostracism known as digital ostracism. According to Riva and Eck (2016) and Hitlan and Noel (2019), digital ostracism occurs when employees are intentionally excluded from electronic communication platforms, including email correspondence, virtual meetings, messaging applications, or online collaborative workspaces. As organisations increasingly rely on digital communication, exclusion from these platforms may significantly reduce employees' ability to contribute effectively to organisational activities and remain informed about work-related developments. The consequences of workplace ostracism extend beyond social exclusion to include adverse psychological and organisational outcomes. Employees who experience persistent ostracism often develop feelings of invisibility, rejection, and insignificance, which may contribute to emotional distress, decreased motivation, and reduced organisational commitment. Waldeck, Tyndall, and Chmiel (2018), together with Adebayo and Ogunsina (2020), observed that prolonged workplace ostracism is associated with increased psychological strain, lower job satisfaction, declining productivity, and weakened attachment to organisational goals. Consequently, organisations that fail to address exclusionary behaviours risk creating unhealthy work environments that undermine employee well-being and overall organisational effectiveness.

Workplace Bullying

Workplace bullying is a persistent pattern of negative behaviour directed at an employee with the intention or effect of causing psychological, emotional, or professional harm. Unlike isolated disagreements or occasional conflicts, bullying consists of repeated actions that create a hostile work environment and undermine the victim's dignity, confidence, and job performance. Okonkwo and Ezech (2019) describe workplace bullying as a form of persistent mistreatment that frequently occurs within unequal power relationships, where individuals in positions of authority or influence take advantage of their status to intimidate or victimise subordinates. Similarly, Einarsen et al. (2020) define workplace bullying as repeated actions and practices directed at one or more employees that are unwelcome to the victim and cause humiliation, offence, or emotional distress, regardless of whether such actions are deliberate or unintentional.

Nielsen and Einarsen (2018) further emphasise that persistence and power imbalance distinguish workplace bullying from ordinary workplace disagreements. They argue that bullying typically involves continuous negative treatment that leaves the victim unable to defend themselves effectively because of differences in organisational authority, social influence, or access to resources. Such behaviours may include verbal abuse, intimidation, social exclusion, threats, ridicule, or any other conduct intended to diminish an employee's confidence and professional standing. The victim's inability to stop or resist these repeated actions demonstrates the seriousness of workplace bullying and its damaging consequences. Workplace bullying may occur regardless of employees' age, gender, ethnicity, or other personal characteristics. Omotayo and Oladele (2018) observed that unequal power relationships contribute significantly to bullying and harassment within Nigerian higher education institutions. Salin (2021) further explains that workplace bullying may occur intentionally or unintentionally and often consists of sustained psychological aggression that humiliates, intimidates, or undermines employees without necessarily involving unlawful discrimination.

The manifestations of workplace bullying vary across organisational settings. Adebayo et al. (2022) identify common forms of bullying to include verbal abuse, excessive criticism, social exclusion, the spreading of false rumours, assigning unrealistic workloads, and deliberate actions intended to undermine employees' work performance. Regardless of whether perpetrators recognise the harmful nature of their actions, such behaviours frequently produce emotional distress, reduced self-esteem, anxiety, and diminished job satisfaction among victims. Adebayo et al. (2022) further observed that bullying often involves aggressive interactions characterised by public humiliation, threatening language, persistent criticism, and other intimidating behaviours that create significant psychological pressure. Researchers have classified workplace bullying into several categories. Morgan (2018) and Reknes et al. (2019) identify four major forms of workplace bullying: direct bullying, task-related bullying, person-related bullying, and cyberbullying. Direct bullying includes behaviours such as shouting, insulting remarks, verbal aggression, and public humiliation (Reknes et al., 2019). Task-related bullying occurs when employees are deliberately assigned unreasonable workloads, impossible deadlines, meaningless assignments, or denied access to essential information needed to perform their duties effectively (Gardner et al., 2016). Person-related bullying involves spreading malicious rumours, isolating individuals socially, ridiculing their personal characteristics, or attacking their private lives (Bartlett & Bartlett, 2021). In recent years, cyberbullying has become increasingly prevalent and includes harassment through electronic means such as emails, messaging applications, social media platforms, and other digital communication channels (Kowalski et al., 2018).

The consequences of workplace bullying are far-reaching for both employees and organisations. Victims often experience stress, emotional exhaustion, anxiety, depression, declining job satisfaction, and reduced organisational commitment. Persistent exposure to bullying may also contribute to absenteeism, poor work performance, increased turnover intentions, and reduced organisational productivity. Consequently, organisations that fail to

prevent or address bullying risk creating toxic work environments that undermine employee well-being, teamwork, and overall institutional effectiveness.

Workplace Harassment

Workplace harassment refers to persistent and unwelcome behaviours directed at an employee or a group of employees that create an intimidating, hostile, humiliating, or offensive work environment. Such behaviours interfere with employees' ability to perform their duties effectively and may adversely affect their psychological well-being, professional relationships, and overall job satisfaction. Solomon et al. (2024) describe workplace harassment as deliberate actions intended to undermine, intimidate, or demean employees through repeated hostile or vindictive conduct. These behaviours may originate from supervisors, colleagues, or subordinates and often have serious implications for both individual employees and organisational effectiveness. Pich and Tunika (2017) argue that breaches of the psychological contract between employees and employers often contribute to the emergence of harassment within organisations. When employees perceive unfair treatment, broken promises, or organisational injustice, interpersonal relationships may deteriorate, creating conditions that encourage hostile behaviours. Similarly, Branch and Murray (2021) observe that workplace harassment may involve continuous negative interpersonal interactions directed at employees by supervisors, colleagues, or subordinates, regardless of whether the behaviour is motivated by discrimination or personal conflict.

Workplace harassment may therefore occur whenever an individual engages in actions, comments, or behaviours that intentionally or unintentionally create discomfort, fear, embarrassment, or emotional distress for another employee. Obi, Ewurum, and Obi (2021), together with Solomon et al. (2024), explain that perpetrators frequently target victims based on their demographic characteristics or perceived vulnerabilities with the intention of intimidating, humiliating, or excluding them from the workplace community. Such behaviours diminish employees' confidence and reduce their willingness to participate fully in organisational activities. Various forms of workplace harassment have been documented in organisational settings. Nwosu and Lizochukwu (2022) identified several common manifestations within Nigerian corporate organisations, including verbal harassment involving insults and abusive language; physical intimidation such as blocking movement or invading employees' personal space; social isolation through exclusion from meetings and workplace activities; professional sabotage involving the withholding of resources or the assignment of unrealistic deadlines; cyber harassment conducted through emails, messaging platforms, or social media; and status-based harassment targeting employees because of their gender, ethnicity, religion, or other personal characteristics. These behaviours create unhealthy work environments characterised by fear, mistrust, and reduced collaboration.

Gender-based harassment remains one of the most frequently reported forms of workplace harassment. Adeniji et al. (2020) observed that although incidents of gender-based harassment occur across many workplaces, numerous cases remain unreported because victims fear retaliation, victimisation, or damage to their professional

reputation. Cultural beliefs and organisational norms may also discourage employees from reporting harassment, thereby allowing inappropriate behaviours to persist unchecked. The underreporting of harassment makes it difficult for organisations to assess its true magnitude and implement effective preventive measures. The consequences of workplace harassment are extensive and affect both employees and organisations. Persistent exposure to harassment often results in emotional distress, anxiety, reduced self-esteem, psychological trauma, declining job satisfaction, and diminished organisational commitment. According to Ogunbade (2021) and Adebayo et al. (2022), employees who experience harassment are more likely to exhibit increased absenteeism, reduced productivity, poor interpersonal relationships, and greater intentions to leave their organisations. At the organisational level, workplace harassment weakens employee morale, disrupts teamwork, reduces service quality, increases staff turnover, and may expose organisations to costly legal actions and reputational damage. Consequently, organisations that promote respect, fairness, inclusiveness, and effective grievance management are better positioned to foster healthy work environments that support employee well-being and organisational performance.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a descriptive survey research design to investigate the work ethic and behaviour of staff in the Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board (HMB) and to determine how these influence service delivery. The target population consisted of employees of the Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board, from which a representative sample was selected using an appropriate sampling technique to ensure adequate representation of the study population. Data for the study were obtained primarily through a structured questionnaire developed in line with the objectives of the research. The instrument was designed to collect information on the prevalent behavioural patterns among staff, the factors influencing employees' work ethic and workplace behaviour, the effects of staff work ethic and behaviour on patient care and hospital performance, and the various dimensions of work ethic demonstrated by employees of the Board. Following data collection, the completed questionnaires were coded, entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), and analysed using descriptive statistical methods. Frequency distributions, percentages, mean scores, and standard deviations were employed to summarise the responses and provide a clear interpretation of the findings in relation to the study objectives.

RESULT, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Descriptive Statistics Result

Staff Behavior in the Workplace

Descriptive Statistics				
N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation

Staff communicate politely with patients and relatives	53	1.00	4.00	1.9434	.84159
Staff obey rules, regulations, and instructions from supervisors	53	1.00	4.00	2.0000	.94054
Staff engage in conflicts or quarrels with colleagues	53	1.00	4.00	2.4717	1.15365
Staff show compassion and empathy to patients	53	1.00	4.00	1.8868	.66968
Staff respond quickly to emergencies and critical cases	52	1.00	4.00	1.8462	.75107
Valid N (listwise)	52				

The descriptive statistics on staff behavior in the workplace indicated varying patterns of behavior among employees of the Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board. The results showed that staff generally demonstrated positive workplace behavior, as reflected in the low mean scores for communicating politely with patients and their relatives (Mean = 1.94, SD = 0.84), obeying rules, regulations, and instructions from supervisors (Mean = 2.00, SD = 0.94), showing compassion and empathy to patients (Mean = 1.89, SD = 0.67), and responding quickly to emergencies and critical cases (Mean = 1.85, SD = 0.75). These relatively low mean values suggested that respondents largely agreed that these desirable behaviors were commonly exhibited by staff. The standard deviation values, all below 1.00 except for one item, indicated that respondents' opinions were fairly consistent regarding these positive behavioral attributes.

However, the statement that staff engaged in conflicts or quarrels with colleagues recorded the highest mean score (Mean = 2.47, SD = 1.15), indicating that respondents were less likely to agree that such negative behavior was common among staff. The higher standard deviation for this item suggested greater variation in respondents' opinions, implying that experiences or observations of workplace conflicts differed across respondents.

Factors influencing work ethic and behavior

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The leadership style of hospital management influences staff attitude	52	1.00	5.00	1.8462	.84910
Poor working conditions discourage staff from putting in their best	51	1.00	5.00	1.7059	.67213
Regular training improves staff skills and attitude to work	53	1.00	5.00	1.6038	.68891
Supervision and monitoring reduce lateness and negligence	53	1.00	5.00	2.1509	.94861

Organizational culture of accountability promotes discipline	53	1.00	5.00	2.1887	1.09292
Valid N (listwise)	51				

The descriptive statistics on the factors influencing staff work ethic and behavior revealed that respondents generally agreed that several organizational factors played an important role in shaping employees' attitudes and conduct within the Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board. The results showed that regular training improved staff skills and attitude to work (Mean = 1.60, SD = 0.69), making it the most highly rated factor influencing work ethic and behavior. Similarly, respondents agreed that poor working conditions discouraged staff from putting in their best (Mean = 1.71, SD = 0.67) and that the leadership style of hospital management influenced staff attitude (Mean = 1.85, SD = 0.85). The relatively low mean scores for these variables indicated a high level of agreement among respondents, while the low standard deviation values suggested that their opinions were fairly consistent.

Furthermore, respondents agreed that supervision and monitoring reduced lateness and negligence (Mean = 2.15, SD = 0.95) and that an organizational culture of accountability promoted discipline (Mean = 2.19, SD = 1.09). Although these items recorded slightly higher mean scores than the others, they still reflected agreement that effective supervision and a culture of accountability positively influenced staff work ethic and behavior. The relatively higher standard deviation for the organizational culture of accountability indicated greater variation in respondents' views compared to the other factors.

Impact of work Ethic and behavior on performance

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Good staff behaviour improves patient satisfaction	51	1.00	5.00	1.6863	.90532
Poor work ethics lead to medical errors and negligence	52	1.00	5.00	1.9038	.93431
Discipline among staff increases hospital productivity	52	1.00	5.00	1.9231	.98710
Teamwork among staff improves the quality of healthcare delivery	52	1.00	5.00	1.5577	.72527
Overall, staff work ethics and behaviour affect the reputation of the hospital	51	1.00	5.00	1.9020	1.10009
Valid N (listwise)	51				

The descriptive statistics on the impact of staff work ethic and behavior on performance indicated that respondents generally agreed that employees' conduct had a significant influence on service delivery and overall hospital performance in the Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board. The findings revealed that teamwork among staff improved the quality of healthcare delivery (Mean = 1.56, SD = 0.73), making it the most strongly supported statement. Respondents also agreed that good staff behavior improved patient satisfaction (Mean = 1.69, SD = 0.91), while poor work ethics led to medical errors and negligence (Mean = 1.90, SD = 0.93). The low mean scores for these items suggested a high level of agreement, and the relatively low standard deviation values indicated that respondents held similar views regarding the influence of staff behavior on healthcare outcomes. The results further showed that discipline among staff increased hospital productivity (Mean = 1.92, SD = 0.99) and that overall staff work ethic and behavior affected the reputation of the hospital (Mean = 1.90, SD = 1.10). Although the latter recorded the highest standard deviation, indicating slightly more variation in respondents' opinions, the mean score still reflected general agreement with the statement.

Work Ethic Dimension

	Descriptive Statistics				
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Staff are diligent and pay attention to details	51	1.00	4.00	1.9412	.64535
Staff show honesty and integrity in handling hospital resources	51	1.00	3.00	1.8039	.66392
Staff take responsibility for their actions and mistakes	51	1.00	4.00	2.5686	1.08176
Staff avoid wasting time and stay focused during work hours	42	1.00	5.00	2.1667	.76243
Staff maintain the confidentiality of patient information	51	1.00	3.00	1.6863	.58276
Valid N (listwise)	42				

The descriptive statistics on the dimensions of staff work ethic revealed that respondents generally perceived employees of the Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board as demonstrating positive work ethic in several important areas. The findings showed that staff maintained confidentiality of patient information (Mean = 1.69, SD = 0.58), making it the highest-rated work ethic dimension. Respondents also agreed that staff showed honesty and integrity in handling hospital resources (Mean = 1.80, SD = 0.66) and were diligent and paid attention to details in carrying out their duties (Mean = 1.94, SD = 0.65). These relatively low mean scores indicated a high level of agreement among respondents, while the low standard deviation values suggested consistency in their opinions regarding these positive work ethic attributes.

The results further indicated that staff avoided wasting time and remained focused during work hours (Mean = 2.17, SD = 0.76), reflecting general agreement that employees

exhibited time-conscious behavior. However, the statement that staff took responsibility for their actions and mistakes recorded the highest mean score (Mean = 2.57, SD = 1.08), suggesting comparatively weaker agreement and greater variation in respondents' views. This implies that accountability may not have been demonstrated as consistently as the other dimensions of work ethic.

Implications of the Findings

The findings of this study provide important insights for healthcare administration and service delivery within the Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board (HMB). The results revealed that healthcare personnel generally displayed desirable workplace behaviours, including courtesy toward patients, compliance with organisational regulations, empathy, teamwork, and prompt responses to emergencies. These positive behavioural attributes suggest that ethical conduct among healthcare workers contributes significantly to the delivery of patient-centred healthcare services. When healthcare professionals demonstrate professionalism and compassion, patients are more likely to develop confidence in public healthcare institutions, resulting in improved satisfaction with the services received. This finding corroborates earlier studies, which established that ethical employee behaviour enhances patient satisfaction, promotes organisational efficiency, and improves the quality of healthcare delivery. Furthermore, the relatively low incidence of workplace conflicts observed in the study indicates that cordial interpersonal relationships among healthcare workers strengthen collaboration, facilitate effective communication, and promote efficient healthcare service delivery.

The study further established that organisational factors, including leadership style, favourable working conditions, regular staff development programmes, effective supervision, and a culture that promotes accountability, significantly influence employees' work ethic and workplace behaviour. This finding suggests that ethical conduct among healthcare workers is largely determined by the organisational environment rather than individual characteristics alone. Healthcare institutions that provide supportive leadership, conducive working environments, continuous professional development opportunities, and effective monitoring systems are more likely to develop disciplined, motivated, and committed employees. The finding supports organisational behaviour theories, which maintain that leadership practices and workplace conditions have substantial effects on employees' attitudes, ethical conduct, and job performance. It also agrees with previous empirical studies, which reported that transformational leadership, supportive supervision, and continuous staff training improve employee commitment, strengthen ethical behaviour, and enhance organisational productivity, whereas poor working conditions diminish employee motivation and performance. Consequently, strengthening organisational support systems is likely to improve staff work ethic and contribute to better healthcare outcomes within the Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board.

In addition, the study revealed that positive work ethics and professional behaviour contributed to increased patient satisfaction, stronger teamwork, improved hospital productivity, fewer medical errors, and enhanced institutional reputation. However, the

findings also indicated that employees' willingness to accept responsibility for their actions and mistakes recorded a comparatively lower level than other dimensions of work ethic. This suggests that accountability remains an area requiring further attention despite the generally high levels of diligence, honesty, integrity, confidentiality, and commitment demonstrated by staff. The finding is consistent with previous studies, which identified accountability as a major determinant of organisational effectiveness and quality healthcare delivery. Existing literature further indicates that healthcare organisations characterised by strong ethical cultures, transparency, and responsibility experience fewer clinical mistakes, higher levels of patient confidence, and superior institutional performance. Therefore, strengthening accountability through regular performance appraisal, effective enforcement of ethical standards, and continuous professional development would further improve service delivery and enhance the overall effectiveness of the Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board.

Conclusion

Based on the findings, the study concludes that staff work ethic and workplace behaviour exert a significant influence on service delivery in the Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board. The results demonstrated that employees generally exhibited positive professional behaviours, including adherence to organisational regulations, empathy toward patients, professionalism, effective communication, and teamwork. These attributes contributed to improved patient satisfaction, increased organisational productivity, and enhanced quality of healthcare services.

The study further concludes that organisational factors such as effective leadership, conducive working conditions, continuous staff training, supportive supervision, and a culture of accountability play critical roles in shaping employees' ethical conduct and workplace behaviour. Although healthcare workers displayed commendable levels of diligence, honesty, integrity, confidentiality, and commitment to duty, the study identified personal accountability for mistakes and professional responsibilities as an aspect requiring further strengthening. Enhancing accountability alongside other ethical values will further improve staff performance and healthcare service delivery within the Hospital Management Board.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. The Bayelsa State Hospital Management Board should strengthen ethical workplace behaviour by organising regular orientation programmes, ethics workshops, and professional development activities that promote professionalism, empathy, effective communication, teamwork, and strict compliance with organisational policies.
2. The Hospital Management Board should enhance organisational support systems by providing conducive working conditions, adopting participatory and supportive

leadership styles, implementing continuous staff training programmes, and strengthening supervisory and monitoring mechanisms to improve employees' work ethic and motivation.

3. The Board should reinforce accountability and ethical compliance through regular performance evaluations, effective monitoring of professional conduct, transparent disciplinary procedures, and clearly defined performance expectations.
4. The Hospital Management Board should institutionalise work ethic development by integrating essential ethical values such as diligence, honesty, integrity, confidentiality, accountability, responsibility, punctuality, and effective time management into staff orientation programmes, performance appraisal systems, promotion criteria, and continuing professional development initiatives.

References

1. Adebayo, O. A., Oluwatoyin, F. E., & Kingsley, A. M. (2022). Patterns of workplace toxicity in Nigerian healthcare organizations: Implications for patient outcomes and professional retention. *Journal of Nigerian Management Studies*, 17(3), 129-146.
2. Adebayo, S. O., & Ogunsina, S. O. (2020). Workplace ostracism and job performance among health workers in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology in Africa*, 4(1), 61-78.
3. Adeniji, M. A., Akinnusi, D. M., & Falola, H. O. (2020). Workplace gender-based harassment in Nigerian financial institutions. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 35(6), 567-584.
4. Alexander, C. S., & Sysko, J. M. (2013). I'm Gen Y, I love feeling entitled, and it shows. *Academy of Educational Leadership*, 17(4), 127-131.
5. Bartlett, J. E., & Bartlett, M. E. (2021). Workplace bullying and the impact on employee performance: A comprehensive review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(12), 6532. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18126532>
6. Branch, S., & Murray, J. (2021). *Workplace bullying: New directions*.
7. Chasovschi, C. (2016). Perspectives on work ethic: An intercultural approach. *The USV Annals of Economics and Public Administration*, 16, 93-98.
8. Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (2011). *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice*. CRC Press.
9. Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (2020). *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Theory, research and practice* (3rd ed.). CRC Press.
10. Ferris, D. L., Chen, M., & Lim, S. (2017). Comparing and contrasting workplace ostracism and incivility. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behaviour*, 4, 315-338.
11. Gardner, D., O'Driscoll, M., Cooper-Thomas, H. D., Roche, M., Bentley, T., Catley, B., Teo, S. T., & Trenberth, L. (2016). Predictors of workplace bullying and cyber-bullying in New Zealand. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 13(5), 448. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph13050448>
12. Goldstein, B., & Eichhorn, R. (1961). The changing Protestant ethic: Rural patterns in health, work and leisure. *American Sociological Review*, 26, 557-565.
13. Hershatter, A., & Epstein, M. (2010). Millennials and the world of work: An organization and management perspective. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), 211-223.
14. Hill, R., & Fouts, S. (2005). Work ethic and employment status: A study of job seekers. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, 42(3), 48-64.
15. Hobart, B., & Sendek, H. (2014). *Gen Y Now: Millennials and the Evolution of Leadership*. California: Wiley.

16. Ibrahim, R., & Olaleye, B. R. (2025). Relationship between workplace ostracism and job productivity: The mediating effect of emotional exhaustion and lack of motivation. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, 17(1), 190-211. <https://doi.org/10.1108/APJBA-08-2023-0408>.
17. Jones, E. E., & Kelly, J. R. (2018). Nonverbal behaviour and ostracism. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 24, 76-80.
18. Kowalski, R. M., Toth, A., & Morgan, M. (2018). Bullying and cyberbullying in adulthood and the workplace. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 158(1), 64-81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2017.1302402>.
19. Meriac, J. P., Woehr, D. J., Gorman, C. A., & Thomas, A. L. (2013). Development and validation of a short form for the multidimensional work ethic profile. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 82(3), 155-164.
20. Millennials in the workforce: Gen Y. workplace strategies for the next century. *e-Journal of Social & Behavioral Research in Business*, 5(1), 1-12.
21. Miller, M. J., Woehr, D. J., & Hudspeth, N. (2001). The meaning and measurement of work ethic: Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional inventory. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 17(5), 1-39.
22. Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2018). What we know, what we do not know, and what we should and could have known about workplace bullying. An overview of the literature and agenda for future research. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 42, 71-83.
23. Nwachukwu, C. E., & Chikwendu, D. U. (2019). Dimensions of workplace toxicity and their effects on employee retention in Nigerian financial institutions. *African Journal of Management Research*, 27(3), 215-234.
24. Nwankwo, C. E. (2018). Toxic leadership behaviours in Nigerian financial institutions: Impact on employee wellbeing and organizational performance. *African Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 24(2), 87-105.
25. Nwosu, C. A. & Uzochukwu, O. C. (2022). Digital harassment in virtual workplaces: Experiences from Nigerian corporate organizations during the pandemic. *African Journal of Business Management*, 16(3), 125-142.
26. Ogungbade, T. K. (2021). Nepotism and favoritism as dimensions of workplace toxicity: Evidence from Nigerian public service organizations. *International Journal of Public Administration and Management*, 9(1), 42-61.
27. Okonkwo, P. I., & Ezech, L. N. (2019). Workplace bullying and organizational culture: A study of Nigerian telecommunications companies. *Lagos Business Review*, 6(2), 214-232.
28. Pilch, I., & Turska, E. (2017). Psychological contract breach and workplace bullying: The mediating role of organizational cynicism and the moderating role of employees' power. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1-12.
29. Reknes, I., Notelaers, G., Magerøy, N., Pallesen, S., Bjorvam, B., Mon, B. E., & Einarsen, S. V. (2019). Aggression from patients or next of kin and exposure to bullying behaviours. A conglomerate experience? *Nursing Research and Practice*, 2019, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/1542016>.
30. Riva, P., & Eck, J. (2016). *Social exclusion: Psychological approaches to understanding and reducing its impact*. Springer.
31. Salin, D. (2021). The prevention of workplace bullying through policies and procedures: An overview. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 170(2), 245-258.
32. Scott, K. L., et al. (2017). Co-worker exclusion and employee outcomes. *Journal of Management Studies*, 54(8), 1254-1279.
33. Solomon, S. T., Chidi, O. F., & Fabian, A. A. (2024). Organizational mobbing behaviour and employee performance in Nigerian universities in Anambra state. *International Journal of Business and Management Research*, 5(1), 409-429.
34. Waldeck, D. (2018). Resilience to ostracism. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(12), 2936-2954.
35. Wollack, S., Goodale, J. G., Wijting, J. P., & Smith, P. C. (1971). Development of the Survey of Work Values. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 55(4), 331-338.



© 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>).