Original Research

Examination of the Social Factors Affecting the Employees' Ethical Behavior in Jahrom University of Medical Sciences

Fatemeh Honarmand Jahromy[1], Seyed Abdolali Mosavat Jahromy[1]*

1. Research center for social Determinants of Health, Jahrom University of Medical Sciences, Jahrom, Iran.

Corresponding Author: Seyed Abdolali Mosavat Jahromy. Research center for social Determinants of Health, Jahrom University of Medical Sciences, Jahrom, Iran. Email: mosavatjahromyseyedabdolali@gmail.com. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9377-3576.

Abstract

Introduction: Humans have specific moral attributes in their individuals and personality aspects shaping their thoughts, speech, and behaviors. The purpose of the study was to examine the social factors affecting employees' ethical behavior (EEB) in Jahrom University of Medical Sciences.

Methods: The study was applied. The population was 298 employees and personnel of Jahrom University of Medical Sciences. The sampling method was simple random sampling. Data collection tool was a demographic questionnaire and employees' ethical behavior questionnaire. Data analysis was done using descriptive and inferential statistical tests at the significance level $p<0.05$.

Results: The results showed that effective variables could predict the changes in EEB with 0.571%a coefficient of determination. Moreover, inappropriate working conditions with a beta of -0.161%, customer misbehavior with a beta of -0.114%, proper performance of managers with a beta of 0.190% and work history with a beta of 0.419% affect EEB. Work history with a beta of 0.419% had the highest effect and customer misbehavior with beta of 0.114% had the least effect on EEB.

Conclusion: The proper performance of managers and work history directly affect EEB and the employees' behavior is affected by management behavior.

Keywords: Ethical Behavior, employees, Jahrom University of Medical Sciences.

Submitted: 12 Nov 2020, Revised: 18 Dec 2020, Accepted: 28 Dec 2020

[Downloaded from mail.intjmi.com on 2026-11-21]

[DOR: 20.1001.1.23222913.2020.9.4.2.5]

Introduction

The organizations face the increasing speed, intensity and depth in both internal and external conditions nowadays. Matching the goals of the organization, employees' views, managers' attitudes, strategies, and activities are among the most significant factors in the development of societies. As human resources shape the base of the nation wealth, are the active agents accumulating capitals, exploit natural resources, found social, economic, and political organizations, and advance the national development, it is obvious that a country unable to develop popular skills and knowledge and to exploit them in the national economy effectively cannot develop anything else (1). Examining the individual behavior in the work environment has attracted the researchers' attention greatly over the past decade. The work environment is the arena to employ

the behaviors that have significant implications for individuals, organizations and community. Some of these behaviors are aiding or civic with social utility. These behaviors are valuable and useful ones the individuals undertake arbitrarily and voluntarily, whereas some others are seen as inappropriate or deviant harmful to organizations. These behaviors affect both organizational performance and personal relationships (2). In organizations behavior analysis, dealing with ethics and ethical values is of the basic needs. Ethical behaviors shape the external face of the organizations, as the result of a variety of ethical values emerged in the organization (3). In the current situation, when non-observance of certain ethical standards has led to financial corruption and many concerns in the governmental and non-governmental sectors, attention to ethics is the main way out of this crisis (4). If there is ethical behavior in an organization, the human resources of that organization will remain loyal to the organizational values. Moreover, they will do their best to work beyond their assigned task. Creativity and innovation, quality improvement, corruption and power-abuse prevention are of other effects of ethical behavior in the organization (5). The role of ethical behavior is decisive in the functions, behaviors, decisions, and relationships (6). While maintaining the profitability and efficiency of the organization, attention to ethical behavior can bring about the attract customers' trust and satisfaction (7). On the other hand, unethical behavior lead to a reduction in communications, and the organization power is devoted to rumors, gossip, and slacking rather than target (8). Unfortunately, weakness in professional ethics is a major social problem slowing down the economic development of Iran, as the results of research by experts show that work capacity decreases dramatically and the sense of responsibility wanes when the professional ethics is weak. Thus, the weakness of professional culture and ethics in society has to be considered as a socioeconomic issue and scientific studies have to be done to better identify the status quo in terms of professional ethics and culture and the factors affecting it (9). The present study is conducted to examine the barriers and problems in the University of Medical Sciences workplace to create a more suitable working environment for the employees, so that they work healthier and more stress-free employees, and people are satisfied with their work.

Methods

The study was applied. The population was 298 employees and personnel of Jahrom University of Medical Sciences. The sampling method was simple random sampling. Data collection tool was a demographic questionnaire and employees' ethical behavior questionnaire. The questionnaire has 25 questions on the factors affecting EEB in Jahrom University of Medical Sciences. The items of the questionnaires were people's consciousness, poor working conditions and environment, lack of welfare facilities, customer misbehavior, and proper performance of managers. The reliability of the questionnaire for the following items was: unsatisfactory working conditions (73%), lack of welfare facilities (75%), customer misbehavior (74%), proper performance of managers (73%) and EEB (74%). Overall questionnaire Cronbach's alpha was 77%. The data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Frequency distribution table and graphs

[Downloaded from mail.intjmi.com on 2026-11-21]

[DOR: 20.1001.1.23222913.2020.9.4.2.5]

were used in descriptive analysis along inferential tests in SPSS21.

Results

Thirty one point two percent of the respondents were 20-35 years of age, 47% were 36-45, and 17.8% were 46 and older - 4% of the respondents did not answer this question (Table 1).

Work history of 7.9% of the employees was less than 5 years, 21.1% was 5-10 years, 27.9% was 10-15 years, 31.5% was 15-20 years, and 9.4% had work history employees more than 20 years, showing that most employees have work history of 15-20 years.

Concerning education, 12.8% had sub-diploma, 17.8% high school diploma and associate's degrees, 36.6% had bachelor's degree, 20.8% master's degree, and 12.1% PhD, showing that most of the employees had bachelor's degree.

The salary of 10.7% of the employees and personnel was less than 800 thousand tomans, 18.5% from 801 thousand to 1000000 tomans, 26.2% from 1100000 to 1500000 tomans, 34.2% from 1600000 to 2000000 tomans and the salary of 10.4% of the employees and personnel was from 2100000 and more, with the highest frequency of salary ranging from 1600000 to 2000000 tomans.

Regarding EEB, 40.6% of the respondents responded as "fully agree," 5% "agree," 20.8% "I have no idea," 22.8% "I disagree" and 10.7% "fully disagree." Most respondents have responded "fully agree."

Regarding EEB, 35.9% of the respondents responded as "fully agree," 11.4% "agree," 14.8 "I have no idea," 25.8% "I disagree" and 12.1% "fully disagree." Most respondents have responded "fully agree."

Regarding EEB, 38.6% of the respondents responded as "fully agree," 12.1% "agree," 16.1 "I have no idea," 22.8% "I disagree" and 10.4% "fully disagree." Most respondents have responded "fully agree."

Regarding EEB, 35.2% of the respondents responded as "fully agree," 12.8% "agree," 13.4 "I have no idea," 27.2% "I disagree" and 11.1% "fully disagree." Most respondents have responded "fully agree."

Regarding the items related to proper performance of managers, 51.7% of the respondents responded as "fully agree," 12.8% "agree," 23.8 "I have no idea," 9.4% "I disagree" and 2.3% "fully disagree." Most respondents have responded "fully agree."

According to the results of variance analysis, there is no significant difference between low salaries and EEB. Thus, the above hypothesis is not confirmed (Table 2).

Pearson correlation coefficient showed a negative, inverse and significant relationship between the poor working conditions and EEB: considering the correlation coefficient -0.492** (Table 3).

Pearson correlation coefficient showed no significant relationships between lack of welfare facilities and EEB (Table 4).

Pearson correlation coefficient showed a negative inverse relationship between customer misbehavior and EEB: a significant negative-inverse relationship considering correlation coefficient of -0.300** (Table 5).

Pearson correlation coefficient showed a positive and direct relationship between proper performance of managers and EEB, considering a correlation coefficient of -0.228** (Table 6).

One-way analysis of variance showed a significant difference between the work experience and EEB at 99% confidence level (Table 7).

[Downloaded from mail.intjmi.com on 2026-11-21]

[DOR: 20.1001.1.23222913.2020.9.4.2.5]

Regression analysis showed that the inappropriate working condition with a beta of -0.161%, customer misbehavior with -0.114%, proper performance of managers with 0.190 % and a work history with a beta of 0.419 affect EEB. Work history with a beta of 0.419% had the most effect and customer misbehavior with a beta of -0.115% had the least effect on EEB (Table 8).

Discussion

Any organization growth and development largely depend on the growth and development of its human resources and their proper use. One of the issues attracting the attention of researchers in this field is EEB, as the behavior of employees is connected with organizations or other issues like profession, family, direct supervisor, religion, and so on. Managers try to control their employees on a variety of issues and the idea of managers is that when a person is hired in an organization, they must accept all the requirements of that organization and be committed to it.

In the relationship between low salary and EEB, one-way analysis of variance test showed that the relationship between two variables was insignificant. In other words, there is no significant difference between the means, meaning that these low salaries do not affect the behavior of the employees. The results of testing this hypothesis are inconsistent with the results of Saeed Moidfar (10).

The results of the study regarding the relationship between inappropriate working conditions and EEB using Pearson correlation coefficient showed that the relationship between the two variables is inverse and negative, meaning that as the conditions of work are inappropriate, EEB decreases. The results of this study are inconsistent with the results of Behnam Kavian (11).

The results of the study showed a significant relationship between the lack of welfare facilities and EEB using Pearson correlation coefficient, meaning that lack of welfare facilities does not affect EEB. The results are in line with those of Behnam Kavian and Saeed Moidfar (10-11).

The results obtained from the results of this study showed an inverse and negative relationship between customer misbehavior and EEB using Pearson correlation coefficient; i.e., as the customer's behavior becomes inappropriate, EEB decreases. The results are in line with those of Georges Anderla (12).

The results of this study showed a direct and positive relationship between proper performance of managers and EEB using Pearson correlation coefficient, which is significant. This means that that the better the proper performance of the managers, so will EEB. The results of this study are in line with those of Hegreti and Sims.

The results showed a significant relationship between work history and EEB using one-way analysis of variance. In other words, there is a significant difference between the means, showing that this work history affects EEB. The results of the study are in line with those of Kersy and Moore (13).

The results showed that the relationship between educational level and EEB, using one-way analysis of variance, was insignificant. In other words, there is no significant difference between the means, meaning that educational level does not affect EEB. The results of this study are in line with those of Posner and Schmidt.

Conclusion

[Downloaded from mail.intjmi.com on 2026-11-21]

[DOR: 20.1001.1.23222913.2020.9.4.2.5]

The results of the study showed that proper performance of managers and work history directly affect EEB, and employees' behavior is affected by management behavior. Furthermore, regarding inappropriate work conditions, customer misbehavior affects EEB and is inversely related to EEB.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank the Clinical Research Development Unit of Peymanieh Educational and Research and Therapeutic Center of Jahrom University of Medical Sciences for providing facilities to this work.

References:

1. Harbinson, N. Fredrick, H (1973), Human Resources as the Wealth of Nation, York University Press, New York.
2. Abbasi Rostami N, Rahimi A, Naeini SH, Ahmadi Z. Investigating the Effect of Ethical Leadership on Volunteer Behaviors of Employees of the Agricultural Jahad Department of Isfahan Province. Journal of Strategic management researches.2018; 23(67): 95-121(In Persian).
3. Tavalaeai R. Factors Affecting Ethical Behaviors of Employees in the Organization. Human Development Police Monthly. 2010; 25(6):45-64. (In Persian).
4. Beikzad J. Hosseinpour A,Sadeghi M. Ethics. Journal of Work and community. 2011; 125-126:4-10. (In Persian).
5. Ghanbari M, Bagheribaghan F, Teymoorzadeh V. (2015). The relationship between organizational ethics and institutionalization of organizational citizenship behavior. Future of Management; 1(25): 115-124. (In Persian).
6. Alvani M. (1999). Necessity of organizational ethics Charter: A Comparative pattern in public administration. Administrative Change; 1(5): 50- 59. (In Persian).
7. Dadgar Y. (2006). Business Ethics in terms of economics and Islamic economics. Journal of Business; 2(10): 87-120. (In Persian).
8. Eydi H, Loghmani M, Sararoudi A. (2015). Predicting employee job satisfaction based on ethical behavior of administrators in Sports and Youth Affairs Kermanshah province. Journal of Sport Management and Motor Behavior; 0(11): 201-210. (In Persian).
9. Asadi H, Rad F, Alizadeh MB. Examining the work ethic with an emphasis on organizational factor. The journal of Sociology Studies. 2010; 2(5):29-44.
10. Moeidfar S. Work Ethics among State Office Employees of the Tehran Provincial Administration. Social Welfare. 2007; 6 (23):321-344.
11. Kavian B. Examining work ethics in public and private sectors. Journal of Tadbir. 2006; 48:45-165.
12. Anderel J. Translation by Mohammad Esmaeal Tavasoli. Business Ethics Journal management system.2003; 4(13):155-182.
13. Cressey, D. R. and Moore, C. A. (1983), Managerial Values and Corporate Codes of Ethics, California Management Review 25: 53-77

Table 1: Frequency distribution of employee age

[Downloaded from mail.intjmi.com on 2026-11-21]

[DOR: 20.1001.1.23222913.2020.9.4.2.5]

Age	Frequency	Frequency distribution
20-35 years	93	31.2
36-45 years	140	47
46 years and older	53	17.8
Sum	286	96
Unanswered	12	4
Total	298	100

Table 2: One-way analysis of variance between low salaries and EEB

Variable	Source of changes	Sum of squares	Degree of freedom	Mean square	statistic F	Sig.
Low salary	Inter-group	1.984	4	0.496	0.720	0.579
	Intra-group	201.948	293	0.689		
	Total	203.993	297			

Table 3: Pearson correlation coefficient table between inappropriate working conditions and EEB

Variable	Pearson Correlation	Correlation statistic
Inappropriate Working Conditions	Correlation Coefficient	-0.492**
	Sig.	0.000
	Frequency	298

Table 4: Pearson correlation coefficient table between lack of welfare facilities and EEB

Variable	Pearson Correlation	Correlation statistic
Lack of welfare facilities	Correlation Coefficient	0.077
	Sig.	0.184

[Downloaded from mail.intjmi.com on 2026-11-21]

[DOR: 20.1001.1.23222913.2020.9.4.2.5]

	Frequency	298

Table 5: Pearson correlation coefficient table between customer misbehavior and EEB

Variable	Pearson Correlation	Correlation statistic
Customer misbehavior	Correlation Coefficient	-0.300**
	Sig.	0.000
	Frequency	298

Table 6: Pearson correlation coefficient table between proper performance of managers and EEB

Variable	Pearson Correlation	Correlation statistic
Proper performance of managers	Correlation Coefficient	-0.228**
	Sig.	0.000
	Frequency	298

Table 7: One-way analysis of variance between employee's work history and EEB

Variable	**Source of changes**	**Sum of squares**	**Degree of freedom**	**Mean square**	**statistic F**	**Sig.**
Work history	Inter-group	31.521	5	6.304	3.524	0.004
	Intra-group	522.322	292	1.789		
	Total	553.842	297			

Table 8: Coefficients of regression analysis of independent variables and EEB

Independent variables	B	S.E	Beta	T value	Sig.
Constant value	0.608	0.709		0.857	0.392
Low salary	0.011	0.047	0.012	0.236	0.813
Improper work conditions	-0.236	0.077	0.161	-3.064	0.002
Lack of welfare facilities	0.054	0.059	0.045	0.912	0.362
Customer misbehavior	-0.106	0.047	-0.114	-2.244	0.026

[Downloaded from mail.intjmi.com on 2026-11-21]

[DOR: 20.1001.1.23222913.2020.9.4.2.5]

Proper performance of managers	0.179	0.049	0.190	3.627	0.000
Work history	0.390	0.048	0.419	8.119	0.000
Education	0.054	0.059	0.045	0.912	0.362

[Downloaded from mail.intjmi.com on 2026-11-21]

[DOR: 20.1001.1.23222913.2020.9.4.2.5]