Journal of Management Research, Entrepreneurship and Strategy
Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences,
University of Jos, P.M.B. 2084, Nigeria.
ISSN: 0189-1480 | Vol. 1, No. 1, 2026

WORKPLACE DIGNITY, UNETHICAL LEADERSHIP, PERFORMANCE PRESSURE, AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE IN JOS NORTH, NIGERIA

Andrew Gwaplai Daniel[1,*], Linus Jonathan Vem[1]
[1]University of Jos
***Corresponding author**: andrewgwap@gmail.com; +2348138981997; ORCID: 0000-0002-1825-0097
DOI: https://doi.org/10.xxxx/xxxx

Keywords:
workplace dignity, unethical leadership, performance pressure, employee performance, banking, Nigeria

Article History:
Received: 30 July 2026
Revised: 22 October 2026
Accepted: 25 October 2026
Published: 7 November 2026

Article Info:
Homepage:
https://jmres.org.ng
Volume: 1, No. 1, 2026
Pages: 361-372

ABSTRACT

This study examined associations among unethical leadership practices, performance pressure, perceived workplace dignity and self-reported employee performance among bank employees in Jos North, Plateau State, Nigeria. A quantitative cross-sectional analysis used 202 records and 44 questionnaire items. Descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, Pearson correlations, HC3-robust regression and bootstrap indirect-effect estimates were used. Workplace dignity had the strongest bivariate association with performance ($r = .640$, $p < .001$); performance pressure ($r = .305$, $p < .001$) and unethical leadership ($r = .179$, $p = .011$) also had positive bivariate associations. In the full regression model ($R^2 = .478$), dignity was positively associated with performance ($B = .464$, $p < .001$), unethical leadership had a positive conditional coefficient ($B = .238$, $p = .006$), and performance pressure was not significant ($B = .007$, $p = .943$). The positive conditional coefficient for unethical leadership should not be interpreted as beneficial: its indirect association through dignity was negative. Because the data are cross-sectional, the indirect estimates do not establish causal mediation. The findings identify workplace dignity as an important correlate of employee performance and support respectful leadership, fair treatment and balanced performance targets. Measurement provenance, sampling documentation and one demographic code require further verification.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Employee performance is central to organisational effectiveness because it reflects the behaviours and work outcomes through which employees contribute to organisational objectives. It includes more than the completion of assigned tasks: individual work performance has been discussed in terms of task performance, contextual performance, adaptive performance and counterproductive work behaviour (Koopmans et al., 2011). In banking, where employees handle customer relationships, financial information, service delivery and procedural controls, performance is relevant both to customer experience and to operational reliability.

Bank employees commonly work under measurable targets, managerial oversight and time constraints. Performance expectations can focus effort and clarify priorities, but pressure that is excessive or experienced as unfair may have different consequences from clear, challenging and achievable goals; research has also examined the ethical risks associated with performance pressure (Chen & Chen, 2023). Goal-setting theory emphasises that the effects of goals depend on factors including commitment, feedback, ability and task complexity (Locke & Latham, 2002). It is therefore inappropriate to assume that performance pressure must either improve or impair performance in every context.

Leadership behaviour may also shape the conditions in which employees work. Leaders influence resource allocation, communication, feedback, fairness and the treatment of employee concerns. Ethical leadership has been conceptualised as normatively appropriate conduct promoted through communication, reinforcement and decision-making (Brown et al., 2005). The present study focuses on perceived unethical leadership practices, including unfair decisions, inconsistent policy application, concealment of information and prioritisation of targets over ethical considerations. This construct should not be treated as identical to abusive supervision, which refers more narrowly to perceived sustained hostile verbal and non-verbal supervisory behaviour (Tepper, 2000).

Perceived workplace dignity concerns whether employees feel respected, valued and treated as persons whose views and worth matter. Thomas and Lucas (2019) developed and validated a Workplace Dignity Scale, underscoring dignity as a meaningful organisational experience. In principle, employees who experience respectful treatment may be more willing and able to contribute constructively. Conversely, unethical leadership may undermine dignity. Performance pressure may also shape dignity, although the direction and strength of this relationship are empirical questions.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Employee performance remains a critical concern for banks operating in competitive and regulated environments such as Jos North Local Government Area, Plateau State, Nigeria. Despite the centrality of performance to organisational effectiveness, the conditions under which bank employees experience pressure, leadership practices and dignity are not fully understood in this context. Performance targets can clarify priorities yet may also coincide with strain or compromised ethical judgement when experienced as excessive or unfair. Unethical leadership practices—unfair decisions, inconsistent policy application, concealment of information and prioritisation of targets over ethical considerations—may undermine the relational basis for constructive contribution. At the same time, perceived workplace dignity, the sense of being respected, valued and treated as a person whose views matter, has emerged as a meaningful organisational experience that may shape willingness and capacity to perform.

Existing literature has examined ethical leadership, performance pressure and dignity in various settings, yet empirical evidence that simultaneously models unethical leadership, performance pressure, workplace dignity and employee performance among bank employees in Jos North remains limited. In particular, the indirect statistical associations of unethical leadership and performance pressure with performance through dignity have received insufficient attention in this local context. The absence of such integrated analysis leaves managers without clear guidance on whether dignity functions as a key correlate that should be prioritised alongside targets and leadership conduct. This study therefore addresses the need for a coherent empirical examination of these associations using the available 202-record dataset attributed to bank employees in Jos North branches.

Research Questions

The main objective of this study is to examine the relationships among unethical leadership practices, performance pressure, perceived workplace dignity and employee performance among bank employees working in branches located in Jos North Local Government Area, Plateau State, Nigeria. The specific research questions are as follows:

i. What is the relationship between unethical leadership practices and employee performance among bank employees in Jos North Local Government?

ii. What is the relationship between performance pressure and employee performance among bank employees in Jos North Local Government?

iii. What is the relationship between unethical leadership practices and perceived workplace dignity among bank employees in Jos North Local Government?

iv. What is the relationship between performance pressure and perceived workplace dignity among bank employees in Jos North Local Government?

v. What is the role of perceived workplace dignity in the relationship between unethical leadership practices and employee performance among bank employees in Jos North Local Government?

vi. What is the role of perceived workplace dignity in the relationship between performance pressure and employee performance among bank employees in Jos North Local Government?

Research Objectives

I. To examine the relationship between unethical leadership practices and employee performance among bank employees in Jos North Local Government.

II. To examine the relationship between performance pressure and employee performance among bank employees in Jos North Local Government.

III. To examine the relationship between unethical leadership practices and perceived workplace dignity among bank employees in Jos North Local Government.

IV. To examine the relationship between performance pressure and perceived workplace dignity among bank employees in Jos North Local Government.

V. To examine the role of perceived workplace dignity in the relationship between unethical leadership practices and employee performance among bank employees in Jos North Local Government.

VI. To examine the role of perceived workplace dignity in the relationship between performance pressure and employee performance among bank employees in Jos North Local Government.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Conceptual Review

2.1.1 Employee Performance

Employee performance reflects the behaviours and work outcomes through which employees contribute to organisational objectives. It encompasses task performance, contextual performance, adaptive performance and the absence of counterproductive work behaviour (Koopmans et al., 2011). In banking, performance is

relevant both to customer experience and to operational reliability because employees handle customer relationships, financial information, service delivery and procedural controls.

2.1.2 Unethical Leadership Practices and Employee Performance

Unethical leadership practices include unfair decisions, inconsistent policy application, concealment of information and prioritisation of targets over ethical considerations. These practices differ from the narrower construct of abusive supervision, which refers to perceived sustained hostile verbal and non-verbal supervisory behaviour (Tepper, 2000). Ethical leadership has been conceptualised as normatively appropriate conduct promoted through communication, reinforcement and decision-making (Brown et al., 2005). The present study focuses on the opposite pole—perceived unethical leadership—and tests its association with employee performance.

H01: Unethical leadership practices are not significantly associated with employee performance.

2.1.3 Performance Pressure and Employee Performance

Performance pressure arises from measurable targets, managerial oversight and time constraints. Goal-setting theory proposes that specific and challenging goals can direct attention, mobilise effort and support persistence, subject to conditions such as goal commitment, feedback, ability and task complexity (Locke & Latham, 2002). Performance pressure is related to goal demands but is not synonymous with effective goal setting. Employees may report pressure alongside effort and performance, while the same pressure may be accompanied by strain or compromised ethical judgement (Chen & Chen, 2023). The current analysis therefore tests the observed association rather than presuming a negative effect.

H02: Performance pressure is not significantly associated with employee performance.

2.1.4 Unethical Leadership Practices and Perceived Workplace Dignity

Perceived workplace dignity concerns whether employees feel respected, valued and treated as persons whose views and worth matter (Thomas & Lucas, 2019). Unethical leadership may undermine dignity by signalling that employees are treated as means rather than ends. Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) suggests that perceived unfairness or unethical conduct may weaken the relational basis for reciprocal contribution.

H03: Unethical leadership practices are not significantly associated with perceived workplace dignity.

2.1.5 Performance Pressure and Perceived Workplace Dignity

Performance pressure may shape dignity, although the direction and strength of this relationship are empirical questions. Clear, achievable targets accompanied by constructive feedback may support dignity, whereas excessive or unfair pressure may erode it.

H04: Performance pressure is not significantly associated with perceived workplace dignity.

2.1.6 Mediating Role of Perceived Workplace Dignity

The proposed model positions unethical leadership practices and performance pressure as predictors, perceived workplace dignity as a mediator, and employee performance as the outcome. The indirect paths are evaluated using bootstrap confidence intervals. Given the cross-sectional data, indirect effects are interpreted as statistical decomposition of associations and not as proof of a temporal causal mechanism.

H05: Perceived workplace dignity does not mediate the relationship between unethical leadership practices and employee performance.

H06: Perceived workplace dignity does not mediate the relationship between performance pressure and employee performance.

2.2 Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework positions unethical leadership practices and performance pressure as independent variables, perceived workplace dignity as the mediating variable, and employee performance as the dependent variable. Direct paths run from unethical leadership and performance pressure to employee performance. Mediator paths run from each predictor to dignity and from dignity to performance. Indirect paths are assessed via bootstrap confidence intervals.



Sources: Adapted from the theoretical and empirical literature reviewed (Blau, 1964; Locke & Latham, 2002; Thomas & Lucas, 2019; Brown et al., 2005).

2.3 Theoretical Review

2.3.1 Social Exchange Theory

Social Exchange Theory, associated with Blau (1964), explains social relationships in terms of exchanges, obligations and responses to treatment received. In organisational settings, employees may respond to fair and respectful treatment with constructive attitudes and behaviours. Conversely, perceived unfairness or unethical conduct may weaken the relational basis for reciprocal contribution. This perspective supports examining whether unethical leadership is associated with workplace dignity and whether dignity is associated with employee performance. The theory offers an explanatory rationale; it does not establish that these relationships must appear in every sample.

2.3.2 Goal-Setting Theory

Goal-setting theory proposes that specific and challenging goals can direct attention, mobilise effort and support persistence, subject to conditions such as goal commitment, feedback, ability and task complexity (Locke & Latham, 2002). Performance pressure is related to goal demands but is not synonymous with effective goal setting. Employees may report pressure alongside effort and performance, while the same pressure may be accompanied by strain or compromised ethical judgement. The current analysis therefore tests the observed association rather than presuming a negative effect.

2.4 Empirical Review

Prior research has linked ethical leadership to positive employee outcomes and has examined the ethical risks of performance pressure (Chen & Chen, 2023). Workplace dignity has been validated as a meaningful

organisational construct (Thomas & Lucas, 2019). Studies of individual work performance have distinguished task, contextual, adaptive and counterproductive dimensions (Koopmans et al., 2011). However, integrated examinations of unethical leadership, performance pressure, dignity and performance among bank employees in Jos North remain scarce. The present study addresses this gap by analysing contemporaneous associations and indirect statistical paths through dignity.

2.5 Research Gap

Although employee performance, leadership behaviour and performance targets have been studied extensively, empirical evidence that simultaneously models unethical leadership practices, performance pressure, perceived workplace dignity and employee performance among bank employees in Jos North Local Government Area is limited. In particular, the indirect statistical associations of the predictors with performance through dignity have received insufficient local attention. Measurement provenance, sampling documentation and one demographic code in the available dataset also require further verification. This study therefore examines these associations using the supplied 202-record workbook while explicitly noting design and data limitations.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The study used a quantitative cross-sectional questionnaire design. The supplied workbook contains 202 records, six demographic fields, 44 substantive item-response fields and an optional open-ended comment. All 44 item fields were complete for all records. The workbook also contains administrative metadata; direct identifiers and potentially identifying fields should be removed from any public or shared analysis file. These data were analysed as supplied, without deleting records on the basis of repeated response patterns.

3.2 Population, Sampling and Generalisability

The intended population is bank employees working in branches located in Jos North Local Government Area, Plateau State, Nigeria. The researcher has previously confirmed that the responses were obtained from staff members in Jos North branches, but the workbook itself does not establish branch-level eligibility or provide a sampling frame. The achieved dataset contains 202 records. The number of eligible employees approached or invited, sampling and recruitment procedures, questionnaires distributed and returned, and branch-level population counts are not established by the workbook. Consequently, a defensible response rate and representativeness cannot be reported from the available file, and conclusions are restricted to associations among the analysed records.

3.3 Instrument and Measurement

The questionnaire contains 11 unethical-leadership items, nine workplace-dignity items, 11 performance-pressure items and 13 employee-performance items. The five response anchors were verified by matching the first 79 records in the numeric workbook to a separate text-form export using identical submission timestamps and identical responses on all 44 items: Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Undecided = 3, Agree = 4 and Strongly Agree = 5. The item wording is directionally consistent within each construct, so no reverse-scoring was applied. Construct scores are the arithmetic means of their assigned items. Demographic category mappings were recovered from the matched subset for categories observed there;

however, position code 5 occurs in seven of the 202 records and was not represented in that subset, so its label remains unresolved. This partial codebook verification should be documented before submission.

3.4 Method of Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics, Cronbach's alpha, Pearson correlations and OLS regression models were used. HC3 heteroscedasticity-consistent standard errors, p-values and 95% confidence intervals are reported for regression coefficients. The full performance model included unethical leadership, workplace dignity and performance pressure simultaneously. Separate two-predictor models estimated associations of unethical leadership and pressure with performance and dignity. Indirect statistical associations through dignity were estimated using 5,000 nonparametric bootstrap resamples (percentile 95% intervals; random seed 42), with the other predictor included as a covariate. These cross-sectional indirect effects are not interpreted as causal mediation. Exact duplicate patterns were assessed across the 44 substantive items: seven response patterns were repeated, involving 17 records. Repeated patterns were retained because they do not by themselves establish duplicate respondents; a sensitivity analysis excluding all flagged records is provided in the accompanying author audit note, not used as the primary analysis.

4.0 DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Respondent Profile and Descriptive Statistics

Table 1

Respondent Demographic Profile (N = 202)

Variable	Category	n	%
Gender	Male	110	54.5
	Female	90	44.6
	Prefer not to say	2	1.0
Age group	Below 25 years	49	24.3
	25-34 years	83	41.1
	35-44 years	50	24.8
	45-54 years	17	8.4
	55 years and above	3	1.5
Highest qualification	Secondary School Certificate	26	12.9
	OND/NCE	56	27.7
	HND/Bachelor's Degree	100	49.5
	Postgraduate Degree	15	7.4
	Other	5	2.5
Banking experience	Less than 1 year	48	23.8
	1-5 years	78	38.6
	6-10 years	50	24.8
	11-15 years	20	9.9

Variable	Category	n	%
	More than 15 years	6	3.0
Employment position	Junior/Entry Level	98	48.5
	Middle Level	62	30.7
	Senior Level	22	10.9
	Management	13	6.4
	Unmapped code 5	7	3.5
Employment type	Permanent/Regular	43	21.3
	Contract	144	71.3
	Other	15	7.4

Note. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Table 2

Construct Descriptive Statistics and Internal Consistency

Construct	Items	Mean	SD	Min	Max	α
Unethical leadership practices	11	3.773	0.907	1.000	5.000	.950
Perceived workplace dignity	9	3.287	1.203	1.000	5.000	.966
Performance pressure	11	3.928	0.824	1.364	5.000	.948
Employee performance	13	3.737	0.834	1.000	5.000	.945

Note. N = 202. α = Cronbach's alpha. SD = standard deviation.

Performance pressure had the highest mean (M = 3.93, SD = 0.82), followed by unethical leadership practices (M = 3.77, SD = 0.91), employee performance (M = 3.74, SD = 0.83) and perceived workplace dignity (M = 3.29, SD = 1.20). Internal consistency estimates ranged from .945 to .966. These alpha values indicate high internal consistency in this sample but do not establish factor structure or convergent/discriminant validity.

4.2 Correlation Analysis

Table 3

Pearson Correlation Matrix

Variable	1	2	3	4
1. Unethical leadership practices	—			
2. Workplace dignity	−.123	—		
3. Performance pressure	.385***	.296***	—	
4. Employee performance	.179*	.640***	.305***	—

Note. N = 202. *p < .05. ***p < .001.

Workplace dignity had the strongest bivariate association with employee performance (r = .640, p < .001). Performance pressure was positively associated with performance (r = .305, p < .001), as was unethical

leadership, though the association was smaller (r = .179, p = .011). Unethical leadership was negatively but not significantly correlated with dignity (r = −.123, p = .081). Performance pressure was positively associated with dignity (r = .296, p < .001), and unethical leadership was positively associated with pressure (r = .385, p < .001). These are contemporaneous associations and do not establish causal effects.

4.3 Regression and Hypothesis Testing

Table 4

Regression Models With HC3 Robust Inference

Outcome and predictor	B	HC3 SE	p	95% HC3 CI	R^2
Performance ← ULP (simple)	.165	.074	.027	[.019, .311]	.032
Performance ← Pressure (simple)	.309	.080	<.001	[.153, .465]	.093
Performance ← Dignity (simple)	.444	.046	<.001	[.353, .534]	.410
Performance ← ULP (joint w/ pressure)	.067	.086	.437	[−.101, .234]	.098
Performance ← Pressure (joint w/ ULP)	.281	.096	.004	[.092, .469]	.098
Dignity ← ULP (joint w/ pressure)	−.370	.086	<.001	[−.538, −.202]	.154
Dignity ← Pressure (joint w/ ULP)	.589	.093	<.001	[.407, .772]	.154
Performance ← ULP (full model)	.238	.087	.006	[.068, .409]	.478
Performance ← Dignity (full model)	.464	.044	<.001	[.378, .551]	.478
Performance ← Pressure (full model)	.007	.099	.943	[−.187, .202]	.478

Note. B = unstandardised regression coefficient; HC3 SE = heteroscedasticity-consistent standard error; CI = confidence interval. ULP = unethical leadership practices. Simple models include one predictor; joint models include unethical leadership and performance pressure; the full model includes all three predictors. R^2 is the conventional OLS coefficient of determination.

In the full performance model, workplace dignity remained positively associated with performance (B = .464, HC3 SE = .044, p < .001). Unethical leadership also had a positive conditional coefficient (B = .238, HC3 SE = .087, p = .006), while performance pressure was not significant (B = .007, HC3 SE = .099, p = .943). The full model explained 47.8% of performance variance (R^2 = .478; adjusted R^2 = .470). The HC3 robust joint Wald test was significant, F(3, 198) = 51.47, p < .001. As a screening sensitivity check, all 17 records belonging to repeated 44-item response patterns were excluded, leaving N = 185; the model R^2 was .474, dignity remained positively associated with performance (B = .477, HC3 SE = .046, p < .001), unethical leadership was borderline and not significant at the .05 level (B = .183, HC3 SE = .094, p = .051), and pressure remained non-significant (B = .026, HC3 SE = .109, p = .811). Because repeated response patterns do not prove duplicate respondents, this exclusion is a sensitivity check only and the primary analysis retains all 202 records. The positive conditional coefficient for unethical leadership in the primary model, alongside its negative adjusted association with dignity and negative indirect association through dignity, is compatible with a possible suppression or inconsistent-path pattern. It is not evidence that unethical leadership improves performance.

4.4 Mediation Analysis

Table 5

Bootstrap Indirect Statistical Associations Through Workplace Dignity

Indirect path	a path	b path	Indirect	95% CI	Sign
ULP → Dignity → Perf.	−.370	.464	−.172	[−.259, −.089]	Neg.
Pressure → Dignity → Perf.	.589	.464	.274	[.177, .380]	Pos.

Note. N = 202; 5,000 percentile bootstrap resamples with seed 42. Each mediation model adjusts for the other predictor. ULP = unethical leadership practices. Confidence intervals excluding zero indicate a nonzero indirect statistical association under the specified model, not causal mediation.

The estimated indirect association between unethical leadership and performance through dignity was negative (point estimate = −0.172; 95% percentile bootstrap CI [−0.259, −0.089]). The indirect association for performance pressure was positive (point estimate = 0.274; 95% CI [0.177, 0.380]). Because the data are cross-sectional, these estimates describe indirect statistical associations under the specified regression models and do not demonstrate causal mediation or temporal ordering.

4.5 Hypothesis Summary

Table 6

Summary of Hypotheses and Corresponding Evidence

Hypothesis	Evidence in current dataset	Decision phrasing
H01: ULP-performance	r = .179, p = .011; joint B = .067, p = .437; full B = .238, p = .006	Results depend on model; no single unqualified decision
H02: Pressure-performance	r = .305, p < .001; joint B = .281, p = .004; full B = .007, p = .943	Positive in two-predictor model; not in full model
H03: ULP-dignity	B = −.370, p < .001 (joint dignity model)	Evidence of negative adjusted association
H04: Pressure-dignity	B = .589, p < .001 (joint dignity model)	Evidence of positive adjusted association
H05: Dignity mediates ULP	Indirect = −.172; 95% CI [−.259, −.089]	Negative indirect statistical association; not causal
H06: Dignity mediates pressure	Indirect = .274; 95% CI [.177, .380]	Positive indirect statistical association; not causal

Note. ULP = unethical leadership practices. Decisions are phrased to reflect model dependence and the cross-sectional design.

5.0 DISCUSSION

The strongest bivariate finding in the 202-record dataset was the positive association between perceived workplace dignity and self-reported employee performance (r = .640; simple-model R^2 = .410). This supports the practical importance of respectful treatment, recognition and employee voice as relevant organisational concerns, but it does not establish that dignity causes higher performance. Both constructs were self-reported in one questionnaire at one time, so common-method and social-desirability influences cannot be excluded.

Performance pressure was positively associated with performance in the bivariate analysis and in the model that included unethical leadership. However, it was not significant in the full model that also included dignity (B = .007, HC3 SE = .099, p = .943). This distinction matters: the bivariate association does not show that increasing pressure will improve performance.

The results for unethical leadership demonstrate why coefficients must be interpreted in context. Its positive bivariate association with performance was small, and it was not statistically significant in the two-predictor model with pressure. In the full model including dignity, the adjusted coefficient became positive and statistically significant, although unethical leadership was negatively associated with dignity and had a negative indirect association through dignity. This pattern is compatible with suppression or inconsistent indirect/direct associations among correlated predictors. The positive conditional coefficient must not be interpreted as evidence that unethical leadership is beneficial.

Both bootstrap indirect associations had confidence intervals that excluded zero under the specified models, but their signs differed. Neither indirect association establishes temporal or causal mediation. The study's intended geographic scope is Jos North Local Government Area. The workbook does not independently verify eligibility or provide a branch-level sampling frame; therefore response rate and representativeness cannot be reported from the available files. Generalisation beyond the analysed respondents is not warranted.

6.0 PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

Bank managers should prioritise respectful leadership, fair and consistent treatment, transparent explanations for decisions, meaningful employee voice, recognition of contributions and confidential channels for raising concerns. These recommendations are consistent with responsible management practice and the observed dignity–performance association, although the cross-sectional design does not establish that any intervention will cause performance to rise.

Performance targets should be clear, achievable given staffing and resources, accompanied by constructive feedback, and reviewed for unintended consequences. Managers should not equate greater pressure with better performance. Balanced targets should protect ethical standards, service quality, employee wellbeing and long-term outcomes rather than reward short-term output alone.

Human-resource units should support supervisory training, fair grievance processes, confidential reporting, employee voice mechanisms and routine assessments that distinguish dignity from performance pressure. Performance monitoring should combine self-reports with supervisor assessments or objective indicators, where feasible, and guard against incentives that encourage rule-bending or unethical conduct.

7.0 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Several limitations qualify the findings. First, the cross-sectional design cannot establish temporal ordering or causal effects. Second, all focal constructs were self-reported in one questionnaire, so common-method variance and social-desirability bias are possible. Third, the workbook does not establish the branch-level sampling frame, recruitment procedure, number of eligible employees approached, or number of questionnaires distributed and returned. Fourth, the original questionnaire's verbal response anchors, scoring key and demographic codebook require verification. Fifth, high Cronbach's alpha values do not establish factor structure, convergent validity or discriminant validity. Sixth, seven identical response patterns were found across 17 records; these warrant transparent screening and sensitivity checks but are not proof of duplicate respondents. Finally, the cross-sectional indirect-effect analysis is not causal mediation and remains vulnerable to omitted-variable bias and measurement error. Future research should employ longitudinal designs, multi-source performance indicators, confirmed sampling frames and full construct-validation procedures.

8.0 CONCLUSION

Among the 202 analysed records attributed to bank employees working in branches located in Jos North LGA, perceived workplace dignity had the strongest positive bivariate association with self-reported employee performance. Performance pressure was positively associated with performance in bivariate and two-predictor analyses, but was not significant in the full model including dignity. Unethical leadership had a small positive bivariate association, was not significant in the two-predictor model, and had a positive conditional coefficient in the full model; this must not be interpreted as a beneficial effect. Its negative adjusted association with dignity and negative indirect association suggest a possible inconsistent-path pattern. The indirect association for pressure was positive, but its meaning requires caution. These are cross-sectional associations, not causal effects. Before submission, the administered questionnaire and scoring key, demographic codebook, sampling frame and recruitment records should be verified, and construct validity should be assessed. The analyses now report HC3 robust regression estimates, but these methodological checks remain important for a defensible submission.

REFERENCES

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. John Wiley & Sons.

Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97*(2), 117–134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002

Chen, M., & Chen, C. C. (2023). The moral dark side of performance pressure: How and when it affects unethical pro-organizational behavior. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 34*(7), 1359–1389. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2021.1991434

Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., Schaufeli, W. B., de Vet, H. C. W., & van der Beek, A. J. (2011). Conceptual frameworks of individual work performance: A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 53*(8), 856–866. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0b013e318226a763

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist, 57*(9), 705–717. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.57.9.705

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(2), 178–190. https://doi.org/10.2307/1556375

Thomas, B., & Lucas, K. (2019). Development and validation of the Workplace Dignity Scale. *Group & Organization Management, 44*(1), 72–111. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601118807784