

Effect of Negative Employee on work Place Environment

(تأثير الموظف السلبي على بيئة العمل)

Student/

Ghadah Ghassan Abbas

(243000809)

Supervision/

Dr.Alfaisal Abdelhameed Mohamed

Dr.Fayez Ali Jrad

Year :

2025

Introduction :

The work environment has a huge impact on how well employees perform, how engaged they feel, and the overall success of a company. A positive workplace keeps people motivated, encourages teamwork, and makes jobs more enjoyable, which leads to better results and less turnover. On the flip side, negativity in the workplace can throw everything off—lowering morale, creating tension, and hurting productivity. Employees with a negative attitude may constantly complain, resist change, treat others poorly, or simply check out from their work, all of which contribute to a toxic culture. Even worse, negativity can spread like wildfire, dragging down the whole team's mood and energy.

This study looks into how negative employees influence the workplace, affecting productivity, mental well-being, and company culture. It will dive into what causes workplace negativity—things like stress, bad leadership, lack of support, or feeling stuck in a job. It will also explore the long-term effects, such as higher turnover, increased stress, and lower company loyalty.

For businesses to thrive, they need to tackle workplace negativity head-on. By using smart HR practices, strong leadership, and better employee engagement programs, companies can reduce negativity and boost productivity. This study aims to give a clear picture of the problem and offer practical solutions to build a happier, more effective workplace.

Research Problem:

Having negative employees in a company can seriously impact productivity, teamwork, and overall job happiness. Negativity can show up in different ways—some people are passive-aggressive, constantly complain, lack motivation, or resist any kind of change. These behaviors can create tension, reduce teamwork, and make people less engaged in their work. If negativity sticks around for too long, it spreads across teams and drags down the entire organization's performance.

Studies show that working around negativity increases stress, emotional exhaustion, and burnout. Employees who deal with negative coworkers often feel unhappy with their jobs and may even start looking for new opportunities, leading to higher turnover. Plus, a negative work atmosphere stifles creativity and innovation because people don't feel comfortable taking risks or sharing new ideas when they're in an unsupportive or toxic environment.

Even though workplace negativity is a well-known issue, there's not a lot of research on how companies can effectively deal with it. This study aims to fill that gap by exploring how negativity affects workplace dynamics and identifying strategies that organizations can use to manage and reduce its impact.

Research Importance :

Figuring out how workplace negativity affects employees is super important for business leaders, HR teams, and decision-makers who want to create a positive and productive work environment. If companies ignore negativity, they risk lower employee morale, unhappy workers, and higher turnover—problems that can seriously hurt business success.

This research is significant for several reasons:

- 1-Enhancing Employee Well-being
- 2-Improving Organizational Performance
- 3-Guiding HR Strategies
- 4-Aligning with Sustainability Goal

Research Objectives:-

- To assess how workplace negativity affects employee morale and performance.
- To identify key sources of negativity in workplace settings.
- To evaluate the role of management in mitigating negative behaviors.
- To examine the link between workplace negativity and employee turnover.
- To propose strategies for fostering a positive workplace culture.

Research Questions:-

How does employee negativity influence workplace productivity?

What are the psychological effects of negative employees on their colleagues?

How can organizations effectively manage and mitigate workplace negativity?

Research Hypotheses:-

H1: Workplace negativity has a direct impact on employee job satisfaction.

H2: Increased exposure to negativity leads to reduced productivity.

H3: Effective HR strategies can reduce the adverse effects of workplace negativity.

H4: Negative employees contribute to higher turnover rates in organizations.

H5: Strong leadership and positive organizational culture can mitigate workplace negativity.

Summary of Previous Studies:

1. Causes of Workplace Negativity

1.1 Toxic Leadership – Studies indicate that authoritarian leadership, favoritism, and lack of support contribute to employee disengagement and job dissatisfaction (Ogbonda & Amadi, 2022). Leaders who fail to recognize employee contributions create an environment where frustration and resentment grow, increasing negative **workplace behaviors**.

1.2 Poor Communication – Eisenberger et al. (1986) found that lack of transparency and ineffective feedback mechanisms fuel workplace negativity, as employees feel undervalued and unappreciated.

1.3 Workplace Stressors – Hobfoll (1989) proposed the Conservation of Resources Theory, stating that employees who experience high job demands with minimal resources are more likely to exhibit frustration, disengagement, and reduced productivity.

2. Consequences of Workplace Negativity

2.1 Increased Turnover Rates – Studies by Harter et al. (2002) and Namin et al. (2021) found that workplace negativity leads to higher turnover rates, as employees seek healthier work environments.

2.2 Reduced Productivity – Employees experiencing chronic negativity tend to withdraw from tasks, avoid collaboration, and perform below their potential (Wright & Cropanzano, 2000).

2.3 Deterioration of Team Dynamics – Negative employees disrupt team cohesion, lower morale, and create a culture of distrust, affecting team effectiveness (Xanthopoulou et al., 2009).

3. Strategies for Mitigating Workplace Negativity

Research suggests that organizations can address workplace negativity through strategic interventions:

3.1 Leadership Development Programs – Training managers in emotional intelligence and conflict resolution can help create a more positive workplace culture (Goleman, 1998).

3.2 Employee Well-Being Initiatives – Implementing stress management programs, flexible work policies, and employee recognition systems can reduce negativity and improve engagement (Fredrickson, 2001).

3.3 Enhancing Psychological Safety – Organizations should encourage open communication, mentorship, and feedback mechanisms to strengthen employee trust and reduce negativity (Edmondson, 1999).

Key Theoretical Frameworks:

1. Social Contagion Theory

Social Contagion Theory explains how emotions, attitudes, and behaviors can spread among employees within an organization. According to Barsade (2002), negative emotions such as stress, frustration, and dissatisfaction can be contagious, influencing colleagues and creating a toxic work environment. This theory aligns with the concept of emotional contagion, which suggests that individuals unconsciously mimic the emotions and behaviors of those around them.

Studies have shown that workplace negativity can be amplified through social interactions. For example, Zapf and Einarsen (2005) found that exposure to hostile behaviors, gossip, and workplace incivility increases the likelihood of employees adopting similar negative behaviors, leading to a toxic cycle. Similarly, Namin, Øgaard, and Røislien (2021) demonstrated that negative peer interactions significantly contribute to workplace stress and lower overall job engagement.

Social Contagion Theory suggests that leaders and managers play a crucial role in either amplifying or mitigating negativity. If leaders exhibit negative behaviors such as micromanagement, lack of recognition, or unfair treatment, employees are likely to adopt similar attitudes, exacerbating workplace toxicity.

2. Psychological Safety Theory

Psychological Safety Theory, introduced by Edmondson (1999), refers to the extent to which employees feel safe expressing their thoughts, concerns, and emotions without fear of negative consequences. A lack of psychological safety often fosters negativity,

stress, and disengagement, leading employees to withdraw from team interactions and experience job dissatisfaction.

Several studies have linked low psychological safety to workplace negativity. Leiter and Maslach (2004) argue that environments with high job demands and low psychological support contribute to burnout and emotional exhaustion. Employees in such settings hesitate to share feedback, raise concerns, or seek help, further fueling workplace dissatisfaction and interpersonal conflicts.

In contrast, organizations that foster psychological safety through open communication, support systems, and fair policies experience higher engagement and lower workplace negativity. Fredrickson (2001) found that positive emotional environments help counteract stress, improve collaboration, and enhance overall workplace well-being.

3. Motivation-Hygiene Theory

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory (1959) provides insight into the factors leading to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. According to Herzberg, workplace dissatisfaction is driven by hygiene factors such as poor leadership, lack of recognition, low job security, and inadequate work conditions. When these factors are present, employees are more likely to develop negative attitudes, which impact morale, performance, and team cohesion.

Studies supporting Herzberg's theory include Judge and Kammeyer-Mueller (2012), who found that employees experiencing job dissatisfaction due to external factors such as unfair treatment or lack of growth opportunities are more likely to exhibit negative behaviors. Similarly, Goleman (1998) emphasizes the role of emotional intelligence in

leadership, suggesting that leaders with poor interpersonal skills often contribute to workplace negativity by failing to address employee concerns.

Organizations that implement positive motivation strategies—such as recognition programs, professional development opportunities, and transparent communication—are more successful in mitigating workplace negativity (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2012)

Research Methodology :

Introduction

The research methodology is a crucial component of this study as it outlines the approach used to examine the impact of workplace negativity on employee outcomes. This chapter details the research design, data collection methods, sampling techniques, and analytical tools used to interpret the collected data. The study employs a quantitative research approach to assess the relationships between negative workplace behaviors, job satisfaction, stress levels, turnover intention, and employee performance.

A survey-based method was used to collect primary data, while secondary data was extracted from existing literature on workplace negativity. The collected data was analyzed using statistical tools, with a particular focus on correlation analysis to determine the strength of relationships between key variables. The results from the correlation matrix provide insights into how negativity in the workplace influences organizational outcomes.

Research Design:

This study adopts a quantitative research design as it provides measurable insights into how workplace negativity affects employees. A survey methodology was chosen to collect structured responses from participants regarding their experiences with negative behaviors in their work environment. The research follows a correlational study design, which helps identify potential associations between workplace negativity and key employee metrics, such as job satisfaction, stress levels, turnover intention, and performance.

The main research variables in this study include:

-Independent Variable: Workplace negativity (measured using negativity scores).

-Dependent Variables:

- . Job satisfaction
- . Stress levels
- . Turnover intention
- . Employee performance

A structured questionnaire was designed, and the data collected was analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) to examine correlation patterns among these variables.

Data Collection Methods :

1:Primary Data Collection

Primary data was gathered through a structured questionnaire designed to measure workplace negativity and its effects on employee outcomes. The questionnaire contained Likert-scale questions (ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) to measure:

1.1. Negativity Score – Frequency of exposure to workplace negativity.

1.2. Job Satisfaction – Level of contentment in the work environment.

1.3. Stress Levels – Extent of work-related stress experienced.

1.4. Turnover Intention – Likelihood of leaving the job due to negativity.

1.5. Performance – Self-reported assessment of job performance.

2: Secondary Data Collection

Secondary data was extracted from academic studies, HR reports, and organizational case studies discussing workplace negativity. This helped compare findings with prior research.

Study Limitations:

Every research study has limitations. The key limitations of this study include:

- 1. Industry-Specific Focus** – The study mainly focuses on corporate workplaces, which may limit its applicability to other industries such as healthcare or education.
- 2. Self-Reported Data** – The use of surveys means that responses might be biased or influenced by personal perceptions.
- 3. Correlation vs. Causation** – While correlation analysis identifies relationships between variables, it does not establish causal relationships.

References

Avey, J. B., Luthans, F., & Jensen, S. M. (2009). Psychological capital: A positive resource for combating employee stress and turnover. *Human Resource Management*, 48(5), 677-693.

[https://www.academia.edu/15511763/Psychological_capital_A_positive_resource_f
or_combating_employee_stress_and_turnover](https://www.academia.edu/15511763/Psychological_capital_A_positive_resource_for_combating_employee_stress_and_turnover)

Bakker, A. B., & de Vries, J. D. (2021). Job demands–resources theory and self-regulation: New explanations for employee burnout and engagement. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 26(1),

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343959204_Job_Demands-
Resources_theory_and_self-
regulation_new_explanations_and_remedies_for_job_burnout](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343959204_Job_Demands-Resources_theory_and_self-regulation_new_explanations_and_remedies_for_job_burnout)

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309-328. [https://peopleful.io/Job-
Demands-Resource-Model-research.pdf](https://peopleful.io/Job-Demands-Resource-Model-research.pdf)

Bălțătescu, S., & Bălțătescu, M. (2017). Toxic workplace environment: In search for the toxic behaviors in organizations with a research in healthcare sector. *Postmodern Openings*, 8(1), 83–109. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/2017.0801.07>

Barsade, S. G. (2002). The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47(4), 644-675.
<https://web.media.mit.edu/~tod/media/pdfs/EmotionalContagion.pdf>

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Sage Publications.

https://books.google.com.pk/books?id=_z3_BOVYK-IC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874-900.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234021447_Social_Exchange_Theory_An_Interdisciplinary_Review

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500-507.

<https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Gressy-Septarini/post/Can-organizational-support-theory-be-measured/attachment/59d634ca79197b80779926f1/AS%3A381265757917184%401467912248391/download/Eisenberger+et+al+%281986%29.pdf>

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 218-226. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3122271/>

Goh, J., Pfeffer, J., & Zenios, S. A. (2020). The relationship between workplace stressors and mortality and health costs in the United States. *Management Science*, 66(5), 2014-2039. <https://jeffreypfeffer.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/GohMgtScience-2.pdf>

Goleman, D. (1998). Working with emotional intelligence. Bantam Books.

https://www.google.com.pk/books/edition/Working_with_Emotional_Intelligence/fOnFvLI8k0C?hl=en&gbpv=0

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-279.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/11367971_Business-Unit-Level_Relationship_Between_Employee_Satisfaction_Employee_Engagement_and_Business_Outcomes_A_Meta-Analysis

Hatta, A. M., & Abdullah, N. A. (2020). The role of emotional intelligence in work stress and work performance. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 10(10), 7940. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v10-i10/7940>

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513-524.

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Stevan_Hobfoll/publication/20507127_Conservation_of_Resources_A_New_Attempt_at_Conceptualizing_Stress/links/53ed1c190cf2981ada12af0c.pdf

Judge, T. A., & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2012). Job attitudes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 341-367. <https://cdn2.f-cdn.com/files/download/34953666/Jobattitudes%20Original%20Article.pdf>

Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2004). Areas of worklife: A structured approach to organizational predictors of job burnout. *Research in Occupational Stress and Well Being*, 3, 91-134.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235297409_Areas_of_Worklife_A_Structured_Approach_to_Organizational_Predictors_of_Job_Burnout

Namin, B. H., Øgaard, T., & Røislien, J. (2021). Workplace incivility and turnover intention in organizations: A meta-analytic review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(1), 25. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19010025>

Nugraha, R. (n.d.). The role of emotional intelligence in mitigating employee turnover: A psychological approach. *Obsesrvasi: Jurnal Psikologi Pendidikan dan Konseling*, 1(1), 680–930.

<https://journal.arikesi.or.id/index.php/Obsesrvasi/article/download/680/930/3765>

Ogbonda, E. H., & Amadi, G. (2022). Toxic leadership and employee turnover intention: A conceptual review. *Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, 9(2), 2345–2240.

<https://strategicjournals.com/index.php/journal/article/download/2345/2240>

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 539-569.

<https://www2.psych.ubc.ca/~schaller/528Readings/Podsakoff2012.pdf>

Sharma, K. (2016). Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being by Martin E.P. Seligman – A book review. *NHRD Network Journal*, 9(4), 106–109.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0974173920160420>

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Sage Publications. <https://sk.sagepub.com/book/mono/preview/job-satisfaction.pdf>

Van den Broeck, A., De Cuyper, N., De Witte, H., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2010). Not all job demands are equal: Differentiating job hindrances and job challenges in the Job Demands–Resources model. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 19(6), 735-759.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/211395465_Not_All_Job_Demands_Are_Equal_Differentiating_Job_Hindrances_and_Job_Challenges_in_the_Job_Demands-Resources_Model

Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. (2000). Psychological well-being and job satisfaction as predictors of job performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 84-

94. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/12655756_Psychological_well-being_and_job_satisfaction_as_predictors_of_job_performance

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Work engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82(1), 183-200.

<https://bpspsychub.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1348/096317908X285633>

Zapf, D., & Einarsen, S. (2005). Mobbing at work: Escalated conflicts in organizations. *Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets*, 237-270.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/232545339_Mobbing_at_Work_Escalated_Conflicts_in_Organizations