

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

Dealing with Negative Staff Behavior: The Case of Lebanese Private School Principals

Khalil Al-Jammal

Professor, Faculty of Education, Lebanese University, Beirut, Lebanon

Abstract:

The purpose of this study was to identify the types of negative employee behaviors at the Lebanese private schools and to know how the principals handle these behaviors. Moreover, this study sought to determine the impact of the negative employee behavior on the schools' working environment and productivity. For this purpose, an extensive review of the literature of negative staff behavior was conducted which constituted the base for the generation of a survey instrument consisting of three sections: section A requested participants to identify the top 7 types of negative staff behavior at schools, section B requested respondents to determine the strategies and skills used by principals to handle the negative school staff, and section C requested them to determine the impact of negative staff behavior on the schools' environment and productivity. The questionnaire was sent to 60 private schools. The total sample consisted of 305 teachers. SPSS 21.0 was utilized to analyze data. The study ranks the top 7 negative personalities at schools. It shows a dark image about managing negative school staff behavior by school principals. Principals don't deal effectively with this behavior which affects the schools' working atmosphere and effectiveness. Limitations of the study are presented and recommendations for future research are suggested. The study offers recommendations to help principals enhance their knowledge, attitudes and practices about dealing with negative school staff behavior.

Keywords: *Manager, negative employees, negative people, negative personalities, negative staff behavior, school principals, teachers*

1. Introduction

Every workplace can have negative people (Gould, 2014; Parker, 2013; Ricker, 2012). Gould (2014) says, "Most of the time, these folks don't make the big mistakes that call attention to themselves. They're frequently pretty good at their jobs, so they're not called on the carpet too often." (p.1). Negative employee behaviors are not always easy to pick out of a crowd, but they can do an amazing amount of damage over time. Indeed, "like a virus running in the background of a computer program, their acidic personalities eat away at the goals – and ultimately the bottom line – of the company week after week, year after year." (Gould, 2014, p.1).

Thus, negative employees can poison the workplace atmosphere (Alexander Hamilton Institute, 2012; Carter, 2012; Zaineb, 2010). However, those people may not be many in the workplace. According to Ricker (2012), "It only takes one person to derail a good day at work." (p.1).

According to Aldrich (2002), "Difficult employees are a huge drain on an agency in terms of wasted time, reduced productivity, greater inefficiency, increased employee turnover and in the extreme cases customer loss." (p.1).

Moreover, Aldrich (2002) assures that "Employees who work with difficult coworkers suffer from low morale, a declining commitment to their work, decreased job satisfaction and greater levels of stress and frustration." (p.1).

Employees need to work in a happy and supportive work environment which can have a significant impact on business results and success (Eroke, 2013; Mielach, 2012; Nauert, 2013; Rasminsky, 2014; Williams, 2010; Wiskow et al. 2010). According to Williams (2010), research studies show that "happier people are more altruistic than their unhappy counterparts, being more likely to give not just their money, but also their time and energy" (p.1). Referring to research studies, the author assures that "a positive mood stimulates people to be creative, tolerant, constructive, generous and non-defensive" (p.1).

Therefore, it is important for organizations to understand how to effectively motivate negative employees and how to manage them well. This is one of the main requirements for creating a positive and attractive environment at the workplace.

2. Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

2.1. Purpose of the Study

This study aimed to:

1. Identify the types of negative employee behaviors at Lebanese private schools.

2. Know how Lebanese private school principals handle negative staff behavior.
3. Determine the impact of the negative employee behaviors on the schools' working environment and productivity.
4. Furnish the recommendations in the light of the principals' skills required to deal with negative school staff behavior.

2.2. Research Questions

This study aimed to elicit answers to the following questions:

1. What types of negative employee behaviors can be found at Lebanese private schools?
2. How do Lebanese private school principals handle negative staff behavior? To what extent do school leaders effectively manage negative people?
3. What is the impact of the negative employee behaviors on the schools' working environment and productivity?
4. What are the recommendations that can be furnished in this regard in the light of the school principals' skills required to deal with negative people?

3. Literature Review

3.1. Types of Negative and Difficult People

Table 1 indicates 22 types of negative and difficult people.

Types	References
Angry People	Borkar(2014), Kassinove(2012),Kleiman(2011), Manager's Legal Bulletin(2012), Patterson(2011).
Back-Stabbers	Allen(2011), Brett(2011), Deutschendorf(2011), Sharma(2014).
Brown-Nosers	Allen(2011), Archer(no date), Holtzclaw(2014), Liebler(2013), Pollick(2014), Ray(2013), Tracey(2013).
Challengers	McIntyre(2011), Wiley(2012).
Chronic Complainers	Allen(2011), Chopra Center(2010), Johne(2012), Kjerulf(2006), Milligan(2013), Morrow(2014), Stewart-Kirkby(1997), Tucker-Ladd(2008), Winch(2011).
Clingers (Indecisives or Stallers)	Chopra Center(2010), Daskal(2013), Kemelgor et al.(2007), McIntyre(2011), Stewart-Kirkby(1997), Tucker-Ladd(2008), Wiley(2012).
Drama Queens (or Kings)	Bairre(2014), Christmas(2013), Farrell(2011), Gettler(2011), McIntyre(2011), McLeod(2013), Wiley(2012).
Gossip Artists	Allen(2011), Corbin&May(2005), Stoneburner(2014), Sun(2011), Vajda(2007).
Hostile Aggressive People	Bailey(2013), Hines(2011), Kassinove(2012), Stewart-Kirkby(1997),Tucker-Ladd(2008), Woodman(2014).
Icebergs/Loners	Brett(2011), McIntyre(2011), Wiley(2012).
Know-It-All Experts	Bloom(2013), Evenson(2014), Holdsworth(2011), Milligan(2013), Sengupta(2011), Stewart-Kirkby(1997), Tucker-Ladd(2008), Tyrrell(2009).
Martyrs/Victims	Brett(2011), Chopra Center(2010), Grohol(2009), Orloff(2012), Pandita(2011), RooGirl(2013), Shahar(2006).
Offloaders	American Management Association-AMA(2010), Brett(2011).
Pessimists	Cadena(2007), DeWitt(2010), Tucker-Ladd(2008), VECCI(2013), Woods(2013).
Power Grabbers	McIntyre(2011), Sorid(2009), Taylor(2013), Wiley(2012).
Seducers	Brett(2011), Munro(2014), Sundheim(2013).
Selfish/Self-Centered People	Barth(2014), Borkar(2011), Borkar(2014), Bowman(2011), Glenner(2013), Grohol(2009), Ryan(2012).
Slackers	Brett(2011), Eisaguirre(2009), Henry(2012), McIntyre(2011), Neely(2012), Olson(2012), Stack(2014), Wiley(2012).
Space Cadets	Fisher(2011), McIntyre(2011), Wiley(2012).
Super-Agreeables	Milligan(2013), Stewart-Kirkby(1997), Tucker-Ladd(2008).
Tardy Employees	Bloom(2013), Brett(2011), HubPages(2012), Knight(2010), Merritt(2014).
Wannabe Comedians	Allen(2011), Assad(2014), Holly(2013).

Table 1: 22 Types of Negative and Difficult People

3.1.1. Angry People

Anger can be defined as a negative feeling caused by another person's actions such as disrespect, humiliation, aggression or neglect. An angry person becomes hostile, is physiologically provoked, and has unwanted behavior (Kassinove, 2012).

Angry people (like raving mad) lose all sense of reasoning and calm and act like there is another person inside them, saying all those hurtful things and leaving someone hurt and broken (Borkar, 2014). According to this author, there is just a whole lot of negativity that works around an angry person. It draws a wall between him/her and the other, and hinders all forms of sane communication.

According to Kassinove (2012), when someone starts yelling, arguing, or cursing then this person is angry; these are verbal expressions of anger. There can also be physical expression of anger such as raising a clenched fist, throwing a book on the floor, breaking a pencil or hitting a wall. In both cases, anger is expressed externally; it is not kept inside someone's system. When we are displeased with someone's actions, we start using these verbal and physical expressions to show that we are angry and this may come along with muscle tension, headaches or an increased heart rate.

3.1.2. Back-Stabbers

Allen (2011) stated that some co-workers are not for real; they are questionable or seem unreliable and suspicious. They just care for themselves. In fact, these employees will ask peers "innocent" questions about themselves or what they are working on; afterwards their peers know that they steal their ideas and get a raise in addition to the corner office (Allen, 2011). According to Brett (2011), the Back-Stabbers at the workplace are employees who take credit for others' work as if it were theirs.

However, Back-Stabbers are everywhere (Sharma, 2014). This author argued that Back-Stabbers backbite, hurl brick back, berate, defame, and do all these things behind the back of the other. They may seem like the well-wishers of people, but they are the ones who betray the others the moment they turn their back.

3.1.3. Brown-Nosers

To Pollick (2014), business circles contain people who are always seeking attention from their superiors to gain personal and professional rewards. They use with their bosses excessive flattery and become suck-ups instead of keeping a quite nice working relationship. While some bosses may respond well to this behavior, others see it as a marginal employee's attempt to climb the corporate ladder ahead of more deserving candidates (Allen, 2011; Pollick, 2014).

Allen (2011) stated that Brown-Nosing may have its perks: more pay, less restrictions and one-on-one time with the boss who can write the Brown-Noser that flawless recommendation upon leaving the firm. To Allen (2011), even though it serves to benefit the boss's cause, it is never the attitude he/she should carry as a person of integrity. Allen (2011) argued that in the business sector, it is viewed as the lesser form of flattery and never quite respected by others in the organization.

3.1.4. Challengers

Challengers at the workplace are programmed to be oppositional (McIntyre, 2011; Wiley, 2012). For instance, they always show the imperfections, complications, or drawbacks for every proposal or idea instead of being positive (McIntyre, 2011).

Nevertheless, Challengers are not at all reluctant to disagree with the superior; they rather enjoy challenging management because they feel it establishes their independence. They resent authority and do not show respect just because the person has a title or a position. Challengers relish debates and do not care if their views are unpopular. In meetings, the Challenger often gets into heated discussions with participants and adamantly holds to his/her positions. The Challenger's focus is on winning the argument, not resolving the problem (McIntyre, 2011; Wiley, 2012).

3.1.5. Chronic Complainers

It seems that every workplace has Chronic Complainers – the people for whom the weather is always too warm or too cold, the boss is a jerk, the food is lousy, work sucks, etc. In fact, the list of complaints is long (Allen, 2011; Chopra Center, 2010; Johne, 2012; Kjerulf, 2006; Milligan, 2013; Morrow, 2014; Stewart-Kirkby, 1997; Tucker-Ladd, 2008; Winch, 2011).

Chronic Complainers are good at finding real problems but are very bad at dealing with them. They know the solution but can't apply it themselves. They always blame someone else for these problems; it is never their fault (Tucker-Ladd, 2008).

Allen (2011) argued that Complainers are easily perturbed by everything and everyone who comes within their personal space. To Chopra Center (2010), these people always find a reason to be angry and bitter and it is always coming from themselves rather than an outside source.

Chronic Complainers tend to make people around them unhappy at work. To Kjerulf (2006), the whole department can feel down just because there is one bitter Chronic Complainer amongst them. This is the negative effect of these people on the staff; it is transmittable.

3.1.6. Clingers (Indecisives or Stallers)

These people are called Clingers because they tend to cling to anyone when they are anxious: they usually feel that they are weak and need to hang to stronger people because they need to be loved and taken care of (Chopra Center, 2010). The main feature of Clingers is dependence (Chopra Center, 2010; Daskal, 2013; Kemelgor et al., 2007; McIntyre, 2011; Stewart-Kirkby, 1997; Tucker-Ladd, 2008; Wiley, 2012). Indeed, these people need clear instructions, ongoing communication, and frequent positive reinforcement. They don't like making decisions alone since they are afraid of making errors. Hence, they always ask for information and clarification

before doing anything to be certain about what is expected. Clingers are unwilling to express divergence because they don't want anyone to be angry at them or lose someone's support. As a result, they sometimes don't express their beliefs (McIntyre, 2011). Because Clingers are loyal, conscientious, and eager to please, superiors usually view them as reliable and helpful. However, these employees will not realize their full potential unless the superior encourages their independence (McIntyre, 2011).

Stewart-Kirkby (1997) and Tucker-Ladd (2008) identify a type of employees that have similar personality traits: the Indecisives or the Stallers. According to them, these employees are truly interested in being helpful; however, they put off making decisions for fear someone will be unhappy. For them, not making a decision is a compromise between being honest and not hurting someone.

3.1.7. Drama Queens (or Kings)

Males or females, these people, who are everywhere (in families, friend groups and workplaces), enjoy creating drama or chaos (Bairre, 2014; Christmas, 2013; Farrell, 2011; Gettler, 2011; McIntyre, 2011; McLeod, 2013; Wiley, 2012).

Drama Queens (DQs) and Kings (DKs) love to be the center of attention. These people seek excitement and attention by playing the lead role in drama (Bairre, 2014; Christmas, 2013; Farrell, 2011; Gettler, 2011; McIntyre, 2011; McLeod, 2013; Wiley, 2012).

DKs and DQs thrive on stirring up conflict, adding fuel to the fire. They don't like workdays that are calm and peaceful; hence, they always find a reason to live a traumatic time or an emotional breakdown such as gossip or rumors (McIntyre, 2011).

Spotting DQs and DKs is easy: when talking with others, they are expressive and animated. Hence, superiors and co-workers never have to ask how a DK or a DQ is feeling, because they can tell simply by looking at them (McIntyre, 2011).

3.1.8. Gossip Artists

Gossip is any language that would cause harm, pain or confusion to others. It is used outside the presence of the person for whom it is intended (Allen, 2011; Corbin & May, 2005; Stoneburner, 2014; Sun, 2011; Vajda, 2007).

According to Corbin and May (2005), gossip can be defined as rumors passed on to others and people involved in it may destroy or hurt others in the workplace.

Corbin and May (2005) argued that some employees take great pleasure and spend a great deal of time gossiping and spreading rumors. Known as rumormongers or Gossip Artists, these employees often participate in gossiping with other colleagues because they believe it increases their importance in the workplace and builds their self-esteem (Allen, 2011; Corbin & May, 2005). Some co-workers may view the Gossip Artist as being the "in-the-know" person in the workgroup (Corbin & May, 2005).

3.1.9. Hostile-Aggressive People

The Hostile-Aggressive person is one of the personality types of negative people (Bailey, 2013; Hines, 2011; Kassinove, 2012; Stewart-Kirkby, 1997; Tucker-Ladd, 2008; Woodman, 2014). Kassinove (2014) believes that people who intentionally hurt or harm others are aggressive people who want to control or dominate others. It occurs usually as marital violence, child or elder abuse, bullying or gang and criminal activities when the aggressor punches, shoves, or hits.

According to Hines (2011), Hostile-Aggressive people are the bullies who always need to be right. They abuse, accuse, and intimidate others. They often threaten others and are prone to tantrums (Hines, 2011).

To Hines (2011), Hostile-Aggressive people feel frustration from others or themselves. According to this author, these people handle their frustration through physical and/or verbal aggression or vandalism. At the workplace, their Hostile-Aggressive behavior usually gains them negative attention from superiors and co-workers.

3.1.10. Icebergs/Loners

Brett (2011) stated that the Iceberg employees are cold and non-communicative. These employees rarely keep the boss or their teams up to date on their work, don't contribute in meetings, and keep to themselves any information they may have.

These employees are called "Loners" by McIntyre (2011). According to the author, noticing Loners is very simple. When the boss finds an employee working on the computer all the time preferring not to talk to colleagues and choosing not to go to conferences and workshops, then he is facing a Loner. Loners also opt to eat alone so they don't have any contact with the others. The boss should not bother to search for Loners in meetings because they look for any excuse to duck out.

3.1.11. Know-It-All Experts

Know-It-All Experts think they know everything (Bloom, 2013; Evenson, 2014; Holdsworth, 2011; Milligan, 2013; Sengupta, 2011; Stewart-Kirkby, 1997; Tucker-Ladd, 2008; Tyrrell, 2009). According to Tucker-Ladd (2008), these people do not like change and rely only on themselves to complete tasks so they don't like anyone to help them. This makes the others feel that they are better than everybody else, and everybody around them feels they are stubborn and intolerant of others' opinions.

Evenson (2014) agrees to the characteristics that Tucker-Ladd (2008) describes such as superiority and intolerance of others' opinions but adds that Know-It-All-Experts do not prefer to listen to others but prefer to do all the talking themselves. They are bossy since they tend to tell everyone around them how to do their job. According to Evenson (2014), the bottom line is that these people don't know any other way to act. They come off as self-centered and pompous and easily irk superiors and employees, especially if they know how to do their job well.

Tucker-Ladd (2008) identified two types of Know-It-All Experts: the truly competent, productive, self-assured, genuine experts and the partially informed persons pretending to be experts. However, Tucker-Ladd (2008) assures that both types cause trouble.

3.1.12. Martyrs/Victims

The Martyr or Victim is another one of the personality types of negative people (Brett, 2011; Chopra Center, 2010; Grohol, 2009; Orloff, 2012; Pandita, 2011; RooGirl, 2013; Shahar, 2006). According to Brett (2011), Martyrs at the workplace are people who do not take responsibility for anything but prefer to blame everything and everyone. They tend to make people around them feel sorry about them by always having a ‘poor me’ attitude.

Orloff (2012) assures that the Victim grates on the other (a superior or a peer) with a poor-me attitude and is allergic to taking responsibility for his/her actions. To Orloff (2012), people are always against ‘Victims’, the reason for their unhappiness. They portray themselves as unfortunates who demand rescuing, and they will make the other their therapist. If the others want to help them, they become overwhelmed by their endless tales of woe. Orloff (2012) argued that these ‘vampires’ may be so clingy that they stick to the other like flypaper.

3.1.13. Offloaders

According to Brett (2011), the Offloaders at the workplace are the employees who ensure they have very little work on their plate while making themselves look very busy and important in front of their superiors. They always have a junior or another employee with them whom they give briefings to (when summoned for briefings themselves). This makes it easier to rely more on the person tagging along than on themselves and making that person responsible if management asks about a project. (Brett, 2011).

To Brett (2011), Offloaders are good communicators because they are able to convince management that someone else didn’t do the job well when in a performance appraisal. The reason behind such behavior is that they are not self-confident (Brett, 2011).

3.1.14. Pessimists

Another “burden” to any group is the Pessimist (Cadena, 2007; DeWitt, 2010; Tucker-Ladd, 2008; VECCI, 2013; Woods, 2013). According to DeWitt (2010), they are ubiquitous. In fact, these people show themselves at work, at school, and in families.

Pessimistic people always say: “It won’t work” or “We tried that” (Tucker-Ladd, 2008). Cadena (2007) stated that Pessimists prepare themselves to the worst in life every morning when they wake up. DeWitt (2010) assures that pessimism is like poison that can destroy any positive thought so dealing with such people can be tricky since others don’t know how to.

While most of their well thought out demise of life does not pan out the way they believed it would, the Pessimists are great at destroying the confidence of others in the world they live in (Cadena, 2007). According to this author, the Pessimist is a person who can create a depressing and exhausting life for others. To Tucker-Ladd (2008), Pessimistic people have the power to drag others down because they stir up the old pool of doubt and disappointment within them.

3.1.15. Power Grabbers

According to McIntyre (2011), these people tend to get into power struggles with their superiors so they often act like they are managing their bosses, instead of the other way around. They always feel the need to take things in charge such as leading a meeting or a project. They always talk about their achievements and want everybody to know them.

Because they don’t like to be given orders, Power Grabbers may resist direction or ignore instructions of their boss. McIntyre (2011) assures that they always aim at being promoted. To Wiley (2012), Power Grabbers’ egos should always be fed so they only work when there is direct benefit to them so they take projects and clients that will be a way for their own development not caring about the company’s progress. They avoid working in teams although they cherish power over others.

3.1.16. Seducers

Strategic friendships and allegiances is the goal for this type of people –they pick and choose their networks to benefit their careers (Brett, 2011; Munro, 2014; Sundheim, 2013). To Brett (2011), these employees praise superiors, compliment them and may even buy them small gifts in order to manipulate and seduce them. Such relations cannot be good for the business but they are only beneficial to the Seducers themselves.

3.1.17. Selfish/Self-Centered People

According to Borkar (2014) and Bowman (2011), the Selfish person is someone who is focusing on one’s own needs, wants, desires, pleasures and gains. This person is not focusing on the needs, wants, desires, pleasures and interests of others. He/she is Self-Centered (Barth, 2014; Borkar, 2011; Ryan, 2012). The Selfish is not able to listen to others. Grohol (2009) assures that when people don’t want to listen, it means that they have no interest in what the other thinks or feels. Hence, this is a barrier for communication.

Usually, a Selfish person is insensitive. Indeed, this person is not empathizing with others to understand how they feel or what they are going through, only because he/she is so stuck on their own self and what is going on with them (Borkar, 2014).

3.1.18. Slackers

Slackers are identified as one of the most difficult employee types (Brett, 2011; Eisaguirre, 2009; Henry, 2012; McIntyre, 2011; Neely, 2012; Olson, 2012; Stack, 2014; Wiley, 2012). According to Wiley (2012), Slackers do the minimum needed for the work to be done. Thus, the boss can’t fire them since the work was done after all even if the end product was not totally satisfying. Wiley (2012) stated that these employees are usually sarcastic and indifferent so they avoid doing the harder tasks. A Slacker can, however, be an efficient social networker (Brett, 2011; McIntyre, 2011) but his/her skills in Facebook, Twitter or mobile phones will significantly affect their work productivity (Brett, 2011).

McIntyre (2011) stated that Slackers can be divided into two categories: Obvious Loafers and Sneaky Slackers. He says that Obvious Loafers are easily detected since they are always either using computers to surf the net in the break room or chit chatting with a colleague at their office and wasting that person's time. However, Sneaky Slackers are harder to spot. In fact, these employees leave their office for a legitimate reason but they take forever to finish what they are supposed to. They may also spend a lot of time working on something they prefer for longer than needed just to avoid tasks they don't like. They don't waste time (web surf or make personal calls) openly. McIntyre (2011) says that both types often take days off.

3.1.19. Space Cadets

They are seen by their superiors as those employees who show difficulty in grasping the reality of their situation (Fisher, 2011; McIntyre, 2011; Wiley, 2012). According to Wiley (2012), When Space Cadets are told by their boss about technical issues that need to be corrected, they show positive enthusiasm in correcting them but that in reality they don't do anything about it and act as if no one informed them of any defect.

McIntyre (2011) say that, in meetings, Space Cadets are not understood by the others since they contribute unworkable ideas or make bizarre comments or even start new discussions in the middle of an idea. This can only be explained in one way: they are most probably thinking of other things while at the meeting and they are always on a different wavelength.

According to Fisher (2011) they are hesitant people but when they say what is on their mind they prove to be intelligent. McIntyre (2011) also believes that they are very intelligent but says that they are not interested in power or control.

3.1.20. Super-Agreeables

The Super-Agreeable employees are super nice and smilingly agree with superior's ideas and projects until some action is required, then they back down or disappear (Milligan, 2013; Stewart-Kirkby, 1997; Tucker-Ladd, 2008).

Tucker-Ladd (2008) assures that Super-Agreeable people seek approval. According to this author, such people have learned, probably as children, that one method for getting "love" is by telling others (or pretending) they really care for and/or admire them. Similarly, they will often promise more than they deliver: "I'll get the report done today" or "I'd love to help you clean up" (Milligan, 2013; Stewart-Kirkby, 1997; Tucker-Ladd, 2008). Tucker-Ladd (2008) argued that Super-Agreeables are experts in phoniness, so the boss should not try to "butter them up".

Stewart-Kirkby (1997) stated that Super-Agreeables want so much that everybody likes them and accepts them that they put themselves in awkward situations. For example, they agree with one person on one thing then they agree with another person who has an opposite view to the first one. Their main traits are being outgoing and sociable; however, they have a bad habit and that is they volunteer to do many things and end up doing nothing.

3.1.21. Tardy Employees

Tardiness is considered as a type of negative behavior of an employee (Bloom, 2013; Brett, 2011; Knight, 2010; Merritt, 2014). According to Brett (2011) and Bloom (2013), the Tardy Employees do their personal things during office hours such as personal meetings during work hours. According to Brett (2011) and Bloom (2013), they always come to work late and leave on time having taken longer lunch breaks than allowed.

This type of behavior affects their productivity that is seen to be fair by everyone (Bloom, 2013; Brett, 2011; HubPages, 2012; Knight, 2010; Merritt, 2014). To Brett (2011), this kind of behavior affects everybody around them negatively since it shows lack of respect to company rules and regulations that everybody follows but them. According to Bloom (2013), not only organization is not getting its money's worth from Tardy Employees, but also their lack of respect in the organization's schedule can have a very disruptive effect to the rest of the team, particularly if other team members are working long hours.

3.1.22. Wannabe Comedians

Allen (2011) describes Wannabe Comedians as people who want nothing but create relations with others at the office just to mock them or mock everything around them.

In fact, comedy can be subjective and accepted during lunch breaks for example; however, if the "Comedian" starts to see people loathe his/her unfunny behavior, it is a sign that business is not the place for a comedy stage (Allen, 2011).

3.2. Manager's Strategies to Deal with Negative/Difficult Employees

3.2.1. Angry People

When dealing with Angry People, a manager should (Kleiman, 2011; Manager's Legal Bulletin, 2012; Patterson, 2011):

- Stay calm during the conversation. Watch the tone of voice and volume.
- Watch his/her non-verbal signals. Make sure his/her body language is not confrontational (e.g., finger pointing, hands on hips), dismissive (e.g., eye rolling), or defensive (e.g., arms crossed).
- Stay out of the employee's personal space, and avoid any physical contact, even if it is meant to be re-assuring.
- Be respectful. Avoid embarrassing the angry employees or making them feel ashamed. Saying, "You're acting like a child!" will only escalate the anger of these employees.
- End the meeting if the angry employee is growing more and more agitated as the conversation progresses. Reschedule the meeting after a brief cooling-off period, when the conversation can be more productive.

- Use active listening strategies and empathize with employees' frustration. Oftentimes, the angry employees' main frustration stems from feeling that their concerns are not being heard. These employees want to be understood and they want to feel justified in their beliefs.
- Ask the angry employees to outline what led up to their displeasure. Assure them that he/she will look into the details of what happened and, the more information they can provide, the more quickly he/she will be able offer a remedy.
- Apologize. Not just a quick "*I'm sorry*", but an honest apology for the frustration they have experienced. Let these employees know, in a genuine way, he/she is sorry for the inconvenience, displeasure, or discomfort they experienced.
- Take action. This is truly what the angry employee wants to know: What is the manager going to do about it?
- Follow up. After the manager comes up with a solution, it's time to check back to be sure the angry employees are now satisfied (and, consequently, delighted to be working for the organization).

3.2.2. Back-Stabbers

When dealing with Back-Stabbers, a manager should (Brett, 2011; Deutschendorf, 2011):

- Be open to feedback from other employees and confront the backstabbers with what they have said or done – let them know their behavior is unacceptable.
- Speak to them in private because, being insecure, they don't cope with confrontation or assertiveness.
- Remain polite, calm and in control of his/her emotions, even if the backstabber becomes angry and verbally lashes out – the manager will end up looking good and the backstabber will look foolish.
- Be aware because backstabbers will often try to turn what superiors are saying into an over-reaction from them; however, the manager should stand his/her ground and repeat what these employees have said or done and that he/she will take it further if they don't stop.
- Screen all information that he/she gives them – he/she should not give out anything that can be used against the organization.

3.2.3. Brown-Nosers

When dealing with Brown-Nosers, a manager should not (Archer, no date; Holtzclaw, 2014; Tracey, 2013):

- Fall victim to favoritism: employees might feel that a little ego massaging will get them what they want. Employees brown nose because, often, brown nosing leads to promotions and to success.
- Limit his/her job as a leader to management and organization; he/she also should guide and mentor them toward success – maybe some employees are brown nosing because, underneath, they are insecure about the quality of their work.
- Call in his/her employee for a meeting and say, "*Stop sucking up to me!*" –he/she should avoid a humiliating or degrading discussion with Brown-Noser employees.
- In addition, a manager should (Archer, no date; Holtzclaw, 2014; Tracey, 2013):
- Identify brown nosers behavior early and create ways to address the problems before they impact the organization in a negative and disruptive way.
- Try to instill a sense of confidence in the Brown-Noser employees, praise their work when it's high in quality, and be empathetic and objective when he/she suggests modifications or improvements.
- Suggest lightly that they build relationships with their co-workers and encourage them to ask their colleagues for help and input on their job.
- Use any compliment that he/she receives as an opportunity to acknowledge the hard work of the entire team –this approach takes the power away from the brown-noser and shines the light on others, making it a less satisfying behavior.

3.2.4. Challengers

When dealing with Challengers, a manager should not (McIntyre, 2011):

- Be intimidated by the Challenger's forceful attitude or behavior.
- Give in or change plans and projects just because the Challenger is unhappy or insistent.
- Get "hooked" into endless debates and arguments. When it's time to end the discussion, just end it.
- Allow the Challenger to hijack meetings by dominating the discussion.

In addition, a manager should (McIntyre, 2011):

- Learn about the Challenger's career goals. Point out how this behavior will interfere with accomplishing them.
- Listen and respond positively when the Challenger presents views in an appropriate, non-confrontational manner.
- Include the Challenger in projects where collaboration is required for success. Provide feedback during this process.
- Help Challengers understand that while they see themselves as strong and independent, others may view them as difficult to work with or hard to manage.

3.2.5. Chronic Complainers

When dealing with Chronic Complainers, a manager should not (Johne, 2012; Morrow, 2014; Winch, 2011):

- Join the Chronic Complainers and agree with them since that just encourages them to continue to come to him/her to vent. The manager should not want to get the reputation for also being a Complainer.

- Enter into controversy with the Chronic Complainers to convince them things are not as bad as they think they are or suggest they are “over-reacting” to events and situations. This will only compel the Chronic Complainer to mention 10 additional complaints or dissatisfactions the manager has not yet heard about.

In addition, a manager should (Johns, 2012; Morrow, 2014; Winch, 2011):

- Make them feel listened to. Often all complainers want someone to really listen to them. Ask questions, paraphrase what they said, and check for understanding. Try to listen without passing judgment. Validate their feelings, express sympathy (which must sound authentic or it will not do the trick), and then redirect the complainer to the task at hand. This is the quickest way for a manager to extract himself/herself from a complaining soliloquy or shorten a grumble-a-thon.
- Offer sympathy followed by brief but pointed advice (when distress is warranted), and it will probably be accepted and appreciated. Even Chronic Complainers sometimes encounter authentic problems and make legitimate complaints. Otherwise, the manager should avoid offering advice or solutions and stick to sympathy and emotional validation.
- Use the direct approach if he/she is busy. *“I wish I could talk more about the situation but I am on a big deadline right now.”* The manager should try various forms of this until Complainers get the hint that the manager is too busy to listen to their complaining.
- Know that the Chronic Complainer’s behavior could be a contagious behavior that affects the entire Organization. This could adversely affect the productivity and reputation of the institution.
- Turn Complainers into problem-solvers by asking them to bring a solution to their gripe along with it.
- Meet regularly to discuss what each team member is working on, and any complaints the employees may have.
- Ask if anyone needs help or support. Nip complaints in the bud by being proactive about detecting and identifying problems.

3.2.6. Clingers (Indecisives or Stallers)

When dealing with Clingers, a manager should (Daskal, 2013; McIntyre, 2011; Stewart-Kirkby, 1997; Tucker-Ladd, 2008):

- Try to find out what the Clinger’s real concerns are (if the manager’s behavior is a part of the problem, the Clinger won’t easily reveal negative opinions about it). Ask Clingers why they find it so difficult to make a decision. Listen carefully for hesitancy or omissions which may provide clues to problem areas. Once the problems have surfaced, help the Clingers to solve them.
- Be convinced to change his/her own behavior if it is a part of the problem.
- Avoid hurting the feelings of the employee when discussing with him/her the problem related to his/her behavior.
- Make the employee comfortable during the meeting. Make a face-to-face discussion with the employee away from the group.
- Ask for the Clinger’s opinion and express appreciation when opinions are volunteered.
- Encourage the employee by using his/her ideas when possible.
- Understand normal mistakes and be able to transform them into learning opportunities (learning from mistakes).
- Delegate decisions, but do so in small steps. Express appreciation when independent decisions are made. Gradually enlarge the scope of delegated tasks or projects.

3.2.7. Drama Queens (or Kings)

When dealing with DQs or DKs, a manager should not (Bairre, 2014; Christmas, 2013; Farrell, 2011; McIntyre, 2011):

- Reward the inappropriate behavior of the DQ and the DK by listening to endless stories or responding to constant complaints.
- Allow the DQ or the DK to waste coworkers’ time with extended gossip or gripe sessions.
- Give in to unreasonable or inappropriate requests simply to make the DQ and the DK shut up.
- In addition, a manager should (Bairre, 2014; Christmas, 2013; Farrell, 2011; McIntyre, 2011):
- Be able to avoid participating in the drama. DQs and DKs are fueled by roping others into their drama.
- Avoid attending every drama he/she is invited to. Long conversations with these employees are a waste of time. Say, *“I’m sorry, I don’t have time to chat today; I have a lot of work to do.”* Be super busy. They will have less chance to talk to the manager if he/she appears to be really busy. Super busy managers don’t have time to hear gossip and they don’t have time to hear tales of woe.
- Spend some time (but not too much) engaging in conversation not directly related to work. DQs and DKs love an audience for their stories.
- Be specific. Clarify the objectives of the work and try really hard to stick to conversations that only relate to the objectives. Clarify the roles and responsibilities of everyone.
- Work with the DQ or the DK to agree on useful work-related goals. Identify tasks that will make productive use of the employee’s high level of interpersonal energy.
- Arrange regular meetings to discuss progress and challenges. Face-to-face interaction is much more effective than email in motivating this type of employees.
- Take notes. Keep a copy of every piece of communication that has taken place between him/her and the employee. That includes notes from any meetings that the two of them have together and obviously emails too. If DQ or DK ever plays the blame game, the manager will have his/her side of the story at hand and in detail.

- Help the DQ or the DK understand how excessive emotionality may turn off coworkers. Clearly define appropriate workplace behavior.
- Assist with or arrange for some career counseling if the employee's personality seems to be a dreadful match for the job.

3.2.8. Gossip Artists

When dealing with Gossip Artists, a manager should (Allen, 2011; Corbin & May, 2005; Stoneburner, 2014; Sun, 2011):

- Always be mindful of who he/she is talking to and how much he/she is telling that person. The manager should not provide intimate details from home or work that'll be churned into a heap of salacious gossip. It can come back to haunt him/her.
- Set the example and tone. The manager, who wants to reduce or eliminate workplace gossip, should take a look at himself/herself first. If the manager is gossiping about his/her own boss, peers or employees, he/she should not be surprised if employees do the same thing. Set the right tone and those employees are more likely to follow.
- Refuse to respond to comments about the absent person with more comments about that person. Even better, try to change the subject subtly.
- Verify via questions. If the manager feels he/she can't avoid the gossip and he/she can't change the subject, at least he/she can ask about details about places and times. By asking about details, the manager is subtly forcing the issue because the person who can't provide any details is tacitly acknowledging the weakness and lack of credibility of that information without attacking the person who is telling him/her.
- Communicate regularly and consistently with employees about what's going on in the workplace. Regular communication with employees minimizes the influence the gossiping employee has over others, because everyone is "in-the-know". If employees don't have good information from the manager about what is going on, they will make it up in the form of speculation and "gossip".
- Be willing not only to listen to issues from employees, but to divulge information as well. In fact, being in front of a problem—that is, getting information to the staff about a problem first—is often better than reacting to inquiries from them. The staff will appreciate this transparency and may gossip and speculate less as a result.
- Focus on solutions not problems. Much gossip arises when a group of workers is concerned about a particular problem. If the manager senses that the conversation in the group is headed toward complaining or gossiping, instead of joining in with the complaining, he/she simply asks the group what anyone thinks might be a solution. The exercise of focusing on solutions will take away from the urge to gossip.
- Tell the gossiping employees that he/she is aware of their behavior. Describe how their behavior results in others not trusting them because as a general rule no one wants to be the subject of the "gossip". For some, this single statement will be a realization that will result in immediate change. Often times the Gossipers don't understand, fully, why they engage in the behavior, and the impact that their behavior has on their own creditability within the team. Finally, the manager has to describe the impact the Gossipers' behavior has on the workplace and that their continued participation in the spreading of gossip is a violation of the workplace expectations.
- Deal with the issue not with the person. When the manager does confront someone who has been gossiping, he/she will come across far more professionally if he/she focuses on the issue and behavior rather than on the person.
- Incorporate the impact the employee's behavior has had on the workplace in his/her performance evaluations, i.e., teamwork, working with minimal supervision, following procedures, and cooperating with others.

3.2.9. Hostile Aggressive People

Bailey (2013) and Woodman (2014) suggested several steps to deal with hostile employees. According to them, the manager should:

- Identify the hostile behaviors the employee is exhibiting. The manager should ask around or even distribute an anonymous survey if he/she must. He/she should find out which employees are voted "most difficult to work with" in the team. While the manager is at it, he/she looks for employees who also show signs of hostility and disrespect towards management. One of the basic functions of management is to make certain that staff is functioning as a team; hostile behavior hampers this objective.
- Document the whole ordeal: who is involved, what triggered it, when it happened, statements from all employees involved. Documenting what happened will prevent he-said/she-said arguments once the manager tries to get to the bottom of the argument. Documenting hostility helps the management identify trends and patterns of employee behavior not normally observed or brought up in annual performance evaluation. Analysis of these trends and patterns can also help management identify ways to target employee problems and come up with corresponding coaching, mentoring or training programs to minimize them.
- Intervene quickly to stop the hostile behavior. Confronting the hostile employee directly may feel awkward or perhaps cause more commotion at work, but it is the quickest way to solve the problem. It also shows other employees that the management does not tolerate inappropriate behavior at the workplace.
- Provide assistance to employees who wish to change their hostile behavior. This can range from training programs to outside counseling to help treat underlying emotional issues.
- Coach these employees in developing better behaviors to replace the hostile and damaging ones.
- Work directly with hostile employees to teach them the correct way to act and behave appropriately within the workplace.
- Use progressive discipline measures to show the hostile employees that they are moving quickly toward termination.

- Terminate them if they are unable or refuse to work with other employees and management to change their hostile behavior.

3.2.10. Icebergs/Loners

When dealing with Icebergs/Loners, a manager should not (McIntyre, 2011):

- Give in and allow these employees to shut out colleagues or avoid necessary meetings.
- Assume that Icebergs or Loners will enjoy social activities if they are forced to participate. They may reluctantly attend, but it will never be their idea of fun.
- Consider these employees as deviant or dysfunctional. There is nothing wrong with preferring independent work.
- Ignore Icebergs or Loners because it is easy.

Hence, a manager should (Brett, 2011; McIntyre, 2011):

- Set clear expectations for necessary communication and collaboration with others and follow up to be sure that it happens.
- Explain the reasons why this involvement with others is important and how it will improve the productivity of the organization. When collaboration is expected, the manager should suggest possible ways (group meeting, individual conversations).
- Communicate via notes or emails to encourage their involvement. The manager can ask them open-ended questions so that they are called to give him/her information. If these employees often answer *'I don't know'*, a good tactic is to ask *'What if you had to guess?'* or *'What if you did know?'*
- Help Icebergs or Loners understand how their behavior may look to others. Colleagues may see “independent” as “cold and unapproachable”.
- Provide enough autonomy. Although they must learn to communicate and collaborate with others, Icebergs or Loners will do their best work alone.

3.2.11. Know-It-All Experts

When dealing with Know-It-All-Experts, a manager should (Evenson, 2014; Holdsworth, 2011; Sengupta, 2011; Tyrrell, 2009):

- Remember, when dealing with the know-it-alls, not to take their behavior personally. This type of persons may not be able to separate fact from opinion. They also don't necessarily think the manager is dumb –they are just thinking about themselves.
- Ensure that everyone has an equal and limited time in meetings to discuss ideas –this may help prevent the know-it-alls from dominating the conversation.
- Understand Know-it-alls thrive on a sense of self-importance. Consequently, to get them to listen (which tends not to come naturally), the manager can use their need for status as sugar coating to get them to swallow something new (his/her take on things). For example, the manager might say: *“I have an idea I'd value your opinion on...”* This sets them up to listen because he/she has appealed to a primary motivation –the importance of their opinion.
- Use their contrariness judo-style. The know-it-alls will often feel compelled to say the opposite of whatever the others say. Their need to hold an opposing point of view is more compelling for them than the need to find the truth of a situation. Thus, the manager could say: *“I'm sure you're going to think this is a bad idea; in fact I'm certain you will think it's silly...but...”*. Now the know-it-all is in the position of having to agree with the manager's idea by first disagreeing with his/her opener that this person is bound to think it silly.
- Use truisms to pre-empt their know-it-all-ism. The manager can drop into the conversation this statement: *“Only narrow-minded fools think they know everything but I was wondering if anyone knows...”*. If Know-It-Alls do proffer their opinion after the manager has seeded such a statement, then it is likely to be more moderate, less dictatorial. Other statements could be used, such as:
 - “Well if we are open-minded about it, we could look at it this way...”
 - “None of us knows everything but together we can work this out...”
 - “I'm surprised to hear you say that; I'd have thought you'd think differently.”

This can apply a mild shock and get these employees to actually question their own opinion (and temporarily halt their transmission) without contradicting them directly and without directly challenging their self-proclaimed authority. Such statements focus their attention because it is about them.

- Repeat his/her own position over and over. Sometimes, this is the only way to get through to the Know-It-Alls. This tactic requires resilience on his/her part. The secret is to avoid getting dragged into the content of their arguments.
- Take Them Aside. Instead of snubbing them in front of others, a private meeting should be the forum to explain. It is best to first list the positives and then get to the negatives so the errant employee will realize areas that require improvement.

3.2.12. Martyrs/Victims

When dealing with Martyrs/Victims, a manager should (Brett, 2011; Pandita, 2011; RooGirl, 2013):

- Acknowledge or focus on things that make these employees feel empowered, rather than reinforcing their role as Martyrs by feeling sorry for them or rather than being pulled into their “story”.
- Tell them, in a tactful and caring way, that he/she recognizes their pattern of perceived victimization. The Martyr is playing out a self-sabotaging, manipulative role. Manager should use some tough love to give them the “push” they need to get back on track.

- Come forward and accept their mistakes. This will not only ensure that there are no blame games, but it will also help the organization to identify their mistakes, work on them and prepare for any such eventualities in a better way.
- Accept that there are situations where everyone unknowingly displays victim mentality, and looks for corrective measures against it. Manager should give Martyrs due recognition. He/she should have a discussion with them and make them aware that he/she will help them to strive towards developing a more positive approach towards life.
- Put his/her concerns in writing, outlining the exact details of their behavior and how it negatively affects the organization culture and proposing suitable solutions to change their behavior.
- Give them time until they are ready to come around if they are not ready to change.

3.2.13. Offloaders

Manager should:

- Set a job description and keep the appraisal focused on the responsibilities of their role. It's important that a clear and detailed job description and specific Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) form the basis of their performance appraisals (Brett, 2011; Callaghan, 2011).
- Use different ways and activities of professional development to enhance their knowledge, attitude and skills (Alberta Teachers' Association, 2010; Al-Jammal & Ghamrawi, 2013).
- Build employee confidence. There are several ways that the manager can help build employee confidence, such as (American Management Association, 2010):
 - Acknowledge weaknesses, but play to employees' strengths.
 - Don't assume employees know how good they are.
 - When employees do something very well, acknowledge it immediately.
 - Encourage them to "go public" about their achievements.
 - Help employees identify their strengths and then find ways to capitalize on them.
 - Create small victories. Design "small wins" or mini-goals that employees can achieve, and then use that victory as a confidence-builder for reaching the larger objective.

3.2.14. Pessimists

According to Tucker-Ladd (2008), a manager should avoid being sucked into their cesspool of hopelessness. A manager should not argue with the pessimist employees; he/she should not immediately offer solutions to the difficulties predicted by them. Tucker-Ladd (2008) suggested the following steps to deal with pessimist employees:

- Make optimistic statements –showing that change is possible– and encourage the team members to brainstorm leading to several possible alternatives.
- Ask what the worst possible consequences of each alternative are (this gives the negativists a chance to do their thing but the manager can use the gloomy predictions in a constructive, problem-solving way). The manager can also ask, "*What will happen if we do nothing?*"
- Welcome everyone's help. This could encourage pessimist employees to be positive. Positive behavior could be contagious.
- To VECCI (2013), a manager should:
 - Be sure it is actually pessimism due to personal issues or frustrations –not simply a difference of opinion.
 - Set the team up to win by setting short-term goals or small projects. A series of successful experiences could boost confidence and encourage optimism.
 - Celebrate success with the whole team. Positivity is contagious.
 - Offer pessimistic team members coaching, mentoring or training. By investing in their employees, managers will boost morale and make them feel valued –it is difficult for the employee to stay negative or pessimistic if he/she is feeling appreciated.

3.2.15. Power Grabbers

When dealing with Power Grabbers, a manager should not (McIntyre, 2011; Taylor, 2013):

- Give up and give in under pressure. The manager must be comfortable using the authority of his/her position when necessary.
- Get sucked into power struggles and useless debates. The manager should not be unable to know when to cut off the conversation and make a firm decision.
- Be afraid to confront the ladder-climbing worker and question further how and why it is that coworkers are getting orders. If the manager avoids interaction because he/she fears confrontation, this will leave a power vacuum that the Power Grabber will happily fill.
- Act like a wimp. Power Grabbers only respect the manager who is comfortable using power.

In addition, a manager should (McIntyre, 2011; Taylor, 2013):

- Diplomatically ask the Power Grabbers if they are aware of something that the management is not.
- Ask them where their expertise or authority is coming from.
- Encourage everyone to communicate with him/her. The employees can check with the manager before they agree to work on anything from a coworker who seems to hold "self-perceived" authority.

- Define clear targets for success and identify the collaborative relationships that must be developed to achieve these professional targets.
- Explain the specific reasons why collaboration with others is important and how it will improve results.
- Include collaboration with team members and respect of coworkers as factors in performance appraisals.
- Help Power Grabbers understand how their behavior may actually interfere with their success.
- Provide public recognition for accomplishments.
- Allow a certain degree of autonomy and independence and follow up regularly.
- Recognize the Power Grabber's leadership strengths and encourage him/her to use them appropriately.
- Reward leadership maturity and leadership roles of employees.
- Provide them with ways, activities and opportunities for leadership professional development.

3.2.16. Seducers

When dealing with Seducers, a manager should not (Brett, 2011; Munro, 2014; Sundheim, 2013):

- Let their behavior dictate his/her feelings or actions.
- Be afraid to say "no". Assertiveness is one key to keeping a controlling employee in check.
- Get down to their level and try to manipulate others or pay them back via their own actions.

In addition, a manager should (Brett, 2011; Munro, 2014; Sundheim, 2013):

- Be able to identify the manipulative behavior. Being aware of this type of behavior is a basic skill required by the manager because everyone loves praise and compliments and he/she therefore easily gets caught up with this kind of manipulation.
- Remain professional and find the good in them. The most efficient way to handle manipulative behavior is to remain professional, speak no bad of the person and determine some of their finer points. The manager should be able to determine the less attractive qualities; however, he/she should focus on some of their more likable attributes. Often, things are not black and white, thus these persons are not entirely bad.
- Try to see things from their perspective. The most effective way to handle manipulative employees is to determine why they are behaving the way they are.
- Set clear and strong boundaries for acceptable and appropriate behavior with other employees.
- Be able to control how he/she responds to them when realizing that he/she cannot control their actions. The manager should remain calm and go about work in a friendly, positive and diligent manner regardless of how employees are approaching things.
- Act only in mutually beneficial situations. The manager should keep an open mind and, prior to blindly saying "yes" or "no" to a request, he/she will analyze how taking action will help or hurt him/her and, if it is the latter he must say "no".

3.2.17. Selfish/Self-Centered People

When dealing with Selfish/Self-Centered People, a manager should not (Barth, 2014; Borkar, 2011; Ryan, 2012):

- Lose his/her temper or peace of mind by getting affected with what they do.
- Give in to their demands at the cost of his/her own and let them dominate him/her. This will only encourage them to be more and more selfish.

In addition, a manager should (Barth, 2014; Borkar, 2011; Ryan, 2012):

- Recognize and understand their motivation. If the manager can get behind the behavior and discover what's motivating it, he/she will have a better chance of responding in a way that might make it less powerful.
- Recognize their good work and encourage employees to recognize the good work of each other. They love that; it can make working with them easier and it can also lead to some reciprocity.
- Try, when interacting with self-centered people, to do so in a group so that there are others present around and there is a chance for the manager to get his/her point across as well. This will prevent a self-centered person from making it all about himself/herself.
- Try and look for breaks in speech to include his/her points of view.
- Speak to them and tell them how their behavior affects him/her. It could help. But it has been seen that a self-centered person cannot really be expected to change.
- Learn to set limits and boundaries. Self-Centered people can be space invaders and suck the manager's time away. It may be hard for them to hear limits, but the manager needs to be firm.

3.2.18. Slackers

When dealing with Slackers, a manager should not (McIntyre, 2011; Neely, 2012; Olson, 2012; Stack, 2014):

- Accept shoddy work.
- Tolerate lame excuses.
- "Reward" Slacker's behavior by entrusting the difficult tasks to someone else.
- Avoid discussing performance problems.

- Be subjective in performance appraisals.
- Give undeserved performance ratings.

In addition, a manager should (McIntyre, 2011; Neely, 2012; Olson, 2012; Stack, 2014):

- Give each employee a specific set of tasks, that's what he/she will be responsible for during the project.
- Make sure Slackers understand exactly what their job entails, and why their work is important within both the team and organizational framework.
- Set regular times for feedback and follow-up to insure that work is actually getting done.
- Be a regular presence in the work area so that he/she knows what is going on.
- Address unfinished projects or missed deadlines immediately.
- Insist that work be completed.
- Address performance issues as soon as they arise.
- Incorporate the impact the employee's behavior has had on the workplace in his/her performance evaluations, i.e., productivity, progress, and punctuality.
- Make a clear connection between productivity and rewards with all employees.
- Motivate Slackers. The manager should keep an eye on these employees and find ways to motivate them toward doing a better job.
- Confront their behavior and be honest with them. The manager should call the Slacker into his/her office and tell this employee, in a straightforward way, about his/her concerns, pointing out specific examples without being threatening or negative.
- Invite the employee to explore his/her talents and skills elsewhere (in a more appropriate position) if he/she is totally unsuited to the job.

3.2.19. Space Cadets

According to McIntyre (2011), a manager should not: "(1) Let the Space Cadet work with no supervision. (2) Delegate projects without specific interim feedback points. (3) Stop listening because the employee's comments are hard to follow. 4) Dismiss the employee as being an airhead".

To McIntyre (2011), a manager should: "(1) Clearly define expectations in terms of results that must be accomplished. (2) Help the employee break down large projects into smaller implementation steps. (3) Set regular times for feedback and follow-up to insure that work is on track. (4) Explain why more mundane or tedious tasks are important. (5) Provide feedback to encourage more concise verbal and written communications. (6) Stress the importance of organized presentations. (7) Take time to understand the Space Cadet's ideas, as they often have benefits that are not immediately apparent. (8) Pay attention when the Space Cadet brings up long-range concerns, because they often have an uncanny ability to anticipate the future. (9) Provide opportunities to be creative." (p.1).

3.2.20. Super-Agreeables

When dealing with Super-Agreeables, a manager should (Stewart-Kirkby, 1997; Tucker-Ladd, 2008; Zimmerman, 2014):

- Let them know their talents and skills.
- Help them enhance their knowledge, attitude and skills.
- Recognize their accomplishments and tell them directly he/she values them as a person.
- Help Super-Agreeables avoid making unrealistic commitments and promises: "*Are you sure you can have the money by then? How about two weeks later?*"
- Settle for only realistic promises.
- Make them feel safe enough to disagree with him/her. Ask them to be candid and make it easy for them to be frank: "*What part of my project is okay but not as good as it could be?*"
- Build in incremental steps, deadlines, and checkpoints for the promises made. The manager should follow up and monitor the results he/she expects.
- Get them to pinpoint their specific next step.
- Listen to their humor because although said in jest, it is often what they are really thinking or feeling.

3.2.21. Tardy Employees

When dealing with Tardy Employees, a manager should (Bloom, 2013; Brett, 2011; HubPages, 2012; Merritt, 2014):

- Decide what policy he/she wants to have on tardiness/absenteeism. If the organization does not already have one, the manager may need to decide what his/her practice is going to be.
- Address tardiness in a professional manner. When discussing the issue, the manager should explain the effect that their tardiness (or absenteeism) has on the operations. The manager should also explain that their unacceptable behavior hurts the morale of the organization by letting co-workers see that they are breaking the rules, while the rest are doing their part to obey them.
- Make sure he/she has this conversation in a private setting, so that other employees cannot hear him/her.
- Get to the heart of the matter by discussing with Tardy employees whether they feel committed to the job and devising a solution from there.

- Find a compromise between their schedule and their work that won't affect the business or their productivity that is seen to be fair by everyone. Tardy employees may have a good reason for coming in late –such as getting their young children off to school or study commitments.
- Tell the Tardy employees what behavior he/she expects from them and the time frame he/she expects to see the improvement. This puts these employees on notice that the expectations have changed.
- Write a formal reprimand (If the schedule of the employees doesn't improve). This reprimand should include the specific actions to be stopped and the consequences if their actions continue.
- Send the same message to all other employees. This way, everyone hears the same message and the expectation has been set with everyone. The best way to do this is at a staff meeting. However, if that is not possible, then it should go out in a memo (or email) to all staff with the message. Managers cannot assume that employees know something if they have not told them.
- Use positive reinforcement or recognition. This is a controversial strategy. The manager can congratulate employees for their new behavior (showing up on time).
- Recognize and reward the ideal employees. Perfect attendance is one of the factors that should be taken into consideration during the performance appraisal.

3.2.22. Wannabe Comedians

When dealing with Wannabe Comedians, a manager should (Allen, 2011; Assad, 2014; Holly, 2013):

- Develop a charter that defines the rights and duties, the appropriate and inappropriate behavior of employees. This charter defines the consequences of enforcement of rules by employees and the consequences of the violation of these rules by them. Make sure all employees know and understand the terms of this charter.
- Identify the behavior of Wannabe Comedians. Document occurrences of mocking: include the dates and times of the occurrences, what was said, and the names of any witnesses.
- Try to identify the causes of their inappropriate behavior and help them to change this behavior.
- Politely tell the employees mocking others to stop. Sometimes, these people believe that others are not bothered by the “teasing” or don't realize they crossed a line. The manager should simply tell them he/she is uncomfortable with their behavior and ask them to stop.
- Use positive reinforcement or recognition. This controversial strategy can be used by the manager to congratulate employees for their new behavior (respecting other employees).
- Recognize and reward the ideal employees. Respecting others is one of the factors that should be taken into consideration in the performance appraisal. Appropriate behavior can be contagious. Rewarding the ideal employee may encourage Wannabe Comedians to change their behavior.
- Write a formal reprimand if all else has failed. This reprimand should include the specific actions to be stopped and the consequences if their actions continue. Workplace harassment should be prohibited by organization laws.

3.3 Negative Personality Adjectives List

Table 2 presents 555 negative traits organized according to the alphabetical order. It is adapted from Borkar (2014), DescriptiveWords.Org, (2013) and Hogg (2011).

A	Abusive, Accident-Prone, Addicted, Affected (Affected By Peer Pressure), Afraid, Aggressive, Allows Imperfection, Aloof, Angry, Annoying, Anti-social, Anxious, Apathetic, Argumentative, Arrogant, Artless, Attention Seeker, Authoritarian, Avaricious, Awkward.	20
B	Backstabbing, Badgering, Bad-Tempered, Barks Orders, Base, Belittling, Belligerent, Biased, Big-Headed, Blames Everyone Else, Boastful, Bombastic, Bone-Idle, Boorish, Boring, Bossy, Bovine, Brags, Brutal, Bully, Bumbling.	21
C	Calculating, Callous, Cantankerous, Careless, Catty, Caustic, Changeable, Chauvinistic, Cheap, Cheats, Cheerless, Childish, Clinging, Closed, Clumsy, Cocky, Cold, Cold-Hearted, Combative, Competitive, Complacent, Complainer, Compulsive, Conceited, Confrontational, Confused, Conniving, Conservative, Constricting, Controlling, Corrects Others Constantly, Corrupt, Covetous, Cowardly, Cowering, Critical, Cruel, Cunning, Curt, Cynical.	40
D	Dangerous, Deceitful, Deceiving, Defeating, Delusional, Demanding, Denial, Dependent, Deranged, Destructive, Detached, Directed By External, Directionless, Disagreeable, Discourteous, Dishonest, Disorderly, Disorganized, Disrespectful, Dissatisfied, Distant, Does Everything By The Book, Does What Is Convenient, Doesn't Listen, Doesn't Think Things Through, Dogmatic, Dominating, Domineering, Doubtful, Dour, Downer, Draconian, Drags People Down, Drama Queen, Drinker, Drugs, Dull, Dysfunctional.	38
E	Easily Aggravated, Easily Fooled, Easily Offended, Easily Threatened, Egocentric, Egoist, Embarrassing, Emotional, Emotionless, Envious, Erratic, Evasive, Evil, Exacting, Exaggerated, Excessive, Exhibitionistic, Extravagant.	18
F	Facetious, Faded, False, False Bravado, Fanatical, Fawning, Fearful, Feels Superior To Others, Fickle, Fidgety, Finicky, Finishes Sentences For Others, Flagging, Flaky, Fleeting, Flippant, Flirtatious, Follower, Foolhardy, Foolish, Forgetful, Frantic, Fraudulent, Frisky, Frivolous, Furtive, Fussy.	27
G	Gives Up Easily, Glares Often, Glib, Gloomy, Glutton, Gold-Digging, Goody-Goody, Gossiper, Greedy, Grim, Grumpy, Guarded, Gullible.	13

H	Harasses, Hard, Harsh, Hateful, Hatred, Haughty, Heartless, Hesitant, High-Handed, Hogs Spotlight, Holier-Than-Thou, Hostile, Hot-Tempered, Humorous, Hyper.	15
I	Ignorant, Ill-Behaved, Ill-Bred, Ill-Will, Immature, Immodest, Impatient, Imperious, Impolite, Impractical, Impulsive, Inactive, Inarticulate, Incompetent, Inconsiderate, Inconsistent, Indecisive, Indifferent, Indiscreet, Indulgent, Inefficient, Infantile, Inflexible, Inhibited, Insane, Insecure, Insensitive, Insincere, Inspires Guilt, Interfering, Interrupts, Intimidator, Intolerant, Introverted, Irresponsible, Irritable, Isolated.	37
J	Jealous, Jittery, Judgmental, Juvenile.	4
K	Kept-Back, Killjoy, Knavish, Know-It-All.	4
L	Lack Of Effort, Lack Of Faith In Self, Lack Of Self-Confidence, Lack Of Stamina, Lacking Conscious, Late, Lax, Lazy, Liar, Life Can't Be Trusted, Life Stinks Attitude, Lifeless, Loafer, Lonely, Lordly, Loud, Low Confidence, Low Drive, Low Energy, Low Self-Esteem.	20
M	Machiavellian, Macho, Mad, Makes Fun Of People, Makes Others Uneasy, Malicious, Manipulative, Martyr Attitude, Materialistic, Mean, Meek, Melodramatic, Merciless, Messianic, Messy, Misanthropic, Miserable, Miserly, Mistrusting, Monosyllabic, Moody, Mopey, Morbid.	23
N	Nagging, Naïve, Narcissistic, Narrow, Narrow-Minded, Nasty, Naughty, Needling, Negative, Negligent, Nervous, Never Happy Unless Miserable, Noisy, Non-Committal, Non Engaging, Nonsensical, Nosy, Not On Time, Not Viable, Numb.	20
O	Oblivious, Obnoxious, Obscene, Obsessive, Obstinate, One-Dimensional, Opinionated, Oppressive, Ostentatious, Others Can't Be Relied On, Outrageous, Outspoken, Overbearing, Overconfident, Overcritical, Over Wrought, Overly Emotional/Excitable, Overly Flirtatious, Overly Polite, Overly Proper, Overly Sensitive, Overly Serious.	22
P	Panicky, Paranoid, Parsimonious, Passive, Pathetic, Patronizing, Perverse, Pessimistic, Petty, Petulant, Phony, Pigheaded, Pitiful, Plotting, Pompous, Poor Judgment, Possessive, Posturing, Power-Hungry, Predatory, Predictable, Prejudiced, Pretentious, Prim, Prissy, Procrastinate, Promiscuous, Proud, Prudish, Puritanical, Pusillanimous.	31
Q	Quaint, Quarrelsome, Quick Tempered, Quirky, Quitter, Quixotic.	6
R	Racist, Radical, Random, Rash, Rebellious, Recalcitrant, Reckless, Rejects Change, Rejects What's Given, Relents, Reluctant, Remote, Repressed, Repulsive, Resentful, Reserved, Restless, Ridiculous, Rigid, Rude, Ruled By Peer Pressure, Rules With An Iron Fist, Ruthless.	23
S	Sadistic, Sanctimonious, Sarcastic, Sardonic, Scathing, Scatterbrained, Scattered, Schemer, Scornful, Second-Guessing, Secretive, Sees Bad In Everything, Self-Centered, Self-Conscious, Self-Indulgent, Selfish, Self-Righteous, Self-Satisfied, Self-Serving, Severe, Sexist, Shallow, Shameless, Shifty, Short-Fused, Short-Sighted, Show Off, Shy, Silly, Slanderer, Sloppy, Slovenly, Small Goals, Small-Minded, Smug, Sneaky, Snobby, Social Approval Required, Sociopathic, Soft, Somber, Sophomoric Behavior, Sour, Speaks In Monotone, Spendthrift, Spiteful, Squeamish, Stalker, Starchy, Static, Stick-In-The-Mud, Stingy, Stinky, Stoic, Stony-Faced, Stubborn, Stuck Up, Stupid, Sullen, Superficial, Suspicious, Swaggering.	62
T	Taciturn, Tacky, Tactless, Take Over, Taker, Talker, Talks Over People, Tattletale, Temper, Temperamental, Terse, Thinks Everyone Is Stupid, Thin-Skinned, Thoughtless, Tight, Timid, Tiresome, Touchy, Trivial, Troubled, Truculent, Two-Faced, Typical.	23
U	Unable To Relax, Unappreciative, Unbending, Uncaring, Uncommitted, Uncommunicative, Uncompassionate, Uncooperative, Uncouth, Uncreative, Undemonstrative, Undependable, Underhanded, Undisciplined, Unenthusiastic, Unethical, Unexpressive, Unfeeling, Unfocused, Unforgiving, Unfriendly, Ungrateful, Unhappy, Unhelpful, Unimaginative, Unkempt, Unkind, Unmotivated, Unorganized, Unpolished, Unpredictable, Unprincipled, Unproductive, Unrealistic, Unreceptive, Unreliable, Unresourceful, Unresponsive, Unrestrained, Unruly, Unscrupulous, Unsmiling, Unsophisticated, Unsure, Unsympathetic, Unsystematic, Untidy, Untrustworthy, Unwilling, Uptight, User.	51
V	Vacant, Vague, Vain, Vengeful, Venomous, Villainous, Vindictive, Violent, Visionless, Volatile, Vulgar.	11
W	Wary, Wasteful, Weak, Weak-Willed, Wears Drab Clothes, Weary, Weird, Wet Blanket, Whimsical, Whines, Wicked, Willful, Wily, Wise-Assed, Wishy-Washy, Withdrawn, Womanizing, Worrier, Wrathful, Wretched.	20
X	Xenophobic	1
Y	Yellow-Bellied, Yucky.	2
Z	Zany, Zealot, Zestless.	3

Table 2: Alphabetical List of the 555 Negative Traits

4. Methodology

4.1. Research Tool

Data was collected via a questionnaire for the purpose of quantitative research. Based on an extensive review of the literature of “negative employees”, the researcher developed a questionnaire consisting of 58 items. The questionnaire was sent to private school teachers in Beirut. The instrument was piloted on a sample comprised of 30 teachers. Therefore, few amendments for language and syntax were introduced.

The survey instrument consisted of three sections: A, B, and C. Section A (consisting of 22 items) requested participants to identify the top 7 types of negative staff behavior at schools. Section B (consisting of 35 items) requested respondents to determine the strategies and skills used by principals to handle the negative school staff. Section C (consisting of 1 item) requested them to determine the impact of negative staff behavior on the schools' environment and productivity.

In section A, two alternative choices were proposed to the respondents. Response choices were: Yes/No. In section B, a four point likert scale was used to rank participants' responses. Response choices were: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Strongly Agree. Regarding section C, a four point likert scale was used to rank participants' responses. Response choices were: 1=Not Affect at All, 2=Not Affect, 3=Moderately Affect, 4=Strongly Affect.

4.2. The Sample

The sample of this study consisted of 360 private school teachers which are equally distributed in 60 schools (6 teachers from each school). The schools are all located in Beirut. Along with the survey, a cover letter and an informed consent form were attached beside the full contact information of the researcher. The cover letter detailed the purpose of the study, assured a guarantee of anonymity for participants and explained how data will be used.

Teachers were invited to complete the questionnaire and return it, along with the signed consent form, to the given address by regular mail, or as a scanned document via email or fax. If these ways were not available, respondents were invited to return the questionnaire, along with the signed consent form, to the assistant researcher. Only 326 surveys were returned, out of which 305 questionnaires were usable.

Finally, it should be noted that the empirical work of this study was conducted between the 15th of October and the 25th of November 2014.

4.3. Data Analysis

Data was analyzed using SPSS 21.0 for windows. Descriptive statistics was used to describe and summarize the properties of the mass of data collected from the respondents. Means scores, standard deviations and percentages were calculated per each item of the survey instrument.

5. Results and Discussions

This part of the study includes the following three sections:

- Ranking of the top seven negative personalities at schools
- Strategies used by school principals to deal with negative staff behavior
- The impact of behavior of the top seven negative employees on the working atmosphere and on the productivity of schools

5.1. Ranking of the Top Seven Negative Personalities at Schools

Table 3 presents data collection on section A of the questionnaire.

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	305	.95	.210
2	305	.96	.202
3	305	.97	.170
4	305	.04	.202
5	305	.98	.150
6	305	.00	.000
7	305	.98	.150
8	305	1.00	.000
9	305	.50	.501
10	305	.02	.150
11	305	.50	.501
12	305	.05	.210
13	305	.00	.000
14	305	.00	.000
15	305	.00	.000
16	305	.00	.000
17	305	.00	.000
18	305	.00	.000
19	305	.03	.170
20	305	.00	.000
21	305	.00	.000
22	305	.02	.150

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics Related to the Ranking of the Top Seven Negative Personalities at Schools

It is quite clear from the results that there are 6 high mean scores varying between 1.00 and .95 related to the following items (respectively):

- (8) Gossip Artists: M=1.00, SD=.000
- (5) Chronic Complainers: M=.98, SD=.150
- (7) Drama Queens or Kings: M=.98, SD=.150
- (3) Brown-Nosers: M=.97, SD=.170
- (2) Back-Stabbers: M=.96, SD=.202
- (1) Angry
- People: M=.95, SD=.210

Table 3 indicates that there are 2 items having the same mean score (M=.50) and standard deviation (SD=.501):

- (9) Hostile Aggressive People
- (11) Know-It-All Experts

However, table 3 shows a less mean score for 5 items; it varies between .05 and .02 (respectively):

- (12) Martyrs/Victims: M=.05, SD=.210
- (4) Challengers: M=.04, SD=.202
- (19) Space Cadets: M=.03, SD=.170
- (10) Icebergs/Loners: M=.02, SD=.150
- (22) Wannabe Comedians: M=.02, SD=.150

The mean score related to the remaining 9 items is: .00 (SD=.000): (6) Clingers (Indecisives or Stallers), (13) Offloaders, (14) Pessimists, (15) Power Grabbers, (16) Seducers, (17) Selfish/Self-Centered People, (18) Slackers, (20) Super-Agreeables, and (21) Tardy Employees.

Table 4 presents the frequency results according to the ranking of the top seven negative personalities at schools.

Items	Types	No	Yes
1	Angry People	14	291
2	Back-Stabbers	13	292
3	Brown-Nosers	9	296
4	Challengers	292	13
5	Chronic Complainers	7	298
6	Clingers (Indecisives or Stallers)	305	0
7	Drama Queens (or Kings)	7	298
8	Gossip Artists	0	305
9	Hostile Aggressive People	152	153
10	Icebergs/Loners	298	7
11	Know-It-All Experts	153	152
12	Martyrs/Victims	291	14
13	Offloaders	305	0
14	Pessimists	305	0
15	Power Grabbers	305	0
16	Seducers	305	0
17	Selfish/Self-Centered People	305	0
18	Slackers	305	0
19	Space Cadets	296	9
20	Super-Agreeables	305	0
21	Tardy Employees	305	0
22	Wannabe Comedians	298	7

Table 4: Frequency Results Related to the Ranking of the Top Seven Negative Personalities at Schools

Table 4 shows that teachers rank the top 7 negative personalities at schools as follows: Gossip Artists (8), Chronic Complainers (5), Drama Queens or Kings (7), Brown-Nosers (3), Back-Stabbers (2), Angry People (1), and Hostile Aggressive People (9).

Indeed, "Gossip Artist" type (8) is chosen by all participants (305 teachers); Chronic Complainers (5), Drama Queens or Kings (7), Brown-Nosers (3), Back-Stabbers (2), and Angry People (1) are chosen by the overwhelming majority of the respondents (the number of teachers varied between 291 and 298), while Hostile Aggressive type (9) is chosen by 153 respondents.

Conversely, table 4 indicates that 9 types of negative personalities are not identified by any of the 305 teachers: Clingers (6), Offloaders (13), Pessimists (14), Power Grabbers (15), Seducers (16), Selfish/Self-Centered People (17), Slackers (18), Super-

Agreeables (20), and Tardy Employees (21). Regarding 5 other types, they are identified by a small minority of respondents –their number varied between 7 and 14 teachers (respectively): Martyrs/Victims (12), Challengers (4), Space Cadets (19), Icebergs/Loners (10), and Wannabe Comedians (22). The remaining type of negative people “Know-It-All Experts” (11) is identified by 152 of the 305 participants.

5.2. Strategies Used by School Principals to Deal with Negative Staff Behavior

Table 5 presents data collection on section B of the questionnaire.

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	305	2.57	.680
2	305	2.19	.656
3	305	1.84	.586
4	305	2.19	.656
5	305	1.55	.678
6	305	2.57	.680
7	305	1.55	.678
8	305	1.55	.678
9	305	1.55	.678
10	305	1.55	.678
11	305	1.84	.586
12	305	2.87	.726
13	305	1.55	.678
14	305	1.55	.678
15	305	1.43	.546
16	305	1.22	.476
17	305	1.48	.550
18	305	1.48	.550
19	305	2.21	.883
20	305	1.22	.476
21	305	1.22	.476
22	305	2.21	.883
23	305	2.55	.777
24	305	2.19	.656
25	305	1.22	.476
26	305	2.19	.656
27	305	2.13	.852
28	305	1.43	.546
29	305	1.48	.550
30	305	1.45	.617
31	305	1.43	.546
32	305	1.58	.863
33	305	1.16	.571
34	305	1.48	.550
35	305	2.13	.852

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics Related to the Strategies Used by School Principals to Deal with Negative Staff Behavior

Table 5 shows that the mean score of 4 items is more than 2.5; it varies between 2.55 and 2.87 (respectively):

1. Providing different opportunities for teachers' professional development (training sessions, workshops inside and outside the school, coaching, mentoring...) in order to develop their knowledge, attitudes and skills in teaching (Item 12: M=2.87, SD=.726).
2. Listening well to the teacher who has a negative behavior and talking to him/her alone, not in front of everyone (Item 1: M=2.57, SD=.680).
3. Helping to find appropriate solutions to the negative behavior of the teacher (Item 6: M=2.57, SD=.680).
4. Providing a good model for staff on both the professional and ethical levels; avoiding getting into the game of employees who have a negative behavior: chatter, gossip, or irony and sarcasm from others (Item 23: M=2.55, SD=.777).

According to this table, the mean score of 8 other items varies between 2.13 and 2.21 (respectively):

1. Treating everyone fairly and equally –not distinguishing a colleague from another (Item 19: M=2.21, SD=.883).

2. Providing the school with a written and formal set of desirable and undesirable behaviors (professional ethics) which is declared to everyone (Item 22: M=2.21, M=.883).
3. Being polite and tactful –controlling his/her emotions during a meeting with the teacher who has a negative behavior (Item 2: M=2.19, SD=.656).
4. Speaking specifically with the person about his/her negative behavior, without using humiliating and hurtful words for one's self (Item 4: M=2.19, SD=.656).
5. Recognizing and appreciating the teachers' efforts (or the team) and honoring ones publicly at the completion of a great work (Item 24: M=2.19, SD=.656).
6. Encouraging all teachers to recognize and appreciate the efforts of their colleagues (Item 26: M=2.19, SD=.656).
7. Encouraging everyone to express his/her ideas and present his/her suggestions and taking them into consideration when possible (Item 27: M=2.13, SD=.852).
8. Evaluating the teachers' attitudes and skills including those related to the "cooperation with the members of the team" and the "respect for colleagues" (Item 35: M=2.13, SD=.852).

Moreover, table 5 indicates that the mean score of 10 items varies between 1.55 and 1.84 (respectively):

1. Explaining to the teacher the negative impact of his/her behavior on his/her colleagues and the school (Item 3: M=1.84, SD=.586).
2. Holding regular meetings to discuss the work progress and challenges faced by teachers while completing their tasks (Item 11, M=1.84, SD=.586).
3. Encouraging the employees to be honest and making them feel that they can express their objections and opinions which are contrary to those of the administration (Item 32: M=1.58, SD=.863).
4. Trying to know the causes that are behind the bad teacher behavior (Item 5: M=1.55, SD=.678).
5. Reminding the teacher of his/her duties and responsibilities, which are declared and defined clearly and precisely (Item 7: M=1.55, SD=.678).
6. Making sure that all teachers know their duties, responsibilities and rights, as well as the expectations of the school administration (Item 8: M=1.55, SD=.678).
7. Helping the teacher to develop a clear timeline for achieving the required work (Item 9: M=1.55, SD=.678).
8. Supervising the proper functioning of things and providing the staff with the needed advices and instructions (Item 10: M=1.55, SD=.678).
9. Helping teachers to develop their effective communication skills with their colleagues, administration and parents (Item 13: M=1.55, SD=.678).
10. Promoting the collaborative culture among the teachers, and explaining to them the importance of cooperation among them and the impact of this state on improving the school productivity (Item 14: M=1.55, SD=.678).

Regarding the remaining 13 items, their mean score varies between 1.16 and 1.48 (respectively):

1. Regularly evaluating the teachers' performance and informing them about their strengths and weaknesses (Item 17: M=1.48, SD=.550).
2. Helping the staff to simplify the difficult and complex tasks –helping them to splinter the big projects into several stages and steps (Item 18: M=1.48, SD=.550).
3. Considering that mistakes have to be accepted –understanding the teacher who makes "ordinary" or "normal" mistakes (Item 29: M=1.48, SD=.550).
4. Providing the needed moral motivation for school staff (Item 34: M=1.48, SD=.550).
5. Trying to take advantage of the mistakes that take place at work: transforming them into learning opportunities (Item 30: M=1.45, SD=.617).
6. Encouraging everyone to work in collaborative teams so that this cooperation is an essential condition for the teams' success and productivity enhancement (Item 15: M=1.43, SD=.546).
7. Giving the staff members an important margin of autonomy and freedom in accomplishing their work (Item 28: M=1.43, SD=.546).
8. Believing in the delegation of tasks and authorities principle: delegating some tasks and authorities to the teacher who has high professional experiences (Item 31: M=1.43, SD=.546).
9. Helping teachers to build and develop their self-confidence (Item 16: M=1.22, SD=.476).
10. Quickly intervening to handle the negative behavior –not leaving things to get worse or deteriorate to intervene (Item 20: M=1.22, SD=.476).
11. Tending to find, after trying several solutions, an alternative work which is more suitable for the employee competencies –in case the employee is not successful in the job position he/she holds (Item 21: M=1.22, SD=.476).
12. Honoring the employee who has high productivity: honoring is not randomly or arbitrarily given, but it is linked to the productivity of the individual or the team (Item 25: M=1.22, SD=.476).
13. Managing school meetings effectively –don't allow bad or annoying behavior to negatively affect these meetings (Item 33: M=1.16, SD=.571).

Table 6 presents the frequency results according to the strategies used by school principals to deal with the negative staff's behavior.

Items <i>The school principal</i>		SD	D	A	SA
1	Listens well to the teacher who has a negative behavior and talks to him/her alone (not in front of everyone).	12	128	144	21
2	Is polite and tactful, and he/she controls his/her emotions during a meeting with the teacher who has a negative behavior.	24	217	46	18
3	Explains to the teacher the negative impact of his/her behavior on his/her colleagues and the school.	78	199	26	2
4	Speaks specifically with the person about his/her negative behavior, without using humiliating and hurtful words.	24	217	46	18
5	Tries to know the causes that are behind the bad teacher behavior.	168	109	26	2
6	Helps to find appropriate solutions to the negative behavior of the teacher.	12	128	144	21
7	Reminds the teacher of his/her duties and responsibilities, which are declared and defined clearly and precisely.	168	109	26	2
8	Makes sure that all teachers know their duties, responsibilities and rights, as well as the expectations of the school administration.	168	109	26	2
9	Or the other school leaders (Supervisor or/and Coordinator) help the teacher to develop a clear timeline for achieving the required work.	168	109	26	2
10	Supervises the proper functioning of things and provides the staff with the needed advice and instructions.	168	109	26	2
11	Holds regular meetings to discuss the work progress and challenges faced by teachers while completing their tasks.	78	199	26	2
12	Provides different opportunities for teachers' professional development (training sessions, workshops inside and outside the school, coaching, mentoring...) in order to develop their knowledge, attitudes and skills in teaching.	18	48	194	45
13	Helps teachers to develop their effective communication skills with their colleagues, administration and parents.	168	109	26	2
14	Promotes the collaborative culture among the teachers, and he/she explains to them the importance of cooperation among them and the impact of this state on improving the school productivity.	168	109	26	2
15	Encourages everyone to work in collaborative teams so that this cooperation is an essential condition for the teams' success and productivity enhancement.	180	121	2	2
16	Helps teachers to build and develop their self-confidence.	243	58	2	2
17	Regularly evaluates the teachers' performance and informs them about their strengths and weaknesses.	166	135	2	2
18	Helps the staff to simplify the difficult and complex tasks; he/she helps them to splinter the big projects into several stages and steps.	166	135	2	2
19	Treats everyone fairly and equally, and he/she does not distinguish a colleague from another.	73	114	98	20
20	Quickly intervenes to handle the negative behavior and he/she does not leave things to get worse or deteriorate to intervene.	243	58	2	2
21	Tends to find, after trying several solutions, an alternative work which is more suitable for the employee competencies –in case the employee is not successful in the job position he/she holds.	243	58	2	2
22	Provides the school with a written and formal set of desirable and undesirable behaviors (professional ethics) which is declared to everyone.	73	114	98	20
23	Provides a good model for staff on both the professional and ethical levels; he/she avoids getting into the game of employees who have a negative behavior (chatter, gossip, or irony and sarcasm from others).	22	125	126	32
24	Recognizes and appreciates the teachers' efforts (or the team's) and honors ones publicly at the completion of a great work.	24	217	46	18
25	Only honors the employee who has high productivity: honoring is not randomly or arbitrarily given, but it is linked to the productivity of the individual or the team.	243	58	2	2
26	Encourages all teachers to recognize and appreciate the efforts of their	24	217	46	18

	colleagues.				
27	Encourages everyone to express his/her ideas and present his/her suggestions and he/she takes them into consideration when possible.	73	139	73	20
28	Gives the staff members an important margin of autonomy and freedom in accomplishing their work.	180	121	2	2
29	Considers that mistakes have to be accepted and he/she understands the teacher who makes “ordinary” or “normal” mistakes.	166	135	2	2
30	Tries to take advantage of the mistakes that take place and he/she transforms them into learning opportunities.	187	98	20	0
31	Believes in the delegation of tasks and authorities principle: he/she delegates some tasks and authorities to the teacher who has a high professional experience.	180	121	2	2
32	Encourages the employees to be honest and he/she makes them feel that they can express their objections and opinions which are contrary to those of the administration.	188	73	28	16
33	Manages school meetings effectively: he/she does not allow bad or annoying behavior to negatively affect these meetings.	278	12	8	7
34	Provides the needed moral motivation for school staff.	166	135	2	2
35	Evaluates the teachers’ attitudes and skills including those related to the “cooperation with the members of the team” and the “respect for colleagues”.	73	139	73	20

Table 6: Frequency Results Related to the Strategies Used by School Principals to Deal with Negative Staff Behavior

Table 6 shows that if “agree” responses are grouped with “strongly agree” ones, then the overwhelming majority of private school teachers (239 participants) has a positive/very positive perception about the use of this strategy by principals: providing different opportunities for teachers’ professional development (training sessions, workshops inside and outside the school, coaching, mentoring...) in order to develop their knowledge, attitudes and skills in teaching (Item 12).

Moreover, if “agree” responses are grouped with “strongly agree” ones, this implies that the majority of private school teachers (it varies between 158 and 165 participants) has a positive/very positive perception about the use of 3 other strategies (respectively):

1. Listening well to the teacher who has a negative behavior and talking to him/her alone, not in front of everyone (Item 1).
2. Helping to find appropriate solutions to the negative behavior of the teacher (Item 6).
3. Providing a good model for staff on both the professional and ethical levels; avoiding getting into the game of employees who have a negative behavior: chatter, gossip, or irony and sarcasm from others (Item 23).

Conversely, table 6 shows that the overwhelming majority of teachers (278 of 305 respondents) “strongly disagreed” about the use of the following strategy by principals: managing school meetings effectively - don’t allow bad or annoying behavior to negatively affect these meetings (Item 33).

In addition, this table indicates that the vast majority of teachers (243 of 305 participants) “strongly disagreed” about the use of the following 4 strategies by principals:

1. Helping teachers to build and develop their self-confidence (Item 16).
2. Quickly intervening to handle the negative behavior - not leaving things to get worse or deteriorate to intervene (Item 20).
3. Tending to find, after trying several solutions, an alternative work which is more suitable for the employee competencies –in case the employee is not successful in the job position he/she holds (Item 21).
4. Honoring the employee who has high productivity: honoring is not randomly or arbitrarily given, but it is linked to the productivity of the individual or the team (Item 25).

Moreover, if “disagree” responses are grouped with “strongly disagree” ones, it can be concluded that almost all private school teachers (301 of 305 participants) have a negative/very negative perception regarding the effectiveness of the use of the following 7 strategies by principals:

1. Encouraging everyone to work in collaborative teams so that this cooperation is an essential condition for the teams’ success and productivity enhancement (Item 15).
2. Regularly evaluating the teachers’ performance and informing them about their strengths and weaknesses (Item 17).
3. Helping the staff to simplify the difficult and complex tasks –helping them to splinter the big projects into several stages and steps (Item 18).
4. Giving the staff members an important margin of autonomy and freedom in accomplishing their work (Item 28).
5. Considering that mistakes have to be accepted –understanding the teacher who makes “ordinary” or “normal” mistakes (Item 29).
6. Believing in the delegation of tasks and authorities principle: delegating some tasks and authorities to the teacher who has high professional experiences (Item 31).
7. Providing the needed moral motivation for school staff (Item 34).

Table 6 shows that if “disagree” responses are grouped with “strongly disagree” ones, then the overwhelming majority of private school teachers (285 of 305 participants) have a negative / very negative perception about the effectiveness of the use of this strategy

by principals: trying to take advantage of the mistakes that take place at work: transforming them into learning opportunities (Item 30).

Moreover, if “disagree” responses are grouped with “strongly disagree” ones, then the overwhelming majority of private school teachers (277 of 305 respondents) have a negative/very negative perception about the effectiveness of the use of the following 9 strategies by principals:

1. Explaining to the teacher the negative impact of his/her behavior on his/her colleagues and the school (Item 3).
2. Trying to know the causes that are behind the bad teacher behavior (Item 5).
3. Reminding the teacher of his/her duties and responsibilities, which are declared and defined clearly and precisely (Item 7).
4. Making sure that all teachers know their duties, responsibilities and rights, as well as the expectations of the school administration (Item 8).
5. Helping the teacher to develop a clear timeline for achieving the required work (Item 9).
6. Supervising the proper functioning of things and providing the staff with the needed advice and instructions (Item 10).
7. Holding regular meetings to discuss the work progress and challenges faced by teachers while completing their tasks (Item 11).
8. Helping teachers to develop their effective communication skills with their colleagues, administration and parents (Item 13).
9. Promoting the collaborative culture among the teachers, and explaining to them the importance of cooperation among them and the impact of this state on improving the school productivity (Item 14).

According to table 6, if “disagree” responses are grouped with “strongly disagree” ones, this implies that the vast majority of participants (it varies between 241 and 261 teachers) has a negative/very negative opinion about the use of other 5 strategies (respectively):

1. Encouraging the employees to be honest and making them feel that they can express their objections and opinions which are contrary to those of the administration (Item 32).
2. Being polite and tactful - controlling his/her emotions during a meeting with the teacher who has a negative behavior (Item 2).
3. Speaking specifically with the person about his/her negative behavior, without using humiliating and hurtful words for one’s self (Item 4).
4. Recognizing and appreciating the teachers’ efforts (or the team’s) and honoring ones publicly at the completion of a great work (Item 24).
5. Encouraging all teachers to recognize and appreciate the efforts of their colleagues (Item 26).

Finally, if “disagree” responses are grouped with “strongly disagree” ones, then the majority of respondents (it varies between 187 and 212 teachers) has a negative/very negative opinion about the use of the remaining 4 strategies (respectively):

1. Encouraging everyone to express his/her ideas and present his/her suggestions and taking them into consideration when possible (Item 27).
2. Evaluating the teachers’ attitudes and skills including those related to the “cooperation with the members of the team” and the “respect for colleagues” (Item 35).
3. Treating everyone fairly and equally –not distinguish a colleague from another (Item 19).
4. Providing the school with a written and formal set of desirable and undesirable behaviors (professional ethics) which is declared to everyone (Item 22).

5.3. The Impact of Behavior of the Top Seven Negative Employees on the Working Atmosphere and on the Productivity of Schools

Tables 7 and 8 present data collection and frequency results on section C of the questionnaire.

N	Mean	Std. Deviation
305	3.41	.601

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics

Table 7 shows that the mean score value concerning the impact of behavior of the top seven negative employees on the schools’ working atmosphere and productivity is more than 3.00 ($M=3.41$, $SD=.601$). According to this high mean, teachers consider that the impact of the mentioned behavior “strongly affect” them.

Not Affect at All	Not Affect	Moderately Affect	Strongly Affect
0	18	143	144

Table 8: Frequency Results

According to table 8, 144 of 305 teachers consider that the behavior of the top seven negative employees “strongly affect” the working atmosphere and the productivity of schools, and 143 others consider that their behavior “moderately affect” them.

However, if “strongly affect” responses are grouped with “moderately affect” ones, then the vast majority of private school teachers (287 of 305 participants) has a negative/very negative perception about the impact of this behavior on the schools’ working atmosphere and productivity.

Regarding the remaining 18 participants, they believe that the behavior of the top seven negative employees does “not affect” the schools’ working atmosphere nor the schools’ productivity. None of the 305 participants believe that this behavior “not affect at all” these two variables.

6. Conclusion

This study shows that teachers rank the top 7 negative personalities at schools as follows: Gossip Artists, Chronic Complainers, Drama Queens or Kings, Brown-Nosers, Back-Stabbers, Angry People, and Hostile Aggressive People.

Indeed, the first type (Gossip Artist) is identified by all participants (305 teachers), the last type (Hostile Aggressive People) is chosen by a small majority of teachers (153 respondents), while the other 5 types (Chronic Complainers, Drama Queens or Kings, Brown-Nosers, Back-Stabbers, and Angry People) are identified by the overwhelming majority (the number of teachers varied between 291 and 298).

According to this study, the vast majority of respondents (287 of 305 teachers) consider that the negative behavior of these employees “affect/strongly affect” the schools’ working atmosphere and effectiveness.

However, the results indicate that school principals use only 4 of 35 strategies related to dealing with negative staff behavior. Moreover, only 1 of these 4 strategies (12) is mentioned (agree/strongly agree) by the vast majority of teachers (239 participants), while the 3 others (1, 6, and 23) are identified (agree/strongly agree) by a small majority (it varies between 158 and 165 participants).

Indeed, principals don’t use 31 of 35 strategies related to dealing with the negative employees. The overwhelming majority of teachers (it varies between 243 and 278 participants) “strongly disagreed” that principals use 5 of these strategies (33, 16, 20, 21, and 25).

Moreover, the vast majority of teachers (it varies between 241 and 301 participants) “disagreed / strongly disagreed” that school principals use the other 22 strategies (15, 17, 18, 28, 29, 31, 34, 30, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 32, 2, 4, 24, and 26).

Based on the forgoing, it can be concluded that the overwhelming majority of teachers “strongly disagreed” or “disagreed/strongly disagreed” that principals use 27 strategies related to handling the negative school staff behavior.

Regarding the remaining 4 strategies (27, 35, 19, and 22), the majority of teachers “disagreed/strongly disagreed” that they are used by school principals even if this majority is not really vast (it varies between 187 and 212 teachers).

Thus, this study provides a dark image about managing negative school staff behavior by school principals. Principals don’t deal effectively with this behavior which affects the schools’ working atmosphere and effectiveness.

7. Limitations and Recommendations

7.3. Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The sample of this study is one of the limitations confronting the validity of this study. In fact, geographically, the sample was localized in the *Mohafazat* (Governorate) of Beirut; the other five Lebanese *Mohafazats* were not represented in the sample. Future research should attempt to involve a larger and more representative sample of teachers across Lebanon.

In addition, the sample included only private school teachers. No teachers from the public school sector were involved. Future research should involve such participants so that a more comprehensive understanding of dealing with the negative school staff behavior is derived.

On the other hand, only teachers took part in the sample. In fact, school principals were not represented in the sample of this study to avoid the negative effects of self-rating. However, future research should attempt to involve the principals, not only to ask them to evaluate the effectiveness of their own strategies about handling the negative staff behavior, but also to invite them to evaluate the skills of other school leaders (such as supervisors, coordinators, heads of departments) or co-workers about dealing with the negative people, and to determine the impact of negative behavior on the schools’ atmosphere and productivity. Indeed, the variety of information sources and variables could help more to identify problems and propose suitable solutions in this area.

Regarding the methodology, it could be improved. In fact, the current study has employed the quantitative methodology. It would be more valid to employ the qualitative methodology as well. In other words, the conduction of a semi-structured interview with some school leaders and teachers would be an added value for this study because this instrument allows researchers to have their own objective perception on the same items in the questionnaire. Future research should take this point into consideration.

7.4. Recommendations

This study suggests, through a selected sample of private school teachers in Beirut, that managing negative behavior by principals is not effective.

Principals should devote part of their time to treat the negative staff behavior, especially, when such behavior undermines the school’s working workplace and effectiveness.

Principals are called to participate in formal training sessions so as to enhance their knowledge, attitudes and skills about dealing with the negative school staff behavior. This can be done through participating in online professional development programs.

Several ways and activities can also be used to achieve this purpose, such as (ATA, 2010; Al-Jammal & Ghamrawi, 2013):

- Reading professional books and articles
- Taking additional college courses (formal courses) such as enrolling in an MA or PhD program –this can be done through participating in online college courses or programs
- Conducting individual action research

- Learning from the experiences of other school principals –this can be done through engaging in direct discussions and through joining a forum online discussion

Moreover, principals are called to provide schools with specialists (such as organizational psychologists, behavioral psychologists, and organizational sociologists) to deal with the negative and difficult employees (Scheid, 2005; Spector, 2011).

Finally, training providers and colleges of education are encouraged to make use of the findings of this study in designing their curricula related to school management (or school leadership), educational supervision, teaching diploma, and training of trainers (ToT).

8. References

- i. Alberta Teachers' Association-ATA. (2010). PD Activities for Professional Growth, Retrieved from: <http://www.teachers.ab.ca>
- ii. Aldrich, N. (2002). Taming the Difficult Employee, Retrieved from: <http://www.lib.niu.edu>
- iii. Alexander Hamilton Institute (2012). Bad Attitudes & Complaints: Handling Workplace Negativity, Retrieved from: <http://www.businessmanagementdaily.com>
- iv. Al-Jammal, K. & Ghamrawi, N. (2013). Teacher Professional Development in Lebanese Schools. Basic Research Journal of Education Research and Review, vol. 2(7): 104-128. Retrieved from: <http://basicresearchjournals.org>
- v. Allen, K. (2011). 7 Types of Difficult People You Will Meet at Work, Retrieved from: <http://madamemoire.com>
- vi. American Management Association - AMA. (2010). Building Employee Confidence, Retrieved from: <http://www.amanet.org>
- vii. Archer, J. (no date). How to Deal with a Brown Noser Employee, Retrieved from: <http://woman.thenest.com>
- viii. Assad, A. (2014). How to Deal with Mocking at Work, Retrieved from: <http://work.chron.com>
- ix. Bailey, P. (2013). Dealing with Unfriendly and Hostile Employees in the Workplace, Retrieved from: <http://www.impactcm.co.uk>
- x. Bairre, C. (2014). How to Deal with a Drama Queen, Retrieved from: <http://www.liveandlovework.com>
- xi. Barth, F.D. (2014). 4 Ways to Deal with Selfish People, Retrieved from: <http://www.psychologytoday.com>
- xii. Bloom, E. (2013). The Seven Types of Difficult Employees – Part 2 of 3, Retrieved from: <http://managermechanics.com>
- xiii. Borkar, R. (2011). Self-centered People, Retrieved from: <http://www.buzzle.com>
- xiv. Borkar, R. (2014). Negative Character Traits, Retrieved from: <http://www.buzzle.com>
- xv. Bowman, A. (2011). 9 Signs that You Might be Selfish, Retrieved from: <http://www.projecthappilyeverafter.com>
- xvi. Brett, L. (2011). Beware the 7 Difficult Employee Types, Retrieved from: <http://www.dynamicbusiness.com.au>
- xvii. Cadena, C. (2007). Avoiding Toxic Personalities: Gossip, Pessimism and Perpetual Liars, Retrieved from: <http://voices.yahoo.com>
- xviii. Callaghan, B. (2011). How to Track Your Business, Retrieved from: <http://www.dynamicbusiness.com.au>
- xix. Carter, S. B. (2012). Emotions Are Contagious - Choose Your Company Wisely, Retrieved from: <http://www.psychologytoday.com>
- xx. Chopra Center (2010). How to Deal with Difficult People, Retrieved from: <http://www.chopra.com>
- xxi. Christmas, N. (2013). How to Handle the Office Drama Queen, Retrieved from: <http://www.practicallyperfectpa.com>
- xxii. Corbin, J. & May, J. (2005). What to Do about Gossip in the Workplace?, Retrieved from: <http://www.mrsc.org>
- xxiii. Daskal, L. (2013). Leadership: Turn Mistakes into Lessons, Retrieved from: <http://www.lollydaskal.com>
- xxiv. DescriptiveWords.Org. (2013). Descriptive Words for Negative Character Traits, Retrieved from: <http://descriptivewords.org>
- xxv. Deutschendorf, H. (2011). Using Emotional Intelligence to Deal with Bullies, Back Stabbers and Sycophants in the Workplace, Retrieved from: <http://www.selfgrowth.com>
- xxvi. DeWitt, D. (2010). How to Cope with Pessimistic People, Retrieved from: <http://voices.yahoo.com>
- xxvii. Eisaguirre, L. (2009). Managing Slackers, Retrieved from: <http://www.workplacethatwork.com>
- xxviii. Eroke, L. (2013). Nigeria: Strategies to Overcome Negative Attitude in the Workplace, Retrieved from: <http://allafrica.com>
- xxix. Evenson, R. (2014). How to Deal with Your Workplace's Mr. or Ms. Know-It-All, Retrieved from: <http://www.amanet.org>
- xxx. Farrell, R. (2011). Five Ways to Deal with the Workplace Drama Queen, Retrieved from: <http://jobs.aol.com>
- xxxi. Fisher, M.B. (2011). Meet the Respondents: Understanding User Personalities, Retrieved from: <http://www.uxbooth.com>
- xxxii. Gettler, L. (2011). Hard Work: Dealing with Drama Queens, Retrieved from: <http://www.smh.com.au>
- xxxiii. Glenner, M. (2013). Hail to the Selfish Employee - Harness this Selfish Motivation for the Greater Good of Your Organization, Retrieved from: <http://www.csa.com>
- xxxiv. Gould, T. (2014). Dealing with Acidic Attitudes: Help for your Managers, Retrieved from: <http://www.hrmorning.com>
- xxxv. Grohol, J. (2009). 10 Reasons You Don't Listen, Retrieved on May 8, 2014, from <http://psychcentral.com>
- xxxvi. Henry, A. (2012). How Do I Handle a Coworker Who Slacks Off?, Retrieved from: <http://lifehacker.com>
- xxxvii. Hines, P.M. (2011). Difficult People: The Hostile Aggressive Person, Retrieved from: <http://ezinearticles.com>
- xxxviii. Hogg, L. (2011). Negative Personality Traits, Retrieved from: <http://listsforwritersandreaders.blogspot.com>
- xxxix. Holdsworth, T. (2011). Part II: Coping with the Five Types of Toxic Coworkers, Retrieved from: <http://www.aligntechsolutions.com>
- xl. Holly, K. (2013). Dealing with Verbal Abuse at Work, Retrieved from: <http://www.healthypace.com>
- xli. Holtzclaw, E. (2014). Is Your Staff Ill, or Ill-Mannered?, Retrieved from: <http://www.forefrontmag.com>
- xlii. HubPages. (2012). How to Stop Employee Tardiness, Retrieved from: <http://amaaineperspective.hubpages.com>

- xliii. Johne, M. (2012). Chronic Complainers a Workplace Blight, Retrieved from: <http://www.theglobeandmail.com>
- xliv. Kassinove, H. (2012). How to Recognize and Deal with Anger, Retrieved from: <https://www.apa.org>
- xlv. Kemelgor, B., Sussman, L., Kline, J., & Zurada, J. (2007). Who Are The Difficult Employees? Psychopathological Attributions Of Their Co-workers. *Journal of Business & Economics Research*, vol. 5(10): 47-62. Retrieved from <http://www.yorku.ca>
- xlvi. Kjerulf, A. (2006). How to Handle Chronic Complainers, Retrieved from: <http://positivesharing.com>
- xlvii. Kleiman, M. (2011). The Six Steps for Dealing with an Angry Employee, Retrieved from: <http://www.tlnt.com>
- xlviii. Knight, A. (2010). Time Will Tell: How to Deal with Tardy Workers, Retrieved from: <http://www.smh.com.au>
- xlix. Liebler, K. (2013). Fine Line between Flattery and Being a Brown-Noser, Retrieved from: <https://www.achievesolutions.net>
- l. Manager's Legal Bulletin (2012). How to Handle an Angry Employee: 6 Tips, Retrieved from: <http://www.businessmanagementdaily.com>
- li. McIntyre, M.G. (2011). Seven Employees that Drive Managers Crazy, Retrieved from: <http://www.youofficecoach.com>
- lii. McLeod, L. (2013). 5 Ways to Cope with Workplace Drama, Retrieved from: <http://www.learncleod.com>
- liii. Merritt, J. (2014). Tardiness: Breaking the Cycle, Retrieved from: <http://www.halowtassava.com>
- liv. Mielach, D. (2012). 11 Things that Make Workers Happy, Retrieved from: <http://www.businessnewsdaily.com>
- lv. Milligan, S. (2013). The Whiner, Know-It-All and Naysayer Can Make the Workplace a Drag, Retrieved from: <http://hrmn.shrm.org>
- lvi. Morrow, P. (2014). Dealing with Complainers in the Workplace, Retrieved from: <http://www.credittoday.net>
- lvii. Munro, D. (2014). Manipulative People: How to Spot Them, How to Manage Them, Retrieved from: <http://www.biznews.com>
- lviii. Nauert, R. (2013). Work Environment Plays Key Role in Well-Being & Happiness, Retrieved from: <http://psychcentral.com>
- lix. Neely, A. (2012). Are Slackers Holding You Back at Work?, Retrieved from: <http://www.brighthub.com>
- lx. Olson, L. (2012). How to Be a Team Player When You Work with a Slacker, Retrieved from: <http://money.usnews.com>
- lxi. Orloff, J. (2012). How to Deal with a Victim Mentality, Retrieved from: <http://www.drjudithorloff.com>
- lxii. Pandita, R. (2011). Victim Mentality in the Workplace, Retrieved from: <http://www.buzzle.com>
- lxiii. Parker, T. (2013). How to Manage a Negative Employee, Retrieved from: <http://quickbooks.intuit.com>
- lxiv. Patterson, K. (2011). How to Defuse Angry Employees, Retrieved from: <http://www.incentivemag.com>
- lxv. Pollick, M. (2014). What is Brown Nosing?, Retrieved from: <http://www.wisegeek.com>
- lxvi. Rasminsky, L. (2014). Ten Ways to Make Your Work Environment More Productive, Retrieved from: <http://www.theglobeandmail.com>
- lxvii. Ray, O. (2013). Kiss-A** Coworkers: More Destructive than You Think, Retrieved from: <http://blog.mindjet.com>
- lxviii. Ricker, S. (2012). How to Break the Cycle with Negative Co-workers, Retrieved from: <http://www.careerbuilder.com>
- lxix. RooGirl (2013). 15 Types of Crazy People and How to Deal with Them, Retrieved from: <http://roogirl.com>
- lxx. Ryan, J. (2012). Dealing with the Self-Absorbed Personality, Retrieved from: <http://softskillsforhardjobs.com>
- lxxi. Scheid, J.C. (2005). *Les Grands Auteurs en Organisation*. Paris: Dunod.
- lxxii. Sengupta, D. (2011). Five Ways to Deal with a Know-It-All Employee, Retrieved from: <http://articles.economicstimes.indiatimes.com>
- lxxiii. Shahar, C. (2006). The Martyr Victim Complex Described, Retrieved from: <http://www.yourlifecheckup.com>
- lxxiv. Sharma, N. (2014). How to Handle Backstabbers, Retrieved from: <http://lifestyle.iloveindia.com>
- lxxv. Sorid, D. (2009). The Authority that's Not on Any Chart, Retrieved from: <http://www.nytimes.com>
- lxxvi. Spector, P. (2011). *Psychologie du Travail et des Organisations* (Traduction: D. Gilibert). Bruxelles: De Boeck.
- lxxvii. Stack, L. (2014). Yes, You Really Do Need to Deal with that Slacker on Your Team, Retrieved from: <http://www.tlnt.com>
- lxxviii. Stewart-Kirkby, C. (1997). Coping with Problem Behaviour, Retrieved from: <http://www.omafra.gov.on.ca>
- lxxix. Stoneburner, C.A. (2014). United States: 6 Do's and Don'ts for Handling Gossip in the Workplace, Retrieved from: <http://www.mondaq.com>
- lxxx. Sun, C. (2011). 10 Tips for Dealing with Workplace Gossip, Retrieved from: <http://www.techrepublic.com>
- lxxxi. Sundheim, K. (2013). Tips for Dealing with Manipulative Co-Workers, Retrieved from: <http://www.simplyhired.com>
- lxxxii. Taylor, L. (2013). How to Manage Power-Mongering Coworkers, Retrieved from: <http://www.psychologytoday.com>
- lxxxiii. Tracey, P. (2013). How to Deal with Brown Nosers, Retrieved from: <http://www.news24.com>
- lxxxiv. Tucker-Ladd, C. (2008). 6 Difficult Types of People and How to Deal With Them, Retrieved on April 25, 2014, from: <http://psychcentral.com>
- lxxxv. Tyrrell, M. (2009). Difficult People: How to Deal with the Know-It-All, Retrieved from: <http://www.selfgrowth.com>
- lxxxvi. Vajda, P. (2007). Dealing with Workplace Gossip, Retrieved from: <http://www.management-issues.com>
- lxxxvii. VECCI (2013). Business Tips: Dealing with Pessimism in Your Team, Retrieved from: <http://www.vecci.org.au>
- lxxxviii. Wiley, S. (2012). Managing and Motivating Challenging Employees, Retrieved from: <http://www.boomer.com>
- lxxxix. Williams, R. (2010). How Workplace Happiness Can Boost Productivity, Retrieved from: <http://www.psychologytoday.com>
- xc. Winch, G. (2011). How to Deal with Chronic Complainers, Retrieved from: <http://www.psychologytoday.com>
- xci. Wiskow, C.; Albrecht, T. & De Pietro, C. (2010). How to Create an Attractive and Supportive Working Environment for Health Professionals, Health Systems and Policy Analysis. (15): 1- Retrieved from: <http://www.euro.who.int>

- xcii. Woodman, C. (2014). How to Deal with Hostile Employees in the Workplace, Retrieved from: <http://smallbusiness.chron.com>
- xciii. Woods, W. (2013). The 10 Questions to Help You Deal with Negative Employees, Retrieved from: <http://www.astd.org>
- xciv. Zaineb, A. (2010). Employee Demotivation - Causes and Solutions!, Retrieved from: <http://blog.commlabindia.com>
- xcv. Zimmerman, A. (2014). The Three Types of Difficult People, Retrieved from: <http://drzimmerman.com>