
Impact of friendly environment at workplace on organizational culture

Author Name: Snehal Adhangale [Research Scholar]

(adhangalesnehal0211@gmail.com)

*Akole Education Society's, Agasti Institute of Management, Computer Application & Research
(Affiliated to Savitribai Phule Pune University)*

Research Guide: Dr. Sandeep Sonawane [Research Guide]

(sandeep_sonawane10@yahoo.co.in)

*Akole Education Society's, Agasti Institute of Management, Computer Application & Research
(Affiliated to Savitribai Phule Pune University)*

Abstract

A hospitable work environment is not just a place where staff is able to talk freely, or sometimes even mingle with colleagues. It is a general organizational climate characterized by trust, interpersonal respect, openness, teamwork, psychological safety, social support, inclusiveness and positive communication. This review explores the impact of an inviting environment on corporate culture followed by the enhancement of employee experiences at work through that culture. Empirical evidence shows that supportive workplace and relationship-based environment are positively related to organizational commitment, job satisfaction, employee well-being, engagement, knowledge sharing, learning behaviors, and performance. Professional relationships are especially important in this regard: a recent meta-analysis including 191 independent samples and over 66,000 participants found that workplace friendships are associated with a range of individual, occupational, and career outcomes. Empirical studies in India also suggest positive relationships of workplace friendship with company loyalty, job participation and health of the employee. The critique suggests that the relationship between a supportive work environment and organizational culture is not one way but two ways. Cordial actions become norms in society when they are persistently advocated by leaders, supported by corporate regulations, and validated by daily exchanges. Or, a culture that prizes competitiveness, hierarchy, fear, exclusion, or incivility may not allow for friendship, psychological safety, and collaboration. The concept of psychological safety is important because, when employees feel interpersonal dangers are surmountable, they can speak up with ideas, admit errors, ask questions and participate in learning.

The literature also indicates that there is no reason why a culture of support cannot coexist with accountability. There is a lot of informality, a bias toward certain people, choices based on camaraderie, cliquish social networks and unclear professional boundaries that can be damaging. The best organizational cultures, therefore, blend cordiality with justice, performance criteria, inclusiveness, ethical governance, role definition and professional constraints. The key lesson here is that in addition to setting clear standards for professional behavior, firms can enhance culture by intentionally developing an environment where people feel valued, supported, heard, and psychologically safe. (Edmondson, 1999)

Keywords: friendly workplace, workplace friendship, organizational culture, psychological safety, employee well-being, organizational commitment, employee engagement, social support, workplace relationships, organizational behavior.

1. Introduction

Organizations are becoming more aware that employee interaction and workplace social atmosphere affect the development of company culture and employee employment experience. A friendly work environment involves respectful relationships, open communication, teamwork, social support, trust, diversity and inclusion, psychological safety, and opportunities for positive interaction (Chen et al., 2024; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Workplace camaraderie and organizational culture have been studied in isolation most often. But the link between congenial work atmosphere and development of corporate culture needs to be studied holistically. The goal of this analysis is to understand how a congenial work atmosphere influences organizational culture (Chen et al., 2024) and to analyze the mechanisms through which interpersonal connections, psychological safety, social support, trust, and collaboration contribute to positive organizational results.

The method used was a systematic methodology of integrative literature review. Review of relevant scholarly literature on workplace camaraderie, organizational culture, psychological safety, perceived organizational support, employee commitment, job satisfaction, and engagement, well-being, and workplace interactions. The assessment included basic theoretical contributions, empirical studies, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and recent publications up to 2026. The studies reviewed differed significantly in terms of research design, samples,

measurements, industry, and outcome factors. Thus, evidence was combined conceptually rather than quantitatively. The PRISMA 2020 guidelines were used as a benchmark for transparency in the articulation of literature identification and synthesis (Page et al., 2021). More than once, the analyzed data have pointed to positive work environments which are friendly and caring, are associated with positive results for both employees and organizations. Workplace camaraderie has been linked to organizational commitment, job engagement, and employee well-being, helping behaviors, emotional outcomes, health and performance (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025). A meta-analysis of 191 individual samples and 66,321 people (Chen et al., 2025) found generally positive relationships between workplace camaraderie and individual, job, and career outcomes. Similarly, a study on business employees in India in 2026 revealed considerable positive impacts of workplace camaraderie on commitment, wellbeing, and job involvement.

The data suggest a very strong importance of family-like or supportive types of corporate culture for employee-focused outcomes. Hartnell et al. (2011), a more detailed examination of 84 empirical studies found that clan, adhocracy and market cultures were positively related to organizational effectiveness, but the relationships differed depending on which effectiveness criterion was used. Edmondson (1999) psychological safety serves a critical function: Employees who feel safe to take interpersonal risks are more likely to engage in learning activities, leading to enhanced team performance.

A positive work environment is a valuable cultural asset. It creates an organizational culture by translating interpersonal qualities like respect, trust, collaboration, empathy, and support into shared norms and expectations Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002). But friendliness has to be balanced with fairness, accountability, inclusiveness, professionalism and ethical leadership. Organizations that want to build a strong culture need to go beyond social events to create systems and leadership approaches that consistently model respect, support, psychological safety and trust (Edmondson, 1999; Hartnell et al., 2011; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Chen et al., 2024, 2025).

1.1 Background of the Study

Workplace isn't a place where employees just perform their tasks. It is an environment where people interact, establish relationships, exchange information, experience emotions, solve problems, and agree upon proper conduct. Interpersonal relations in the work setting could influence the employees' perception of their organization and influence the corporate culture. Organizational culture consists of shared ideas, assumptions, interpretations, anticipations and behaviors that influence workers' perceptions and interactions with their job. Schein's important method classifies the visible artifacts, values and basic assumptions. Therefore, culture can be seen in many ways, from how professionals interact with one another, to deeply held beliefs about employee behavior. This hypothesis views positive work environment as a relational expression of organizational culture. Accessible supervisors, collaborative colleagues, courteous dialog, informal interaction, mutual support, recognition, inclusivity and an openness to feedback can foster camaraderie. Such activities may become normative if they are widely practiced. Employees learn by formal rules and the relationship between their supervisors and fellow workers.

The phenomenon of camaraderie at work is receiving scholarly attention. Workplace camaraderie is found within an organizational context that has objectives, responsibilities, performance evaluations, hierarchy, and professional boundaries unlike relationships outside of work. However, these engagements may provide emotional, social, and task-oriented benefits. Recent research has shown that employment networks can help employees with their work-related challenges. Three studies of 1,305 workers in 2026 found workplace camaraderie had beneficial relationships with supportive, emotional, health and performance outcomes. And so to the new, robust meta-analysis of office camaraderie. Across 191 datasets and 66,321 individuals, we documented a robust homological network of workplace camaraderie to personal, job-specific, and career-related outcomes. The Conservation of Resources hypothesis proposes that friendship offers social, emotional and task-based support. The Indian context is relevant. A 2026 study of 316 genuine responses from Indian corporate employees found that camaraderie in the workplace improved organizational commitment, employee welfare and job engagement. The study suggested that a friendly and inviting work environment could help organizations understand the psychological needs of their employees and build up a supportive organizational culture. These findings lead to an important question: Do friendly relations change corporate culture and workers' experiences? Apparently it is, but it is

complicated. Friendly working environments build trust and collaboration. But it is the organizational culture that determines whether they are viable or not. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)

1.2 Organizational Culture and Workplace Environment

The culture and climate of an organization are related but they are not the same thing. Climate refers to shared perceptions regarding organizational processes and contexts. Culture deals with deeper meanings, values and assumptions. Integrative thinking understands the fact that the perceptions of employees toward the work environment can affect the principles of the organization.

This is not to be confused with company ethos. Amicable settings as a representation, is a function, as part of a larger culture. A company can say that co-operation and respect are important, but it is the staff who will judge their sincerity through normal experience. The formal values are witnessed when leaders listen to their employees. When peers support each other, when mistakes are analyzed constructively and respect is accorded to all people. When a company appreciates teamwork but also rewards individual competition, ignores interpersonal conflict, or allows disrespect, employees may develop their own informal understandings. This indicates the difference in values and cultural practices. (Schneider et al., 2026)

1.3 Why a Friendly Environment Matters

People work much of their lives. This relational dimension of the experience may influence satisfaction, mental health, motivation, and commitment. Cultures of nurturing are also able to improve corporate efficacy. Research on supportive, innovative and bureaucratic cultures has shown that supportive and innovative cultures are positively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. However, culture does not always influence all behavioral outcomes such as turnover, absenteeism and productivity. Moreover, the evidence does not support the simplistic proposition that friendliness is always good for productivity. In contrast, friendly organizations seem to impact important psychological and relational processes that may enhance organizational performance. (Pathardikar & Sahu, 2011)

1.4 Problem Statement

Some companies focus on formal regulations, pay structures, performance management and digital infrastructure, but they do not see interpersonal connections. Personnel routinely interact with the culture of the organization. If there is no trust, social support, respect or psychological safety in an environment you cannot expect personnel to collaborate, work together, ask for help or show difficulty. However, some organizations use social activities to promote a perception of a “fun” or “supportive” work environment without tackling the underlying issues of injustice, overwork, poor management, exclusion or career development. Such strategies might increase the outward cordiality, but not produce real cultural change. The main theme of this analysis is therefore the impact of a really hospitable atmosphere at work on the organizational culture, the mechanisms that explain this relationship and the conditions under which friendliness can be beneficial. (Edmondson, 1999)

1.5 Research Question

Research question:
What is the effect of a positive workplace environment on organizational culture through interpersonal and organizational factors?

Support questions:
1. How does relationship at work affect behavior and attitudes of employees?
2. What is the role of psychological safety in a nice workplace?
3. How Do Trust, Social Support and Perceived Organizational Support Influence Culture?
4. Workplace friendships: an avenue for enhancing organizational commitment and involvement?
5. What risks are posed by extreme workplace informality or friendliness?
6. What are the ways organizations build a culture of health, welcome, and accountability?
(Edmondson, 1999)

2. Objective

2.1 General Objective

This review intends to assess the impact of a friendly workplace environment on organizational culture by systematically reviewing the literature on workplace relationships, social support,

psychological safety, trust, employee well-being, commitment, engagement, and organizational effectiveness. (Edmondson, 1999)

2.2 Specific Objectives

1. To examine the impact of friendly work condition on employee attitudes and organizational performance.
2. To identify specific psychological and social relationships between corporate culture and friendliness.
3. To discover how psychological safety can foster collaboration in the workplace.
4. To discuss the impact of supportive or clan culture on organizational effectiveness.
5. To understand the risks and downsides of workplace friendships.
6. To give practical advice for leaders of management and organizations.
7. To identify research gaps and suggest further research.

3. Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

3.1 Schein's Organizational Culture Framework

Schein's idea accounts for how friendships are incorporated into the culture of the workplace. The model has three levels: artifacts, values and assumptions. The artifact level friendliness is manifested in the open office interaction, casual conversation, team activities, approachable management, social events, and visible collaboration patterns. Those values might be respect, teamwork, inclusivity, caring for employees and collaboration. Friendly behavior becomes cultural when employees believe that helping co-workers, listening to others, and being polite to others are “how things are done here.” Repeated friendly behavior that is socially encouraged and passed on to new hires becomes culturally significant.

3.2 Social Exchange Theory

Social Exchange Theory suggests that relationships develop through the exchange of resources. Feeling supported by the superior and coworkers may create an obligation among employees to reciprocate.

The study of perceived organizational support focuses on employees' perceptions that the organization values and cares about them. Fairness, leadership support, HR procedures and working conditions affect organizational support. So a nice workplace might create a positive exchange cycle:

Organizational support results in trust, good employee reaction and collaboration, greater social interactions and the culture gets stronger. (Eisenberger et al., 2020)

3.3 Psychological Safety Theory

Psychological safety is the team's willingness to take risks with one another. In Edmondson's seminal research of 51 work teams, psychological safety was associated with team learning behavior, which moderated the relationship between psychological safety and team performance. Courteous, not punishing, responses foster open communication, making psychological safety critical to a pleasant workplace culture. So friendly surroundings make possible: Included: asking questions, admitting mistakes, seeking help, providing constructive criticism, disagreeing, sharing new ideas, and reporting problems. Recent literature reviews on psychological safety have been focused on getting work done, learning habits, enhancing work experience and leadership. (Edmondson, 1999)

3.4 Conservation of Resources Theory

More is explained by *Conservation of Resources theory*. Employees want to keep and protect valuables. Workplace friendships can provide emotional support, knowledge, help, companionship and social resources. A new meta-analysis of workplace friendships, from a resource-based perspective, finds several positive outcomes. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)

3.5 Competing Values Framework

The *competing values framework* identifies four types of organizational culture: clan, adhocracy, market, and hierarchy. Clan culture is important in creating a nice workplace because it encourages participation, cohesion, cooperation and interpersonal bonds. Meta-analysis of 84 empirical investigations and 94 independent samples indicated that clan, adhocracy and market cultures had a positive and variable effect on organizational performance ratings. Recent studies have also stressed the clan culture. The relationship between organizational culture and commitment was positive for SMEs in 2024, whereas national collectivism weakened the relationship. (Hartnell et al., 2011)

4. Methods

4.1 Research Design

This article presents a structured integrative literature review. The issue is quantitative, qualitative, theoretical, systematic-review, and meta-analytic research on related dimensions; an

integrated review is appropriate. There are no survey data in the study. Therefore, the Results section is a synthesis of scientific information and not novel data from samples. The evaluation was guided by the PRISMA 2020 reporting guidelines. PRISMA 2020 has 27 reporting items to promote transparency in the rationale for conducting a review, selection of studies, and synthesis of evidence. (Page et al., 2021)

4.2 Literature Search Strategy

Searches were conducted in scholarly and academic sources using combinations of the following phrases to locate the literature that was under consideration. There are various types of workplace environments: “friendly workplace environment,” “workplace friendship,” “organizational culture,” “supportive organizational culture,” “clan culture,” “psychological safety,” “employee well-being,” “organizational commitment,” “employee engagement,” “social support at work,” “workplace relationships,” and “organizational effectiveness.” The following are some of the combinations of search phrases: ("workplace friendship" OR "friendly workplace" OR "social support") AND ("organizational culture" OR "organizational climate") and ("psychological safety" OR "employee support" OR "workplace relationships") AND ("commitment" OR "engagement" OR "well-being" OR "performance"). (Edmondson, 1999)

4.3 Inclusion Criteria

Studies were significant with: Studied workplace relationships, friendship, supportive culture, psychological safety or similar constructs; Reported results for the organization or the employee Published in reputable academic sources; Provided enough data to interpret workplace environment and outcomes; Contributed conceptually or empirically to the research quest. (Edmondson, 1999)

4.4 Exclusion Criteria

When it left out the literature: Focused only on friendships outside of work; had no organizational or employee outcomes; had no methodological information; provided commercial advice with no academic basis; or Duplicated evidence from a better review.

4.5 Data Extraction

Information was organized according to:

Author and publication year;

Geographical context;

Research design;

Sample characteristics;

Principal variables;

Measurement approach;

Major findings;

Theoretical framework;

Organizational outcomes; and

Limitations.

4.6 Analytical Approach

Statistical meta-analysis was not performed due to different methodology and outcome measures in the literature reviewed in this article. We performed a thematic synthesis. These themes framed the evidence: Workplace friendship impacts employee wellbeing, commitment, psychological safety, organizational culture, trust, social exchange, engagement, performance, cultural and contextual differences and related risks. It enables conceptual comparisons of data from studies with different measurement devices and research strategies without false statistical precision. (Edmondson, 1999)

4.7 Ethical Considerations

No institutional participant agreement was required for this review as it used previously available material and did not collect personally identifying information or include human participants. All published work should be cited and referenced correctly. The paper does not describe secondary evidence as an original empirical study. The difference here is important: review publications are not supposed to be making up sample sizes , statistical coefficients , or survey results .

5. Results

5.1 Overall Pattern of Evidence

Studies show that friendly, supportive work environments boost employee-oriented organizational outcomes. Most consistent results are organizational commitment, work satisfaction, well-being, engagement, supporting behavior, learning behavior and performance.

The interaction is not always automatic or positive. Structured friendliness, inclusive interactions and equitable and accountable organizational structures affect outcomes. (Edmondson, 1999)

5.2 Workplace Friendship and Employee Well-Being

One obvious benefit of having friends at work is employee well-being. Friendships at work can offer emotional support in difficult times, practical assistance when the pressures of work mount up, a forum in which to air grievances and a feeling of belonging. A recent study from India shows that friendship at workplace promotes employee well-being, job involvement and organizational commitment. (2026). Three studies found health and emotion to be good correlates of workplace friendships. The findings suggest that social interactions can be resources in challenging work contexts. Organizations cannot ignore the influence of employee networks on performance. Social connection can ease employees' job responsibilities. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)

5.3 Workplace Friendship and Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is the employee's attachment and identification with the company. Studies show friendly interactions can enhance employee engagement by helping them feel like they're part of the team. An Indian study (2026) demonstrates that friendship at the workplace enhances organizational commitment. Research on organizational culture has also linked commitment to the support of cultural traits. Earlier studies have shown positive association between supportive and creative culture and corporate commitment and significant cultural antecedents and personnel commitment in Indian public sector. A separate study in China revealed that hierarchical and clan cultures, supervisor support and organizational trust had positive predictive effects on emotional commitment. Trust influenced the culture of the clan and the support of the supervisor. The results indicate that interpersonal friendliness may mediate the relationship between belonging, trust and perceived organizational support and commitment. (Eisenberger et al., 2020)

5.4 Workplace Friendship and Job Involvement

Job involvement is the degree to which employees identify psychologically with their job. "Positive workplace relationships could encourage workers' engagement in organizational

operations. The Indian research of 2026 showed a strong positive association between workplace friendship and job engagement. Research on southern Indian hospitality found that workplace friendship promoted proactive performance through employee involvement, and the mediating effect was further enhanced by friendship self-efficacy. These findings suggest that social connection could influence performance both directly and through psychological mechanisms such as engagement and self-efficacy. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)

5.5 Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior

Psychological safety is an especially good way to connect friendliness to corporate culture. Workers are more likely to ask questions and raise mistakes if they believe that colleagues and bosses will not humiliate or punish them for taking appropriate interpersonal risks. Edmondson found the effect of learning behavior on the relationship between psychological safety and team performance in 51 teams. This observation offers a robust theoretical basis for why pleasant environments can enhance organizational learning. A friendly culture makes communication safer. Psychological safety transforms interpersonal ease into learning. (Edmondson, 1999)

5.6 Supportive Culture and Organizational Effectiveness

Boosts performance. Research shows that a happy workplace, one that is relationship-oriented, leads to increased productivity. A Meta analysis of the Competing Values Framework found that clan culture had a positive effect on corporate performance, but the strength and type of effect was dependent on the outcome. In 2024, psychological capital mitigated the positive relationship between company culture and labor performance. It is psychological resources that shape culture, not amicability. (Hartnell et al., 2011)

5.7 Trusts as a Mediating Mechanism

Trust is the secret to a happy workplace. Trustworthy bosses and coworkers can help foster open communication and collaboration. A recent study of organizational culture and psychological safety across 18 countries found that a clan culture was associated with higher psychological safety than a hierarchy culture, and that this relationship was mediated by confidence in top management.

That matters, because it suggests culture is also touching the employee experience. Trust is a cultural factor impacting psychological safety. (Edmondson, 1999)

5.8 Social Support and Perceived Organizational Support

Supportive workplace relationships may be interpreted by employees as an indication that the company cares about them.

The theory of organizational support suggests that it matters how employees perceive the extent to which their contributions and well-being are valued. In empirical research, fairness, supervisor support, human-resource procedures and working environment have been supported as predictors of organizational support.

That means you can't create a welcoming environment through your interactions with co-workers. "Leadership and organizational systems must show real concern for employees. (Berman et al., 2002)

5.9 Workplace Friendship and Performance

The evidence concerning performance is generally positive but more complex than the evidence concerning well-being and commitment. The 2026 research on workplace friendship found positive associations with performance-related outcomes, while the hospitality research indicates that engagement can mediate the relationship between friendship and proactive performance. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)

However, friendship may also create interruptions, social obligations, favoritism, or reduced willingness to provide difficult feedback. Therefore, organizations should not assume that increasing social interaction automatically increases productivity.

5.10 Positive and Negative Effects

The literature identifies several benefits of workplace friendship: (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)

Greater emotional and social support;

Stronger organizational commitment; (Pathardikar & Sahu, 2011)

Higher job involvement;

Improved well-being;

Increased engagement;

Greater willingness to cooperate;

Greater information sharing;

Stronger psychological safety; (Edmondson, 1999)

Improved learning behavior; and. (Edmondson, 1999)

Potentially stronger performance.

However, *potential negative effects* include:

Favoritism;

Exclusion of employees outside friendship groups;

Conflicts of interest;

Difficulty giving honest feedback;

Excessive informal interaction;

Blurred professional boundaries;

Interpersonal conflict when friendships end;

Reduced competitiveness in certain situations; and

The creation of informal power networks.

A study examining workplace friendship and employee outcomes found that friendship can reduce job insecurity and turnover intention but also highlighted the possibility that supervisor friendship can have complex consequences depending on employee work ethics. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)

Therefore, the objective should not be to maximize friendship. The objective should be to create an environment in which positive relationships coexist with fairness and professionalism.

6. Discussion

6.1 Interpretation of the Findings

The evidence reviewed supports the central proposition that a friendly workplace environment can influence organizational culture by shaping employees' everyday experiences, expectations, and behaviors.

The relationship can be understood as a reinforcing cycle:

Friendly leadership and organizational practices



Trust, respect, social support and psychological safety. (Edmondson, 1999)



Positive interpersonal relationships and workplace friendship. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)



Higher engagement, commitment, well-being and learning



Repeated positive behaviors



Shared norms and assumptions



Stronger supportive organizational culture

This cycle explains why culture is more than a formal policy document. Employees observe how others behave and use those observations to understand what the organization genuinely values.

6.2 Friendly Environment as a Cultural Mechanism

The review suggests that friendliness should be understood as both an outcome and a mechanism of culture.

When an organization values cooperation and respect, employees may develop friendly relationships. At the same time, repeated friendly interactions reinforce the perception that cooperation and respect are expected behaviors.

This process is consistent with Schein's model. Visible behavior constitutes an important cultural artifact, while repeated behaviors may become associated with espoused values and eventually deeper assumptions.

For example, consider an organization in which managers regularly ask employees for their opinions, colleagues assist one another, and mistakes are discussed constructively. Over time, new employees may learn that asking for help is acceptable and that cooperation is valued. These expectations become part of the organizational culture.

6.3 Psychological Safety as a Key Mediator

The review strongly supports psychological safety as one of the mechanisms connecting friendliness and culture. (Edmondson, 1999)

A friendly workplace can reduce perceived interpersonal risk. However, psychological safety requires more than being socially pleasant. Employees need confidence that disagreement, questions, mistakes, and suggestions will be treated constructively. (Edmondson, 1999)

Edmondson's research provides evidence that psychological safety contributes to learning behavior and performance. (Edmondson, 1999)

This distinction is important. A workplace can be socially friendly but psychologically unsafe. Employees may joke together and socialize while still being afraid to challenge a manager. Genuine organizational friendliness therefore requires both positive relationships and freedom to communicate professionally.

6.4 Relationship with Organizational Commitment

The evidence indicates that friendly environments can strengthen commitment by creating belonging. Employees who develop positive relationships at work may have stronger emotional connections to the organization. They may not want to leave not only because of compensation or career opportunities but because they value their colleagues and organizational community. This interpretation is consistent with evidence linking workplace friendship, clan culture, organizational trust, supervisor support, and commitment. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)

However, commitment based exclusively on friendship can become problematic if employees remain in an organization because of social relationships despite poor working conditions. Therefore, relationship-based commitment should complement rather than substitute for fair compensation, career development, effective leadership, and meaningful work.

6.5 Relationship with Employee Engagement

Friendly environments may increase engagement by satisfying social and psychological needs. Employees are more likely to invest energy in their work when they feel accepted and supported. Workplace friendship can provide encouragement and assistance, which may increase confidence and willingness to contribute. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)

The recent hospitality research from India provides evidence that workplace friendship can influence proactive performance through employee engagement. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026). This suggests that managers should consider social relationships when designing engagement strategies.

6.6 Relationship with Innovation and Learning

Innovation requires employees to communicate ideas, challenge existing practices, and tolerate uncertainty. A culture characterized by fear and interpersonal risk can discourage these behaviors. (Edmondson, 1999)

Psychological safety therefore becomes important. When employees believe that mistakes will be treated as learning opportunities rather than personal failures, they may be more willing to experiment. (Edmondson, 1999)

Friendly relationships can provide the interpersonal foundation for this safety, while organizational leadership determines whether such safety extends to meaningful work-related disagreement.

6.7 Leadership and the Development of Friendly Culture

Leaders play a critical role in determining whether friendliness becomes a healthy organizational norm.

Managers influence culture through:

Their communication style;

Reactions to mistakes;

Treatment of employees;

Fairness in decision making;

Willingness to listen;

Recognition practices;

Conflict management;

Inclusion;

Workload distribution; and

Responses to employee concern

If leaders demonstrate respect and openness, employees receive a strong signal about acceptable behavior.

Recent evidence from China indicates that supervisor support and organizational trust are important predictors of affective commitment and that clan culture can strengthen the relationship between trust and commitment. (Hartnell et al., 2011)

6.8 Cultural Context

Culture cannot be separated entirely from national and social context. The 2025 meta-analysis of workplace friendship identified cultural factors such as individualism and collectivism as potential moderators of relationships involving workplace friendship. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)

This is particularly relevant in India and other collectivist or relationship-oriented contexts, where social belonging and interpersonal relationships may play a substantial role in organizational life. However, organizations should avoid assuming that all employees have identical preferences. Younger employees, remote workers, introverted employees, employees from different cultural backgrounds, and employees with different personal boundaries may experience workplace friendship differently. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026). Thus, a genuinely inclusive friendly culture should provide opportunities for connection without forcing employees to participate in social activities.

6.9 Remote and Hybrid Work

The growth of remote and hybrid work has changed how workplace friendships develop. Employees may have fewer spontaneous interactions, informal conversations, and opportunities to build relationships. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026). At the same time, digital communication can create new forms of connection. Virtual meetings, online communities, mentoring programs, team discussions, and informal digital spaces can support relationships.

The challenge for organizations is to avoid equating physical proximity with cultural connection. A friendly culture should be represented in communication norms, leadership behavior, inclusion, and support regardless of work location.

6.10 Friendly Culture versus "Fun" Culture

A significant distinction must be made between a friendly culture and a fun workplace. A fun workplace may include games, parties, celebrations, informal dress, or recreational activities. These activities can contribute to positive experiences, but they do not necessarily indicate genuine organizational support.

A friendly culture is deeper. It is demonstrated when:

Managers treat employees respectfully;

Employees can disagree without fear;

Colleagues provide assistance;

Workload concerns are taken seriously;

Employees are included in decisions;

Conflicts are handled fairly;

Achievements are recognized;

Mistakes are treated constructively; and

Professional boundaries are respected.

Therefore, organizations should not attempt to create friendliness merely by organizing social events. Cultural change requires consistent behavioral and structural reinforcement.

6.11 Risks of Excessive Workplace Friendship

Despite the positive findings, workplace friendship has potential disadvantages. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026).

Favoritism

When supervisors develop close friendships with selected employees, other employees may perceive unfair treatment. Even if favoritism does not actually occur, the perception of unequal treatment can undermine trust.

Exclusion

Strong friendship groups can unintentionally exclude employees who are less socially connected. This may produce informal in-groups and out-groups.

Conflict of Interest

Friendship can complicate managerial decisions involving performance evaluation, promotion, discipline, or resource allocation.

Reduced Constructive Criticism

Employees may hesitate to criticize friends because they want to protect the relationship.

Blurred Boundaries

Excessive social interaction can interfere with productivity and professional responsibilities.

Emotional Consequences

When a close workplace friendship breaks down, the consequences may affect team functioning and job satisfaction. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)

The evidence therefore supports a balanced model in which organizations encourage respectful relationships while establishing clear professional standards.

6.12 Comparison with Existing Literature

The findings of this review are broadly consistent with previous research. The workplace friendship literature emphasizes relationships between friendship and employee attitudes, performance, and well-being. Recent meta-analytic evidence strengthens this conclusion by demonstrating positive associations across a large number of samples. Psychological safety research similarly indicates that interpersonal conditions influence learning and team functioning. Organizational culture research demonstrates that supportive and clan-oriented cultures are associated with employee attitudes and organizational effectiveness. Organizational support research provides another complementary explanation by showing that employees respond positively when they perceive the organization as valuing their contribution and caring about their well-being. Recent evidence therefore supports an integrated model rather than treating friendship, culture, psychological safety, and support as completely separate concepts. (Edmondson, 1999)

6.13 Theoretical Implications

The review makes several theoretical contributions.

First, it suggests that workplace friendship should be understood as a cultural phenomenon rather than merely an interpersonal phenomenon. Friendships develop within organizational structures and can influence organizational norms. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)

Second, psychological safety can explain how friendly relationships translate into learning and organizational effectiveness. (Edmondson, 1999)

Third, social exchange theory explains why employees may reciprocate organizational support with positive attitudes and behaviors.

Fourth, Conservation of Resources theory explains why workplace friendship can be beneficial during demanding work conditions. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)

Finally, Schein's culture framework helps explain how repeated interpersonal behaviors can become shared assumptions and norms.

Together, these perspectives support a multilevel understanding of the relationship:

Individual level: well-being, satisfaction, engagement.

Interpersonal level: friendship, trust, social support.

Team level: psychological safety, collaboration, learning. (Edmondson, 1999)

Organizational level: culture, commitment, effectiveness.

6.14 Managerial Implications

Organizations should develop friendly environments deliberately rather than assuming that relationships will develop automatically.

Managers can:

Demonstrate respectful communication;

Create psychologically safe team meetings;

Encourage employees to ask questions;

Recognize supportive behavior;

Provide mentoring opportunities;

Encourage cross-functional interaction;

Establish fair conflict-resolution processes;

Prevent favoritism;

Respect professional boundaries;

Provide flexible opportunities for social interaction;

Include remote employees;

Train managers in supportive leadership; and

Regularly assess employees' perceptions of organizational culture.

Organizations should also measure culture periodically rather than relying solely on management perceptions.

6.15 Limitations of the Review

Several limitations should be acknowledged.

First, the literature uses different definitions and measurements of workplace friendship, organizational culture, psychological safety, and employee outcomes. This makes direct comparisons difficult. (Edmondson, 1999)

Second, many organizational studies use cross-sectional designs. Such studies can demonstrate associations but cannot always establish causality.

Third, workplace friendship may be influenced by national culture, organizational industry, organizational size, leadership style, employee personality, and work arrangement. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)

Fourth, positive workplace relationships may have both positive and negative consequences depending on context. (Berman et al., 2002)

Fifth, much of the available evidence comes from specific countries or sectors. Findings from healthcare, hospitality, education, manufacturing, or corporate settings may not generalize completely to every organization.

Systematic research on organizational culture has similarly noted considerable heterogeneity in culture definitions, measurement approaches, settings, and study designs, which can restrict direct comparison among studies.

6.16 Future Research Directions

Future research should move beyond simple correlations between workplace friendship and positive outcomes. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)

Longitudinal research could examine whether friendly relationships actually cause changes in organizational culture or whether organizations with positive cultures simply make friendships easier to develop.

Future studies could also investigate:

Differences between coworker friendship and supervisor friendship;

Effects of friendship in remote and hybrid workplaces;

Friendship and employee voice;

Friendship and innovation;

Friendship and psychological safety; (Edmondson, 1999)

Cultural differences between collectivist and individualist societies;

Friendship among different generations;

Gender differences in workplace relationships; (Berman et al., 2002)

Friendship and employee retention;

Friendship and ethical decision making;

Risks of informal power networks;

Workplace friendship and inclusion; (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)

The role of artificial intelligence and digital communication in workplace relationships; and how organizations can balance friendship with professional accountability. (Berman et al., 2002)

Experimental and longitudinal designs would be particularly valuable because much of the existing literature is based on surveys.

7. Conclusion

The purpose of this review was to examine the impact of a friendly workplace environment on organizational culture. The evidence indicates that workplace friendliness is not simply a matter of employee happiness or social interaction. It can influence important organizational processes by strengthening trust, social support, psychological safety, engagement, commitment, learning, and well-being. (Edmondson, 1999)

The evidence from workplace friendship research is particularly compelling. A recent meta-analysis involving 191 independent samples and 66,321 participants found broad positive relationships between workplace friendship and individual, job-related, and career outcomes. Recent research among Indian corporate employees also found significant positive relationships between workplace friendship, organizational commitment, job involvement, and employee well-being. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)

The review further demonstrates that a friendly environment can contribute to organizational culture through repeated interpersonal behaviors. When employees consistently experience respect, trust, cooperation, openness, and support, these behaviors can become shared expectations. In Schein's framework, repeated behaviors may move from visible artifacts toward shared values and deeper assumptions.

Psychological safety is a particularly important mechanism. Employees who feel safe taking interpersonal risks are more likely to engage in learning behaviors, communicate problems, ask questions, and contribute ideas. The evidence from team research demonstrates the relationship between psychological safety, learning behavior, and team performance. (Edmondson, 1999)

The review also establishes that organizational friendliness should not be understood as unlimited informality. A healthy culture must combine positive relationships with fairness, accountability, inclusion, performance expectations, and professional boundaries. Friendship can create favoritism, exclusion, conflicts of interest, and difficulty providing honest feedback if it is not managed carefully.

Therefore, the central conclusion is that organizations should not attempt simply to make workplaces "fun." They should create respectful, supportive, inclusive, psychologically safe, and relationship-oriented environments in which employees can build positive connections while maintaining professional standards.

Based on the reviewed evidence, organizations should consider the following recommendations:

Develop respectful leadership. Managers should model empathy, fairness, openness, and constructive communication.

Build psychological safety. Employees should be able to ask questions, acknowledge mistakes, and express alternative opinions without fear of humiliation or retaliation. (Edmondson, 1999)

Encourage healthy workplace relationships. Organizations can provide mentoring, team-building, peer-learning, and cross-functional collaboration opportunities. (Berman et al., 2002)

Maintain fairness. Friendly relationships should never determine promotion, performance evaluation, compensation, or access to opportunities.

Prevent exclusion. Social groups should not become informal organizational power structures.

Respect individual differences. Employees should not be pressured to participate in social activities.

Support remote employees. Digital and hybrid workers should have equitable opportunities for communication and relationship building.

Recognize supportive behavior. Employees who assist colleagues, share knowledge, mentor others, and contribute to team well-being should receive appropriate recognition.

Train managers. Leadership development should include psychological safety, conflict management, inclusion, trust, and relationship management. (Edmondson, 1999)

Measure organizational culture. Regular employee surveys, interviews, focus groups, and feedback systems can identify whether organizational values are actually reflected in daily behavior.

Balance friendliness with accountability. A healthy culture should encourage interpersonal warmth while maintaining clear performance and ethical expectations.

Use evidence-based cultural interventions. Social events alone should not be considered sufficient to change organizational culture.

In conclusion, a friendly workplace environment can become a powerful cultural asset when friendliness is embedded in organizational values, leadership behavior, HR practices, and everyday employee interactions. The strongest culture is not one in which everyone is required to become friends; it is one in which employees feel that they can work with others respectfully, trust their colleagues and leaders, ask for help, express ideas, and contribute without unnecessary interpersonal fear. Such a culture has the potential to benefit employees while simultaneously supporting organizational learning, commitment, engagement, and effectiveness.

References

1. Berman, E. M., West, J. P., & Richter, M. N. (2002). Workplace relations: Friendship patterns and consequences (according to managers). *Public Administration Review*, 62(2), 217–230. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0033-3352.00172>. (Berman et al., 2002)
2. Braithwaite, J., Herkes, J., Ludlow, K., Testa, L., & Lamprell, G. (2017). Association between organisational and workplace cultures, and patient outcomes: Systematic review. *BMJ Open*, 7(11), e017708. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-017708>.
3. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999>. (Edmondson, 1999)
4. Eisenberger, R., Shanock, L. R., & Wen, X. (2020). Perceived organizational support: Why caring about employees counts. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 7, 101–124. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012119-044917>. (Eisenberger et al., 2020)
5. Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y., & Kinicki, A. (2011). Organizational culture and organizational effectiveness: A meta-analytic investigation of the competing values framework's theoretical suppositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 677–694. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021987>. (Hartnell et al., 2011)
6. Kim, T.-Y., Lin, X., & Kim, S.-P. (2019). Person–organization fit and friendship from coworkers: Effects on feeling self-verified and employee outcomes. *Group & Organization Management*, 44(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601117726632>. (Kim et al., 2019)
7. Mirando, T. J., Han, K., Vespi, C., Colarelli, S. M., et al. (2026). Friends with (workplace) benefits: Support, affect, health, performance, and innovation outcomes. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00218863261433643>.

8. Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., et al. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>. (Page et al., 2021)
9. Pathardikar, A. D., & Sahu, S. (2011). Implications of the organization cultural antecedents on organizational commitment: A study in Indian public sector units. *SAGE Open/Global Business Review*, 12(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/097215091101200306>. (Pathardikar & Sahu, 2011)
10. Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2026). Organizational climate and culture: History, current status, integration, and change. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 13, 309–335. (Schneider et al., 2026)
11. Sharma, K., & Chaturvedi, A. (2021). Linking workplace friendships to the organizational outcomes concerning job satisfaction and job performance. *LBS Journal of Management & Research*, 19(1), 22–37. <https://doi.org/10.5958/0974-1852.2021.00002.X>. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)
12. Balachandar, A., & Gurusamy, R. (2026). Friendships at workplace and its impact on employees. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 13, 262.
13. Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Jackson, T. A., McInnis, K. J., Maltin, E. R., & Sheppard, L. (2012). Affective, normative, and continuance commitment levels across cultures: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2), 225–245. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.09.005>. (Meyer et al., 2012)
14. Mirando, T. J., Han, K., Vespi, C., & Colarelli, S. M. (2026). Friends with (workplace) benefits: Support, affect, health, performance, and innovation outcomes. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*.
15. A comprehensive meta-analysis of workplace friendship: A resource-based perspective. (2025). *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 35(1). (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)
16. Organizational culture, trust, and supervisor support: Drivers of employee commitment in China. (2025/2026). *Frontiers in Psychology*.

17. Impact of dimensions of organizational culture on employee satisfaction and performance level in select organizations. (2024). IIMB Management Review. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iimb.2024.07.001>.
18. Chen, Y.-C., Wang, Y.-H., & Chu, H.-C. (2024). Meta-analytic structural equation modeling for exploring workplace friendship, well-being, and organizational commitment. *Work*, 79(3), 1039–1053. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-230482>. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)
19. Chen, Y., Yang, C., Chen, A., & Yang, X. (2025). A comprehensive meta-analysis of workplace friendship: A resource-based perspective. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 35(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2025.2557315>. (Chen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2025; Mirando et al., 2026)
20. Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y., & Kinicki, A. (2011). Organizational culture and organizational effectiveness: A meta-analytic investigation of the competing values framework's theoretical suppositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 677–694. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021987>. (Hartnell et al., 2011)
21. Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383. (Edmondson, 1999)
22. Chen, Y.-C., Wang, Y.-H., & Chu, H.-C. (2024). Meta-analytic structural equation modeling for exploring workplace friendship, well-being, and organizational commitment. *Work*, 79(3), 1039–1053. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-230482>
23. Mirando, T. J., Han, K., Vespi, C., Colarelli, S. M., et al. (2026). Friends with (workplace) benefits: Support, affect, health, performance, and innovation outcomes. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00218863261433643>