Received: 15 November 2017 | Revised: 15 February 2019 | Accepted: 3 April 2019

DOI: 10.1002/job.2367

THE JOB ANNUAL REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT ISSUE

WILEY Journal of Organizational Behavior

Moral emotions: A review and research agenda for management scholarship

Rebecca Greenbaum[1] | Julena Bonner[2] | Truit Gray[3] | Mary Mawritz[4]

[1] Human Resources Management Department, School of Management and Labor Relations, Rutgers University, Piscataway, New Jersey

[2] Management Department, Jon M. Huntsman School of Business, Utah State University, Logan, Utah

[3] Management Department, Spears School of Business, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma

[4] Department of Management, LeBow College of Business, Drexel University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Correspondence
Rebecca Greenbaum, Human Resources Management Department, School of Management and Labor Relations, Rutgers University, Piscataway 08854, NJ.
Email: rebecca.greenbaum@rutgers.edu

Summary

By discussing "families" of moral emotions, we synthesize and review the moral emotions literature in an effort to advance organizational scholarship. First, we broadly discuss "what constitutes a moral emotion?" Second, we critically examine each family of moral emotions. We discuss key controversies and debates, particularly in terms of construct overlap, and provide recommendations. Third, we review scholarly work on each family of moral emotions in the workplace and offer ideas for future research. Finally, in our general future directions, we discuss a range of theoretical perspectives that can be used to advance the moral emotions literature in the management field.

KEYWORDS

affect, behavioral ethics, emotions, moral emotions

1 | INTRODUCTION

Organizations are inherently social. They bring together people from multiple backgrounds to collectively pursue the organizations' goals. As members of the organization, employees benefit by receiving financial security, opportunities for growth and development (Rousseau & McLean Parks, 1993), and perhaps even chances to give back to society more broadly (Thompson & Bunderson, 2003). However, because the organizational context forces diverse employees to work together towards a common goal, this context requires employees to cooperate with one another and to refrain from infringing on each other's rights (Folger, 2001). In this respect, extant research has focused on the physiological processes that allow people to navigate the complexities of social interactions and relationships (Ekman, 1992), and emotions have been identified as serving the important social function of helping people to harmoniously live and work together (Morris & Keltner, 2000). Moral emotions, in particular, serve to support the moral standards enacted by society (Haidt, 2003) and help people to evaluate their own and others' behaviors in terms of contributing to, or detracting from, a well-functioning world. Moral emotions also play a key role in circumventing unethical conduct (i.e., behavior that does not align with societal moral standards; Treviño, Weaver, & Reynolds, 2006) and encouraging prosocial behavior (Bartlett & DeSteno, 2006), two employee-driven outcomes that are important to an organization's vitality (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002).

The management field has experienced increased scholarly interest in both behavioral ethics (Treviño, den Nieuwenboer, & Kish-Gephart, 2014) and emotions (Barsade, Brief, & Spataro, 2003), which has contributed to a growing body of organizationally relevant research on moral emotions. This growth in research has created the need to systematically organize key research findings. However, research on moral emotions in the organizational sciences has yet to be reviewed. Furthermore, as the moral emotions literature has developed, ambiguities have surfaced, especially with respect to construct clarity. In this regard, the management field would benefit from recommendations on how to handle these issues to create a more streamlined literature. Finally, even though there has been an increase in research on moral emotions in organizational behavior, this research domain remains understudied in terms of explaining organizational phenomena. A systematic, comprehensive review could provide scholars with a resource to use in applying research on moral emotions to the organizational context.

We provide a review of the moral emotion's literature in the management sciences with a few objectives in mind. First, we clarify what constitutes a "moral" emotion. We discuss moral emotions as activated, physiological processes (Ekman, 1992) that arise due to morally relevant situations (Haidt, 2003). Thus, we do not review research on moral emotions that are expressed as individual differences. Second, we organize the literature into four dominant families of moral emotions (Haidt, 2003). Within each family, we draw on the moral psychology literature to reconcile ambiguities concerning construct overlap of specific moral emotions. Third, we review and synthesize current management research on moral emotions. Then, after reviewing research on each emotion, we provide provoking directions for future research. Finally, we discuss theoretical perspectives that can be used in future research to further advance the field. Our review is organized in such a way that scholars can use it as a reference guide to learn general information about moral emotions research, and also to hone in on specific moral emotions.

2 | WHAT IS A MORAL EMOTION? DEFINITION AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Moral emotions are "… emotions that are linked to the interests or welfare of society as a whole or at least of persons other than the judge or agent" (Haidt, 2003, p. 853). People experience moral emotions as an efficient way of recognizing when they, or others, have or have not upheld moral standards (i.e., standards enacted by society to promote a well-functioning world). These emotions originate from biological hardwiring (e.g., Bloom, 2013; de Waal, 2005; Sagi & Hoffman, 1976), past experiences (Ekman, 1992), and social learning (e.g., Tangney & Dearing, 2002). For example, past research suggests that infants and primates are biologically predisposed to recognize unfair social interactions and to respond with moral emotions and behaviors (e.g., de Waal, 2006; Geraci & Surian, 2011). Additionally, people experience moral emotions when they are victims of mistreatment (e.g., Huang, Greenbaum, Bonner, & Wang, in press). These emotions serve a protective function by alerting people to the possibility of harmful, future situations (Tangney, Stuewig, & Mashek, 2007). Finally, as children, individuals are often reprimanded for their behaviors that infringe upon the rights of other people and are taught that moral emotions are an appropriate response (e.g., shame; Lagattuta & Thompson, 2007). Thus, past research suggests that people are born with or develop a capacity to automatically experience moral emotions in response to (im)moral events. These emotions then serve as motivational forces that drive subsequent behaviors (Tangney, Stuewig, & Mashek, 2007).

3 | MORAL EMOTIONS IN THE MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

Moral emotions have been grouped into four families that share similar characteristics (Haidt, 2003). Each family differs in terms of whether the focus is on the transgressor (self vs. other) or victim, and whether the behavior violates or transcends moral standards. These families include *other-praising*, *other-suffering*, *other-condemning*, and *self-condemning* moral emotions. Please see Table 1 for the definitions of each moral emotion.

3.1 | Other-praising emotions

People experience *other-praising* moral emotions when they are exposed to, and encouraged by, another person's morally laudable behaviors (Haidt, 2003). Other-praising emotions include gratitude and elevation. These emotions are quite distinct from one another and thus do not elicit much controversy. Although substantial issues have not surfaced between these two constructs, each construct has been compared with other constructs (e.g., positive affect), which we discuss below in the individual sections.

TABLE 1 Key Definitions

Moral emotions	Definition "… those emotions that are linked to the interests or welfare of society as a whole or at least of persons other than the judge or agent" (Haidt, 2003, p. 853).
Other-praising emotions	Positive feelings that occur when another person upholds moral standards.
Gratitude	Positive feelings that occur due to being the recipient of another's good deeds.
Elevation	Positive feelings that arise due to witnessing another person's moral excellence.
Other-suffering emotions	Feelings that occur when another person is the victim of a moral standard violation.
Sympathy	An emotional reaction to the suffering of others that is accompanied by desires to help.
Other-condemning emotions	Negative feelings towards others because they have violated moral standards.
Contempt	Feelings of disdain or disapproval towards those who have violated moral standards without opportunities for reconciliation.
Anger	Feelings of indignation towards those who violated moral standards, along with desires to redress the wrongdoing.
Disgust	An emotional experience that surfaces due to violations of personal or group sanctity.
Self-conscious emotions	Negative feelings towards the self because one has violated moral standards.
Shame	An emotional experience that arises due to negative self-evaluations of one's moral character.
Guilt	A negative emotional experience triggered by one's own behaviors that indicate a moral failure.

3.1.1 | Gratitude

People experience gratitude when they are the recipient of another's good deeds (Bartlett & DeSteno, 2006; Emmons, 2003; Emmons & McCullough, 2003). A person may receive assistance, support, or a gift from another person, which elicits positive feelings in the form of gratitude (e.g., thankfulness; Grant & Gino, 2010; Tesser, Gatewood, & Driver, 1968). Gratitude is different than the basic "happiness" emotions (e.g., joy and amusement; Algoe & Haidt, 2009), because it motivates reciprocating behaviors (McCullough, Kilpatrick, Emmons, & Larson, 2001) and interpersonal bonding (Algoe & Haidt, 2009; Morris & Keltner, 2000; Osborne, Smith, & Huo, 2012). Additionally, extant research has shown that gratitude produces incremental validity over general feelings of positive affect (Spence, Brown, Keeping, & Lian, 2014), which provides evidence of gratitude's distinctiveness (Algoe & Haidt, 2009).

Antecedents

Extant research demonstrates that an organization's and a leader's perceived good deeds can facilitate employee gratitude. Using a daily diary study, Ford, Wang, Jin, and Eisenberger (2018) found that at the between-person level of analysis, perceived organizational support facilitated employees' chronic feelings of gratitude. Within person, they found that supervisor helping temporarily activated employees' episodic feelings of gratitude. Similarly, Ng (2016) conducted a longitudinal field study and found that perceived respect from the organization produced employee gratitude. Furthermore, qualitative research conducted by Ford, Agosta, Huang, and Shannon (2018) proposed a range of antecedents of gratitude including (a) receiving recognition for one's hard work; (b) receiving attractive resources, benefits, and work perks; (c) conducting meaningful work; and (d) having high-performing, supportive colleagues. In contrast, an organization's decision to impose furloughs (i.e., involuntary reductions in pay) incited employees' relative deprivation (i.e., viewing one's situation as unfair and comparatively worse than that of others), which hindered feelings of gratitude (Osborne, Smith, & Huo, 2012).

Good deeds enacted by the organization and its members can also facilitate gratitude among consumers. For example, organizations that had strategies to control offshore drilling procedures elicited gratitude in their consumers, especially when the drilling was viewed as environmentally risky (Grappi, Romani, & Bagozzi, 2013). Similarly, consumers have been found to respond to corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives by experiencing gratitude (Xie, Bagozzi, & Grønhaug, 2015). Past research has also shown that a salesperson's extra role behaviors and information sharing towards customers activate consumer gratitude (Mangus, Bock, Jones, & Folse, 2017). In sum, these studies demonstrate that an organization's socially responsible behaviors are beneficial to both employee and customer experiences.

Consequences

A considerable amount of research has examined gratitude in relation to favorable outcomes. For example, induced gratitude has been found to lead to improved well-being and prosocial behaviors. Across two experimental studies, Emmons and McCullough (2003) manipulated gratitude and found that induced gratitude improved life satisfaction, led to positive expectations regarding the future, reduced unfavorable physical symptoms, and enhanced helping behaviors and other-directed social support. Similarly, results from a longitudinal study that utilized a gratitude intervention demonstrated that participants experienced enhanced well-being, higher self-reported scores on gratitude, and reduced absenteeism (Kaplan et al., 2014). In another study, a gratitude intervention program enhanced participants' subjective well-being on the job (Neumeier, Brook, Ditchburn, & Sckopke, 2017). Furthermore, health care participants were subjected to a gratitude intervention that involved counting blessings via daily diary entries (Cheng, Tsui, & Lam, 2015). Participants were found to experience less stress and less depressive symptoms, which continued after the intervention ended.

Research also suggests that the effectiveness of gratitude intervention programs depends on participants' personality traits and tenures. For example, conscientious participants did not respond favorably to a gratitude intervention, presumably because the intervention was viewed as an obligation rather than as an opportunity to grow (Winslow et al., 2017). Similarly, less agreeable participants responded to the intervention by experiencing less job-related well-being. Less agreeable individuals may have been more skeptical about the intervention or may not have had enough positive relational experiences for the intervention to work. Finally, new organizational members responded to the intervention with enhanced job-related well-being and less stress. Compared with those with long tenures, newcomers may have more growth potential and optimism to capitalize on the benefits of gratitude intervention programs. In sum, gratitude intervention programs appear to help employees reflect on how they have benefitted from others' goodwill (Cheng, Tsui, & Lam, 2015), which can produce positive outcomes for employees and their organizations (e.g., Emmons & McCullough, 2003).

Beyond interventions, management research has demonstrated that experiences of gratitude produce favorable outcomes. Extant research has shown that gratitude encourages prosocial behaviors (i.e., Bartlett & DeSteno, 2006; Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Emmons & McCullough, 2003; Ford, Wang, Jin, & Eisenberger, 2018; Grant & Gino, 2010; Michie, 2009; Spence, Brown, Keeping, & Lian, 2014) by increasing feelings of self-worth (Grant & Gino, 2010). Additionally, being the source of gratitude may encourage people to pay it forward by engaging in prosocial behaviors towards multiple parties (e.g., Halali, Kogut, & Ritov, 2017; Schnall & Cannon, 2012; Spence, Brown, Keeping, & Lian, 2014) and refraining from destructive behaviors (e.g., Baron, 1984; Ford, Wang, Jin, & Eisenberger, 2018). Research also suggests that employees who experience gratitude care about CSR initiatives (Andersson, Giacalone, & Jurkiewicz, 2007), have high job satisfaction (Lanham, Rye, Rimsky, & Weill, 2012; Waters, 2012), enhanced loyalty (Osborne, Smith, & Huo, 2012), and less burnout on the job (Chan, 2010; Lanham, Rye, Rimsky, & Weill, 2012). Employees' gratitude towards the

organization also contributes to their organizational embeddedness, which consequently reduces turnover (Ng, 2016). Gratitude may also facilitate the formation of trustworthy relationships, especially in new relationships (Dunn & Schweitzer, 2005). Furthermore, extant research demonstrates that organizations may even benefit when employees anticipate being the recipients of gratitude. When employees have a high orientation towards fulfilling duties, they are more likely to anticipate receiving gratitude, which encourages them to channel their core self-evaluations into higher job performance (Grant & Wrzesniewski, 2010).

In addition to the effects of gratitude on favorable outcomes, research suggests that gratitude may have a negative bearing on status judgments. Tiedens, Ellsworth, and Mesquita (2000) demonstrated that people who express gratitude are perceived as being lower in status than are those who express pride. The authors contend that emotional expressions infer one's capabilities, with gratitude suggesting that a person needs others to succeed.

Beyond implications for employees, gratitude also appears to produce substantial customer-related benefits. When customers experience gratitude towards an organization, they are more likely to have positive attitudes towards the organization (Mangus, Bock, Jones, & Folse, 2017), communicate favorably about the organization (Grappi, Romani, & Bagozzi, 2013; Xie, Bagozzi, & Grønhaug, 2015), and identify and invest in the organization (Xie, Bagozzi, & Grønhaug, 2015). Overall, past research provides evidence that gratitude produces a range of personal (e.g., satisfaction), relational (e.g., trustworthiness), and organizational benefits (e.g., prosocial behaviors) for both employees and consumers, with only one study suggesting that gratitude could be unfavorable.

Future directions

Despite past research on gratitude in organizations, the literature can be further developed. First, future research could explore if "societal grand challenge" movements, which address global challenges, such as poverty, political instability, social progress, and environmental progression (George, Howard-Grenville, Joshi, & Tihanyi, 2016), elicit employee gratitude. Employees may benefit from an organization's efforts to reduce inequality, promote education, and produce economic growth, which may incite gratitude and encourage employees to help with such programs. A person's background (e.g., immigrant and socioeconomic status) may moderate the extent to which he or she responds to grand challenge movements with gratitude. Those who had a low socioeconomic status as children may respond to grand challenges with enhanced gratitude because they have experienced hardships in the past and understand the importance of such movements. Second, future research may consider the effects of gratitude on creativity, productivity (Fagley & Adler, 2012), and social networks. For example, gratitude may encourage employees to reach out to a broader social network to help others. Finally, Fehr, Fulmer, Awtrey, and Miller (2017) considered organizational- and individual-level forms of gratitude. Future research should continue to examine the effects of gratitude at multiple levels of analysis (Emmons, 2003).

3.1.2 | Elevation

People experience elevation when they observe another person's moral excellence and feel warm and uplifted by the observation (Haidt, 2003). Like gratitude, elevation is elicited by another's good deeds; but unlike gratitude, the observer is not a direct recipient of the behavior (Algoe & Haidt, 2009). Therefore, with gratitude, people are motivated to repay their benefactor; however, with elevation, people are not necessarily interested in repaying the moral exemplar but instead are motivated to model the exemplar's positive example (e.g., Vianello, Galliani, & Haidt, 2010). In this respect, extant research has demonstrated that gratitude and elevation are distinct emotions. Furthermore, elevation has been found to be distinct from basic emotions (e.g., happiness; Romani & Grappi, 2014; Vianello, Galliani, & Haidt, 2010) and general positive affect (Schnall, Roper, & Fessler, 2010; Vianello, Galliani, & Haidt, 2010). Yet Haidt (2003) suggested that elevation and awe, which occur when people transcend their humanness and feel connected with nature and/or a higher calling (Fagley & Adler, 2012; Keltner & Haidt, 2003; Schnall & Cannon, 2012), may share conceptual space. Thus, research is needed to properly differentiate these two constructs.

Antecedents

Research demonstrates that workplace events can affect employee and consumer elevation. For example, a leader's interpersonal fairness and self-sacrificial behaviors have been found to elicit employee elevation (Vianello, Galliani, & Haidt, 2010). Also, in a series of experimental studies, Aquino, McFerran, and Laven (2011) found that people high in moral identity were more likely than those low on the trait to respond to uncommon moral acts (i.e., unexpected, extraordinary acts of kindness) with feelings of elevation. Additionally, an organization's use of "meaningful" advertisements, which use virtuous or moral imagery, propelled consumers to experience elevation, especially when they were low, rather than high, in empathy (Wu & Dodoo, 2017). The authors concluded that those high in empathy may not have viewed the meaningful advertisement as extraordinary because they could relate to the moral actor, which suppressed elevation. Two studies also demonstrated that CSR initiatives result in consumer elevation (Romani & Grappi, 2014; Romani, Grappi, & Bagozzi, 2013). Finally, another study found that a company's offshore drilling strategies led to consumer elevation, particularly when offshoring drilling was risky (Grappi, Romani, & Bagozzi, 2013).

Consequences

Extant research consistently demonstrates that elevation leads to favorable employee and consumer behaviors and attitudes. For example, employees experiencing elevation have been found to engage in prosocial behaviors (Algoe & Haidt, 2009; Aquino, McFerran, & Laven, 2011; Schnall, Roper, & Fessler, 2010; Vianello, Galliani, & Haidt, 2010) and to be committed to their organizations (Vianello, Galliani, & Haidt, 2010). In terms of consumer reactions, research suggests that an organization's offshore drilling strategies can elicit consumer elevation, which then influences consumers' positive

attitudes towards the company (Grappi, Romani, & Bagozzi, 2013). Also, in response to meaningful advertisements, consumers responded with elevation, which then positively influenced their positive attitudes towards the advertisement and the brand (Wu & Dodoo, 2017). Finally, extant research has found that consumers' elevation propels them to support CSR initiatives and other environmentally friendly products (Romani et al., 2016), donate money, and volunteer their time (Romani & Grappi, 2014).

Future directions

In terms of future research, more research is needed on antecedents and consequences of elevation. An organization's perceived impact (i.e., progress towards "making a difference" in the world; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990) may influence employee elevation. Therefore, an organization could regularly discuss impact-related milestones, such as donating a large amount of food to the needy, or could look for opportunities to give back (e.g., Aquino, McFerran, & Laven, 2011), such as responding to natural disasters with donations of time or money. These acts of kindness could propel employee elevation, making them want to be better people and to give back through their jobs (Vianello, Galliani, & Haidt, 2010). Additionally, organizations could institute and discuss social justice initiatives (e.g., breaking the class ceiling) and how they have helped others, which may propagate employee elevation. Leaders could also actively voice their moral concerns and try to "do right" on behalf of humanity to stimulate employee elevation. Finally, historically, social activists (e.g., Martin Luther King Jr.) likely developed social support through rallies, and other symbolic activities (e.g., press conferences), because these events promoted elevation in both proximal and distal followers. In this respect, managers, who do not regularly interact with frontline employees or customers, may be able to garner support from these constituents by utilizing rhetoric, actions, and symbols that spawn feelings of elevation.

Most research on elevation assumes that displays of "moral excellence" will match the moral expectations of one's own community. However, as described by Warren (2003), some people may exhibit destructive conformity, such that they conform to the moral norms of their in-groups, but these moral norms may differ from the expectations of society at large. With this in mind, even an unethical leader (e.g., Adolf Hitler) may engage in speech or behaviors, or use symbols, that are regarded as "morally excellent" to his or her specific group of followers. These followers may experience "elevation," which may perpetuate conduct that is considered immoral to other groups or cultures. Thus, future research could consider whether leaders engage in tactics that elicit elevation in followers, but with outcomes that are destructive to other people.

In terms of consequences, future research could examine conditions under which elevation leads to employee turnover. Major life events, or epiphanies, can jar employees into leaving their jobs. After witnessing moral transcendence, employees' elevation may encourage them to change jobs to become better people and to give back to the world. This may be particularly true for employees who are low in continuance commitment and thus do not need to stay in their current jobs for financial reasons (Kanter, 1968). It would also be interesting to investigate whether organizations can induce elevation to motivate ingenuity related to solving social and environmental problems.

3.2 | Other-suffering emotions

Individuals experience *other-suffering* moral emotions when they observe people as victims of moral violations, witness their suffering, and subsequently feel encouraged to help (Haidt, 2003). Other-suffering emotions are typically categorized as sympathy, compassion, or empathy; yet these emotions tend to have similar definitions and are often used interchangeably (Goetz, Keltner, & Simon-Thomas, 2010). In terms of sympathy and compassion, some scholars have argued that these emotions are definitionally the same (Haidt, 2003; Shirako, Kilduff, & Kray, 2015). However, other research recommends using compassion as an overarching construct, with sympathy serving as a specific type of compassion (Goetz, Keltner, & Simon-Thomas, 2010). Yet in the management literature, there is a research stream that discusses compassion as an iterative process that involves noticing, feeling, and acting upon another person's suffering (for a review, see Rynes, Bartunek, Dutton, & Margolis, 2012) and discusses compassionate behaviors (Frost, Dutton, Worline, & Wilson, 2000; Grant, 2012; Grant & Patil, 2012) or compassionate organizing (i.e., organizing efforts to give back to those in need; Dutton, Frost, Worline, Lilius, & Kanov, 2002; Dutton, Workman, & Hardin, 2014; Dutton, Worline, Frost, & Lilius, 2006). Because the management literature often discusses compassion in terms of a process that includes cognitions, emotions, and behaviors, we recommend discussing the emotional experience alone as sympathy.

Furthermore, although some research has defined empathy in a way that is similar to sympathy (e.g., Hershcovis & Bhatnagar, 2017; Patient & Skarlicki, 2010), other research has noted the distinctive, vicarious nature of empathy (e.g., Cohen, 2010; Joireman, Kamdar, Daniels, & Duell, 2006; McNeely & Meglino, 1994; Wolff, Pescosolido, & Druskat, 2002). In terms of the latter, empathy has been defined as vicariously experiencing another's emotions (Lazarus, 1991), but not necessarily with subsequent desires to help. Additionally, some scholars argue that empathy is not an emotion but rather an individual difference that acts as a precursor to an emotional experience (Batson, 2009; Cropanzano, Dasborough, & Weiss, 2017; Goetz, Keltner, & Simon-Thomas, 2010; Haidt, 2003). In this regard, a person needs to be capable of experiencing another's emotional state (through empathy), which then leads to specific types of empathic emotions (e.g., empathic sadness and empathic fear) that may or may not be prosocial in nature (Goetz, Keltner, & Simon-Thomas, 2010).

Because empathy has been defined in many ways, with some of the definitions matching sympathy and other definitions being quite different (Batson, 2009), we recommend using the term "sympathy" to describe emotional reactions that occur due to the misfortune of others, which are accompanied by desires to help (Haidt, 2003). By using the term sympathy, the field can more clearly operationalize sympathy as an other-suffering emotion without becoming inundated by complex definitional issues that exist with compassion and

empathy. Thus, we limit our review to research on sympathy, but in some cases, we cover research on "compassion" and "empathy" because these constructs are defined in a way that aligns with our definition of sympathy. In these cases, the constructs are the same, definitionally, but with different labels.

3.2.1 | Sympathy

Antecedents

Research suggests that certain workplace conditions can either enhance or decrease sympathy. For example, high-quality dyadic relationships have been found to propel interpersonal sympathy towards relationship partners (Ingram & Zou, 2008; Lam, Huang, Walter, & Chan, 2016), especially when the work environment was low in cooperativeness. The authors speculated that when a social context is less cooperative, people are more attentive to their dyadic relationships and thus react to such relationships with stronger emotions. Another study found that social support produces sympathy (operationalized as empathy) in coworkers (Daniels, Glover, & Mellor, 2014). Research also suggests that a person's unfortunate circumstances can produce sympathy in others. Employees' personal and work-related problems can elicit sympathy in managers (Kaplan & Cowen, 1981), whereas mistreatment from customers can result in sympathy from coworkers (operationalized as moral empathy; Hershcovis & Bhatnagar, 2017). Additionally, a customer's unfavorable experiences (e.g., family death) can elicit sympathy in employees (operationalized as compassion; O'Donohoe & Turley, 2006).

Research has also examined moderators, suggesting that gender and power may play a role in sympathetic responding. For example, victims of workplace mobbing (i.e., continuous mistreatment towards a weak victim) were more likely to garner sympathy from women than men (Mulder, Bos, Pouwelse, & van Dam, 2017). Also, in a negotiating context, when individuals were viewed as high in power (vs. low), their vulnerability came across as manipulative and inappropriate (Shirako, Kilduff, & Kray, 2015), which reduced others' sympathy and damaged negotiation relationships.

Although limited, extant research has examined conditions that detract from sympathy. Personal responsibility for circumstances appears to be negatively related to others' sympathy (Rudolph, Roesch, Greitemeyer, & Weiner, 2004; Struthers, Eaton, Czyznielewski, & Dupuis, 2005). This finding also holds in non-Western cultures (Zhang, Reyna, Qian, & Yu, 2008). Additionally, when an employee was late to a workplace meeting and provided a controllable reason for his or her tardiness, others felt less sympathy (Mroz & Allen, 2017). Research also indicates that organizations, as victims of wrongdoing, are less likely to receive sympathy from others. An organization's wrongdoing often elicits anger in others, but when the organization is a victim, people are not inclined to feel sympathy (Rai & Diermeier, 2015). The authors propose that people do not respond to an organization's hardships with sympathy because in the minds of humans, organizations are capable of thinking (e.g., making poor decisions) but not feeling. An exception occurs when organizations are viewed as high in experience (i.e., capable of feeling) and low in agency (i.e., capable of thinking; e.g., a sport's team); under such conditions, organizations garner more sympathy from observers. In sum, relationship quality, unfortunate circumstances, and perceptions of responsibility appear to have relationships with sympathy.

Consequences

In terms of consequences, extant research has consistently shown that sympathy is positively related to a host of favorable outcomes. For example, sympathy has been found to positively affect helping behaviors and intentions (e.g., Hershcovis & Bhatnagar, 2017; Rudolph, Roesch, Greitemeyer, & Weiner, 2004; Struthers, Eaton, Czyznielewski, & Dupuis, 2005) and social responsibility (Kollen, 2016; Miller, Grimes, McMullen, & Vogus, 2012). Mroz and Allen (2017) found that sympathy results in positive attitudes towards the target of sympathy, followed by prosocial intentions to help. Additionally, Mulder, Bos, Pouwelse, and van Dam (2017) reported that women who experienced sympathy in response to workplace mobbing were more likely to have intentions of helping the victim. In a negotiation context, a negotiation partner's sympathy can lead to better negotiation outcomes (e.g., a greater proportion of valued outcomes; Shirako, Kilduff, & Kray, 2015). Past research also suggests that receiving sympathy from others results in higher positive affectivity and consequently, higher organizational commitment (Lilius et al., 2008), and improved relationship quality between coworkers (Daniels, Glover, & Mellor, 2014).

However, research has demonstrated that stress levels and individual differences can affect the relationship between sympathy and favorable outcomes. For example, Eldor and Shoshani (2016) found that receiving sympathy from coworkers was even more important for producing favorable outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction and less burnout) when participants were experiencing high (vs. low) levels of stress. Similarly, receiving sympathy from supervisors was more important in propagating work engagement, followed by desirable job performance (e.g., citizenship behaviors), when employees' stress levels were high (vs. low). Furthermore, in an experimental study, Patient and Skarlicki (2010) induced sympathy (operationalized as empathic concern) and found that sympathy led participants to use just procedures to deliver bad news, especially when the communicator was high (vs. low) in moral development.

Although most research focuses on the positive effects of sympathy, some research suggests that sympathy may not be beneficial in certain situations. For example, Lee and Chung (2012) found that in the wake of a crisis, an organization's sympathetic apology (i.e., expressing sympathetic emotions during the apology) was received in the same manner as an unsympathetic apology in terms of relieving the public's anger. In sum, sympathy appears to be an important emotion for stimulating helping intentions and behaviors, as well as for improving job attitudes, negotiation outcomes, and fair procedures, but may not be beneficial in certain circumstances.

Future directions

Despite extant research on sympathy, future research is needed on this emotion. Some scholars have implied that sympathy can be

experienced by an entire group (e.g., Barsade & O'Neill, 2014; Kanov et al., 2004; Lilius, Worline, Dutton, Kanov, & Maitlis, 2011); however, research has yet to fully explore sympathy at the group level. Future research could examine conditions that activate collective sympathy that then drives social movements. For example, leaders may be able to use vivid rhetoric (see Carton, Murphy, & Clark, 2014) to induce group-level sympathy that then results in openness to social change. Furthermore, research is limited in terms of understanding when sympathy is not needed or perhaps even counterproductive (see Lee & Chung, 2012). Future research could examine the relationship between sympathy and counterproductive helping behaviors. For example, a low-performing employee may garner sympathy from coworkers, with coworkers then assisting the employee in receiving a promotion.

3.3 | Other-condemning emotions

Individuals experience *other-condemning* moral emotions in response to other people's moral transgressions (Haidt, 2003). These emotions, which include contempt, anger, and disgust, encourage people to protect themselves from harmful others. The other-condemning emotions pose considerable controversy in terms of the distinctiveness of each emotion. Some scholars approach these emotions as if they are equivalent, interchangeable emotional responses to moral violations (Molho, Tybur, Güler, Balliet, & Hofmann, 2017; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985). Other scholars combine contempt, anger, and disgust into a higher order emotion that captures moral condemnation (Hutcherson & Gross, 2011), moral outrage (Molho, Tybur, Güler, Balliet, & Hofmann, 2017), or negative moral emotions (Xie, Bagozzi, & Grønhaug, 2015). For example, Xie, Bagozzi, and Grønhaug (2015) found empirical support to combine contempt, anger, and disgust into a higher order construct of negative moral emotions. Conversely, research also calls for a socio-functional approach to studying other-condemning emotions (e.g., Hutcherson & Gross, 2011; Molho, Tybur, Güler, Balliet, & Hofmann, 2017), suggesting that each moral emotion is distinct and has unique antecedents and consequences.

Although most research, to date, supports a socio-functional account to studying the other-condemning emotions (e.g., Fischer & Roseman, 2007; Ford, Agosta, Huang, & Shannon, 2018; Hutcherson & Gross, 2011; Molho, Tybur, Güler, Balliet, & Hofmann, 2017), it also refutes theoretical proposals that are modular in nature. For example, Rozin, Lowery, Imada, and Haidt (1999) argued that each emotion arises from specific types of moral violations, such that contempt arises from violations of community, anger from violations of autonomy, and disgust from violations of divinity. However, recent research suggests that mapping moral violations onto specific other-condemning emotions is not very clean or direct. Ford, Agosta, Huang, and Shannon (2018) found that a range of moral violations predict both anger and contempt, but each emotion then produces different reactions (i.e., anger results in approach behaviors and contempt results in avoidance behaviors). Also, Fischer and Roseman (2007) concluded that moral violations can spawn anger alone, which then results in rapid attempts to resolve the injustice. Yet they also concluded that moral violations can result in the coactivation of anger and condemnation, with anger often serving as a precursor to contempt. In addition, Molho, Tybur, Güler, Balliet, and Hofmann (2017) found that people respond to self-relevant moral violations with anger but respond to other-relevant moral violations (e.g., observing a moral violation) with disgust. Interestingly, Molho et al.'s research is somewhat at odds with recent work that suggests that other-oriented moral violations specifically spawn moral anger (see Lindebaum & Geddes, 2016) instead of disgust.

Complicating things further, research by Hutcherson and Gross (2011) suggests that the other-condemning emotions are activated by both nonmoral and moral considerations. For example, the most nebulous emotion, contempt, tends to be activated by demonstrations of incompetence, which typically does not relate to morality. Similar to arguments proposed by Lindebaum and Geddes (2016), Hutcherson and Gross (2011) noted that self-relevance is highly important to the activation of anger, but self-relevance may obscure whether an event is indeed moral (i.e., relating to society or other people; Haidt, 2003). Hutcherson and Gross (2011) also concluded that a range of moral violations consistently predict disgust, with it serving as the most widely applicable, other-condemning moral emotion. Interestingly, despite the apparent differences in emotions, Hutcherson and Gross implied that each emotion at least partially overlaps with morality and that these emotions are likely to coexist.

In terms of reconciling ambiguities, we support the distinction of the three other-condemning emotions because research has shown that each emotion can be activated by unique antecedents and can produce unique outcomes. Furthermore, because some research has questioned the moral nature of these emotions, future research should explicitly define and operationalize each emotion with respect to morality. However, when a theoretical model proposes the same antecedents and consequences for multiple other-condemning emotions (e.g., Smith-Crowe & Warren, 2014), scholars may consider combining these emotions into a higher level construct of negative moral emotions (Xie, Bagozzi, & Grønhaug, 2015) or moral condemnation (Hutcherson & Gross, 2011). Doing so needs to clearly align with the chosen theory and should reflect a parsimonious model. If this path is chosen, both theoretical and empirical support of a higher order, emotional experience should be provided (see Xie, Bagozzi, & Grønhaug, 2015).

3.3.1 | Contempt

Contempt captures feelings of disdain towards those who have violated moral norms (Izard, 1977), with the norm violator receiving little chance for reconciliation (Fischer & Roseman, 2007; Ford, Agosta, Huang, & Shannon, 2018; Hutcherson & Gross, 2011). Given our contention that contempt should be categorized as a moral emotion, below, we only review research that captures contempt as a morally relevant experience.

Antecedents

Research has shown that individual, dyadic, and team factors can affect feelings of contempt. In terms of individual factors, a qualitative investigation found that employees experience contempt in response to unfair treatment, poor compensation and benefits, unsupportive bosses and coworkers, and undesirable job tasks (Ford, Agosta, Huang, & Shannon, 2018). Furthermore, theoretical work by Smith-Crowe and Warren (2014) suggests that employees with weak organizational identities who are reprimanded for corrupt practices are likely to experience contempt. For a dyadic effect, past research has found that leader–member exchange dissimilarity (e.g., one coworker has a higher leader–member exchange relationship than another coworker) drives contempt, but only when one coworker is high in social comparison orientation (Tse, Lam, Lawrence, & Huang, 2013). Regarding teams, research has found that teams with high-quality, dyadic relationships are less likely to experience contempt, especially when the team's cooperative goals were low (vs. high; Lam, Huang, Walter, & Chan, 2016). Overall, extant research points to unfairness as a main activator of contempt, with high-quality relationships minimizing contempt.

Consequences

Research has investigated how people manage their own contempt as well as how people react to others' expressions of contempt. Theoretical work suggests that employee contempt triggers moral reasoning that suppresses support of corrupt organizational practices (Smith-Crowe & Warren, 2014). Furthermore, employee contempt towards a coworker results in poor perceptions of the coworker's citizenship behaviors (Tse, Lam, Lawrence, & Huang, 2013). Research also suggests people distance themselves from the source of contempt, especially when the source is to blame for his or her actions (Fischer & Roseman, 2007). In this respect, a person's contempt towards another person may result in negative character judgments.

In terms of reactions to another person's contempt, theoretical work suggests that people who express contempt are judged as being high status in the eyes of observers (Morris & Keltner, 2000). Additionally, Melwani and Barsade (2011) found that being the target of contempt reduced one's self-esteem, which then influenced performance behaviors and aggression towards the source of contempt. The authors found that low-status targets (compared with high) were more likely to respond to contempt by enhancing performance but lowering aggression. Additionally, targets of contempt reciprocated this emotion by expressing their own contempt, which resulted in enhanced aggression. Other research has found that a team's collective feeling of contempt is negatively related to team members' job performance (Lam, Huang, Walter, & Chan, 2016). In sum, extant research provides evidence for contempt leading to negative character judgments and mostly unfavorable organizational behaviors.

Future directions

Future research could consider additional antecedents of contempt and continue to examine how employees manage their own contempt. With respect to antecedents, "problem" employees may breed contempt in others. For example, coworkers who engage in counterproductive work behaviors exhibit behavioral tendencies that go against how one "ought to" behave at work (e.g., Spector et al., 2006). Coworkers may respond to these counterproductive employees with contempt. Future research could also examine whether employees manage their contempt by trying to correct a problematic employee's behaviors. Shaming behaviors are often used to realign a person's behaviors with moral expectations, whereas shunning behaviors are used to encourage a person's exit from the group (Toubiana & Zietsma, 2016). If a counterproductive employee is a high performer, and thus provides value to the group, coworkers may manage their contempt by using shaming tactics to get the employee to abide by group norms moving forward.

3.3.2 | Anger

Anger captures feelings of indignation that occur because someone has violated a moral standard without justification (Haidt, 2003), which then results in desires to correct the injustice (e.g., Izard, 1977). To constitute "moral" anger, some scholars argue that the moral violation needs to be other directed (i.e., someone else is the victim) more so than self-directed (i.e., I am the victim; Lindebaum & Geddes, 2016). Although we generally agree with this claim, we also believe it is difficult to discern other- versus self-directed moral violations (Haidt, 2003). If not corrected, a self-directed moral violation can escalate into harm towards society more broadly (e.g., not stopping a sexual harasser, which leads to the sexual harassment of other victims). Thus, we review research on anger that arises from both types of moral violations. We also have excluded research on anger that stems from nonmoral incidents, such as lack of competence (e.g., Frijda, 1987; Hutcherson & Gross, 2011; Stickney & Geddes, 2016; Struthers, Eaton, Czyznielewski, & Dupuis, 2005). (See Gibson & Callister, 2010, for a review of nonmoral anger.)

Antecedents

Research suggests that mistreatment, both direct and indirect, drives anger in the workplace (Fitness, 2000). Unfairness in organizations tends to elicit anger in employees (Krehbiel & Cropanzano, 2000; Schweitzer & Gibson, 2008; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985; Weiss, Suckow, & Cropanzano, 1999). Also, interactional and procedural unfairness regarding layoffs, daily interactions with unfair supervisors, and injustices towards one's in-group have been found to propagate employee anger (Barclay, Skarlicki, & Pugh, 2005; Ford, Wang, Jin, & Eisenberger, 2018; Tausch et al., 2011). In addition, extant research suggests that when outcome favorability and justice perceptions are both low, they interact to predict employees' anger (Krehbiel & Cropanzano, 2000).

Beyond injustices, other moral violations trigger anger (e.g., Aquino, Douglas, & Martinko, 2004; Hershcovis & Bhatnagar, 2017; Rupp & Spencer, 2006). Meier and Semmer (2013) identified reciprocity as a moral norm (Gouldner, 1960) and found that a colleague's failure to reciprocate triggered anger. Also, employees experiencing incivility have reported feelings of anger (Domagalski & Steelman, 2005; Porath & Pearson, 2012). Transgressions initiated by the

organization can also spawn anger (Rai & Diermeier, 2015). As an example, offshoring is often considered an immoral event (Robertson, Lamin, & Livanis, 2010) that can drive anger in consumers, especially when the offshoring is risky (Grappi, Romani, & Bagozzi, 2013).

In terms of indirect mistreatment, research suggests that third parties often respond to moral violations with anger (e.g., Rupp & Spencer, 2006), but their reactions depend on moderators. Mitchell, Vogel, and Folger (2015) found that supervisors' abuse of coworkers propelled employee anger, but only when the coworker was not perceived as deserving of the abuse. Also, victims of workplace mobbing who directly addressed their mistreatment (e.g., stood up for themselves), instead of avoiding perpetrators, did not stimulate as much victim-directed anger in those who observed the mobbing (Mulder, Bos, Pouwelse, & van Dam, 2017). These victims were viewed as taking responsibility and thus were judged as less at fault for the continued mobbing. Additionally, P. S. Russell and Giner-Sorolla (2011) found that harmful events that were intentional lead to stronger anger reactions in observers. Similarly, supervisors who intended to harm their subordinates by engaging in verbal abuse elicited stronger anger in observers (Turillo, Folger, Lavelle, Umphress, & Gee, 2002). Furthermore, results from a meta-analytic review demonstrated that a perpetrator's blameworthiness for a harmful event (e.g., an accident) resulted in enhanced anger (Rudolph, Roesch, Greitemeyer, & Weiner, 2004). Individual differences have also been found to affect the moral violation to anger relationship, with research suggesting that people high (vs. low) in moral identity respond to observed injustices with stronger anger (O'Reilly, Aquino, & Skarlicki, 2016). In sum, injustices and other moral violations (e.g., offshoring and incivility) result in anger in both victims and observers, but such reactions often depend on moderators.

Consequences

In comparison with contempt and disgust, anger stands out as the other-condemning emotion that spawns immediate actions aimed at resolving the immoral event (Hutcherson & Gross, 2011). Anger represents a motivational force that encourages people to retaliate against (Barclay, Skarlicki, & Pugh, 2005; Izard, 1977), or to correct (Bies & Tripp, 2002; Carver & Harmon-Jones, 2009), the moral norm violator. Indeed, a considerable amount of research supports anger leading to retaliation (Ford, Agosta, Huang, & Shannon, 2018; Grappi, Romani, & Bagozzi, 2013; Hershcovis & Bhatnagar, 2017; for a meta-analytic review, see Rudolph, Roesch, Greitemeyer, & Weiner, 2004) or corrective actions (O'Reilly, Aquino, & Skarlicki, 2016), some of which are aggressive (e.g., Meier & Semmer, 2013; Molho, Tybur, Güler, Balliet, & Hofmann, 2017) or unethical (Schweitzer & Gibson, 2008) in nature. Other research suggests that moderators influence how people handle their anger. In response to moral violations, people of high status handle their anger through direct retaliation (viz., aggression), whereas those of low status handle their anger by reducing work efforts or by "kicking the dog" and mistreating family or customers (Porath & Pearson, 2012). Additionally, observers high in moral identity (vs. low) are less likely to manage their anger through retaliation (Mitchell, Vogel, & Folger, 2015).

In terms of corrective actions, anger can also be prosocial (Lindebaum & Geddes, 2016) in that it propels people to stop perpetrators of misconduct (Hutcherson & Gross, 2011). For example, Hershcovis and Bhatnagar (2017) found that in response to moral violations, anger promoted both victim-directed support (e.g., offering helpful comments) and perpetrator-directed punitive action. Additionally, Fischer and Roseman (2007) found that even though anger propagates short-term, verbal aggression, it also leads to reconciliation and relationship improvement. Furthermore, recent work has suggested that anger can serve as a catalyst for positive social change. For example, a qualitative study of employee experiences at work found that anger triggered approach-oriented responses, such as confronting the perpetrator (Ford, Agosta, Huang, & Shannon, 2018), whereas theoretical work has suggested that anger may lead to whistle-blowing or changes in harmful organizational practices (Lindebaum & Geddes, 2016).

Future directions

Anger has been rather extensively studied; thus, future research could focus on vicarious anger, or the contagion of anger, in the workplace. Coworkers often tell each other stories that revolve around anger-inducing events (Fitness, 2000). These stories could result in anger-related emotional contagion that affects important, work-related outcomes (e.g., citizenship behaviors). Additionally, more research is needed on how anger affects employees' day-to-day job experiences beyond retaliation. For example, Rupp and Spencer (2006) found that anger made it hard for employees to engage in emotional labor. Also, anger could be motivating in that it may propel employees to institute prosocial change, but it could also be destructive by detracting from job performance. To this end, research could further examine conditions under which anger is more or less likely to motivate prosocial change. For example, employees who do not benefit from diversity-valuing behaviors (e.g., taking action to promote a diverse work force; Hekman, Johnson, Foo, & Yang, 2017) may react with anger (due to perceptions of unfairness), which may hinder their endorsement of such practices.

3.3.3 | Disgust

Disgust represents an emotional experience that surfaces due to violations of personal (Haidt, 2003; Rozin, Lowery, Imada, & Haidt, 1999) or group sanctity (Xie, Bagozzi, & Grønhaug, 2015). Sanctity refers to expectations of purity in terms of how people or groups should behave as respectable human beings (Rozin, Lowery, Imada, & Haidt, 1999). In this respect, disgust is different than contempt and anger because it arises from moral violations that go against a divine moral code.

Antecedents

In terms of antecedents, extant research suggests that moral violations drive feelings of disgust. For example, appraisals of a person's untrustworthiness have been found to trigger disgust (Hutcherson & Gross, 2011). Other research has found that interpersonal injustices

(i.e., treating people with a lack of dignity and respect) resulted in disgust (Skarlicki, Hoegg, Aquino, & Nadisic, 2013).

Consequences

In terms of consequences, past research has found that disgust leads to passive responses and character judgments. For example, disgust can create indirect behavioral responses, such as socially excluding or gossiping about the source of disgust (Molho, Tybur, Güler, Balliet, & Hofmann, 2017). Similarly, daily sensitivities to disgust were negatively related to overtly harmful behaviors (Pond et al., 2012). Finally, sources of disgust are often judged as having an immoral character (Hutcherson & Gross, 2011).

Future directions

Organizational research on disgust has been limited. This may be because scholars perceive that moral violations related to sanctity are rare. Although disgust may seem less pervasive in organizational settings, we argue it is still an important emotion to consider, especially as social movements evolve, and employees reveal more information about their personal lives to coworkers. To the extent that disgust is conceptualized as arising from moral violations that go against a divine moral code (Rozin, Lowery, Imada, & Haidt, 1999), future research could investigate organizational policies or contexts that may be perceived as going against human sanctity. For example, future research could consider whether some employees, such as social conservatives, view LGBT-supportive policies as moral violations, which could result in disgust reactions. Additionally, because social media can provide a considerable amount of exposure to a coworker's personal lives (Ollier-Malaterre, Rothbard, & Berg, 2013), social media content may provide employees with information about their coworkers that could elicit feelings of disgust. Finally, "dirty" occupations (e.g., coroner, see Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999) may have a difficult time recruiting talent because of perceptions of divinity violations and resulting disgust reactions. In this respect, future research could also investigate how employees overcome their disgust reactions and continue to work with sources of disgust.

3.4 | Self-condemning emotions

Individuals experience *self-condemning* moral emotions when they violate moral standards (Leary, 2002; Leary & Miller, 2000), thus underscoring the individual's moral failings (Gruenewald, Dickerson, & Kemeny, 2007). The two primary self-condemning moral emotions are *shame* and *guilt*. Individuals experience *shame* when they violate moral standards and consequently experience negative feelings that suggest that they have a flawed moral character (Leith & Baumeister, 2008; Lewis, 1971; Smith, Webster, Parrott, & Eyre, 2002). *Guilt* also arises as a result of violating moral standards, but guilty feelings focus on the immorality of one's *behaviors* rather than one's moral character (Lewis, 1971). Thus, shame and guilt are distinct because shame is an internally focused emotion (e.g., I am a bad person) whereas guilt externalizes the moral violation to one's poor behavioral choices (e.g., I did a bad thing; Wicker, Payne, & Morgan, 1983).

As an internally focused emotion, shame is more destructive to one's personal welfare than guilt (Behrendt & Ben-Ari, 2012; Tangney, Miller, Flicker, & Barlow, 1996). When people experience shame, they focus on the fact that other people may discover their flawed moral character and not want to associate with them. In turn, people experiencing shame often withdraw or hide from other people to keep from being "found out." Guilt, on the other hand, promotes constructive reactions (Lindsay-Hartz, 1984; Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Tangney, Miller, Flicker, & Barlow, 1996; Wicker, Payne, & Morgan, 1983). People experiencing guilt see that their poor behavioral choices do not necessarily reflect on who they are as moral people Thus, a person's guilt serves as a motivational force to correct wrongdoings and to make better choices moving forward.

Although shame and guilt are usually conceptualized as distinct emotions, past literature suggests that these emotions are highly correlated (e.g., as high as r = .71 to .91; Harder & Zalma, 1990; Vess, Schlegel, Hicks, & Arndt, 2014). These correlations call into question their discriminant validity. Additionally, recent research is unclear as to whether shame and guilt propagate distinct behavioral tendencies (e.g., Barclay, Skarlicki, & Pugh, 2005; Bonner, Greenbaum, & Quade, 2017). Thus, to the extent that shame and guilt are related to similar antecedents and similar consequences, there may be instances where these emotions should be combined. In fact, some scholars have combined these two emotions and labeled the experience self-conscious moral emotions (Barclay, Skarlicki, & Pugh, 2005) or self-condemnation (Lickel, Schmader, Curtis, Scarnier, & Ames, 2005).

For management research, we recommend following tradition by separating shame and guilt on theoretical grounds (Lewis, 1971). However, we also support combining guilt and shame into a measure of "self-conscious moral emotions" but only under three conditions: (a) Theoretical explanations are provided for why people react to their own moral violations with both emotions, (b) guilt and shame are expected to relate to the same behavioral outcomes, and (c) empirical evidence supports a single measure of self-conscious moral emotions as reflected by high correlations (r > .70) and/or confirmatory factor analyses.

3.4.1 | Shame

Shame captures feelings that arise due to negative self-evaluations of one's own moral character (e.g., Ausubel, 1955; Tangney, 1999; Tangney, Stuewig, & Mashek, 2007), in which case people feel concerned that other people will view them as having a faulty moral character.

Antecedents

People experience shame when they fail to live up to their own or society's moral standards (Keltner, 1996; Tangney, 1992; Tangney, Miller, Flicker, & Barlow, 1996). For example, Bonner, Greenbaum, and Quade (2017) found that employees respond to their own unethical conduct with shame. Similarly, Umphress and Bingham (2011) argued that unethical pro-organizational behavior elicits employee shame, but only when the unethical pro-organizational behavior

violates one's personal moral standards. Moreover, when employees could not attribute the reason for a layoff to an external source, they were more likely to experience shame, presumably because they perceived that their own wrongdoings contributed to the layoff (Barclay, Skarlicki, & Pugh, 2005). Research also suggests that employees react to unfavorable workplace events (e.g., conflict) with enhanced shame (e.g., Behrendt & Ben-Ari, 2012), particularly when an employee views the event as arising from the organization and as personally uncontrollable (e.g., the employee believes he or she lacks intelligence; Harvey, Martinko, & Borkowski, 2017). The authors speculated that the person experiencing shame may feel powerless in trying to remedy the negative event. In sum, research suggests that people experience shame when their own character and behaviors fall short of their moral expectations.

Outcomes

In terms of outcomes, extant research demonstrates that shame motivates both withdrawal (e.g., avoidance; Scherer & Wallbott, 1994; Schmader & Lickel, 2006) and approach (e.g., restorative) behaviors (e.g., Bonner, Greenbaum, & Quade, 2017; de Hooge, Breugelmans, & Zeelenberg, 2008; González-Gómez & Richter, 2015; Lickel, Kushlev, Savalei, Matta, & Schmader, 2014; Tangney, Miller, Flicker, & Barlow, 1996). Employees may handle their shame differently depending on whether they believe their reparation will be successful (de Hooge, Zeelenberg, & Breugelmans, 2011). If reparation is viewed as risky or difficult, an employee may handle their shame through avoidance rather than reparation. Furthermore, because shame is self-threatening, it may motivate employees to engage in behaviors that serve to restore their positive self-images (e.g., creative behaviors; González-Gómez & Richter, 2015). Research by Bonner, Greenbaum, and Quade (2017) also found that employees react to their own shame by engaging in exemplification behaviors to restore their images as good, helpful employees. Shame has also been found to encourage restitution for damages, behaviors that promote transparency, recommendations for policy changes (Bagozzi, Sekerka, & Sguera, 2018), and apologies (Hareli, Shomrat, & Biger, 2005). Finally, in interdependent-based cultures, shame can propel self-protective behaviors that enhance relationship quality and improve sales performance (Bagozzi, Verbeke, & Gavino, 2003). In sum, shame influences restorative behaviors that are beneficial to organizational functioning.

At the same time, the self-protective nature of shame can result in negative outcomes. For example, Verbeke and Bagozzi (2002) found that shame resulted in avoidance behaviors and reduced sales performance. In a different study, Bagozzi, Verbeke, and Gavino (2003) found that shame leads to self-protection (e.g., trying not to offend customers) and reduced performance, especially in independent cultures. Also, Behrendt and Ben-Ari (2012) found that shame triggered by conflict resulted in enhanced self-concern and noncooperative coping tactics (e.g., avoidance, competition, and neglect). Last, when employees attributed negative workplace events to personally uncontrollable attributions, such as low intelligence, shame motivated deviant behaviors as a means of hiding personal failings (Harvey, Martinko, & Borkowski, 2017). Thus, shame can also produce outcomes that are undesirable to organizations.

Recent research has begun to investigate third-party reactions to shame. When people display shame, others may infer that the person regrets his or her behaviors (Martens, Tracy, & Shariff, 2012). Shame communicates one's trustworthiness and commitment to social norms (Martens, Tracy, & Shariff, 2012). Theoretically, Morris and Keltner (2000) argued that shame signals to others one's moral awareness and regret, thereby reducing the likelihood of sanctions. Preliminary research also shows that verbal and nonverbal expressions of shame can serve an appeasing function (e.g., Giner-Sorolla, Castano, Espinosa, & Brown, 2008; Keltner & Buswell, 1997). For example, when a chief executive officer verbally expressed shame during an apology, people were more satisfied with the apology than when shame was not expressed (Giner-Sorolla, Castano, Espinosa, & Brown, 2008).

Future directions

Future research could further examine anticipatory or vicarious shame (e.g., Lickel, Schmader, Curtis, Scarnier, & Ames, 2005). Perhaps, employees may steer away from certain social networks, particularly those that are morally dubious, because of anticipated shame. Even if these social networks provide career advantages, anticipated shame may hinder this type of relationship formation. Also, an organization's unethical behaviors can elicit vicarious shame in employees, especially when employees initially have a high organizational identity. Those with high organizational identities view themselves as one with the organization (e.g., Albert & Whetten, 1985) and thus may be more inclined to internalize the organization's unethical conduct as their own. Finally, given that some research has indicated the importance of examining shame within groups (Lickel, Steele, & Schmader, 2011), there is also a need for research on group-level shame. For example, future research could consider whether group-based shame stifles problem solving and creativity.

3.4.2 | Guilt

Guilt is a negative emotional experience that is triggered when one's behavior indicates a moral or social failure (Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Wolf, Cohen, Panter, & Insko, 2010). People also experience guilt when they anticipate future unethical conduct. Guilt tends to revolve around "the adverse impact of one's actions on others" (Grant & Wrzesniewski, 2010, p. 110) and works to regulate people's behaviors so they refrain from harming others (Tangney & Dearing, 2002).

Antecedents

Guilt is triggered by one's personal transgressions, such as lying, cheating, or harming another person (Tangney, Wagner, Hill-Barlow, Marschall, & Gramzow, 1996; Wicker, Payne, & Morgan, 1983). Thus, in organizational settings, research demonstrates that counterproductive and self-interested behaviors elicit guilt (Ilies, Peng, Savani, & Dimotakis, 2013; Oc, Bashshur, & Moore, 2015). Other research suggests that guilt is conditional. In response to one's own transgressions, people experience guilt when they know the victim (Yam & Reynolds,

2016), the unethical act is deemed a moral violation (Umphress & Bingham, 2011), they had control over the event, or they created harm for another person (Bohns & Flynn, 2012). Furthermore, when people receive feedback that suggests that their behavior violates moral norms, they experience heightened guilt (Ilies, Peng, Savani, & Dimotakis, 2013). Similarly, research has found that those in positions of power experience enhanced guilt when they receive feedback that they allocated resources unfairly (Oc, Bashshur, & Moore, 2015). Conversely, there are some conditions under which people respond to their own transgressions with less guilt, such as when the target of the transgression behaved unfairly (Schweitzer & Gibson, 2008), or when inauthentic leaders fail to raise employees' moral awareness (Cianci, Hannah, Roberts, & Tsakumis, 2014).

Interestingly, extant research also demonstrates that people experience guilt in response to other's moral violations, particularly when they have direct ties to the norm violator or when they benefit from the moral violation. For example, research suggests that when ingroup members violated one's personal values, participants experienced guilt (Rothschild, Landau, Sullivan, & Keefer, 2012). Furthermore, when an unfair event transpired and employees benefitted from such an event, they were more likely to experience guilt (Barclay, Skarlicki, & Pugh, 2005; Brockner et al., 1986; Krehbiel & Cropanzano, 2000; Weiss, Suckow, & Cropanzano, 1999). Theoretical work also suggests that in corrupt organizations, employees may experience guilt as a result of going along with appropriate behavior and refraining from the organization's unethical behavior (Smith-Crowe & Warren, 2014). Overall, research suggests that people experience guilt when they, or associated others, engage in moral violations, but these relationships appear to be conditional.

Outcomes

In terms of outcomes, extant research suggests that guilt is related to favorable outcomes (e.g., de Hooge, Nelissen, Breugelmans, & Zeelenberg, 2011). For example, when participants of an ultimatum game felt guilty about a selfish offer in round 1, they made more generous offers in round 2 (Ketelaar & Au, 2003). Similarly, as a result of unfair resource allocations, participants' guilt led them to make fairer allocations moving forward (Oc, Bashshur, & Moore, 2015). In addition, when employees experienced guilt concerning counterproductive work behaviors, they were more likely to engage in subsequent helping behaviors (Ilies, Peng, Savani, & Dimotakis, 2013). Extant research also demonstrates that guilt prompts people to compensate victims for their wrongdoing (i.e., right the wrong), especially when they have a close relationship with the victim (Ghorbani, Liao, Çayköylü, & Chand, 2013). Also, research suggests that guilt prompts people to engage in cooperative coping strategies, demonstrate concern for others, take responsibility for their actions (Behrendt & Ben-Ari, 2012), and apologize (Hareli, Shomrat, & Biger, 2005). Anticipated guilt may also produce favorable outcomes, such as enhanced job performance (Grant & Wrzesniewski, 2010). Overall, a robust body of research suggests that guilt is beneficial because it spawns compensatory actions.

However, extant research also suggests that guilt may lead to unfavorable outcomes, especially under certain conditions. For example, in survey research of working adults, extant research suggests that the intrusion of job demands on family life can produce employee guilt that results in reduced job and life satisfaction, but primarily when control of resources (e.g., time, energy, and job equipment) is low instead of high (Hochwarter, Perrewé, Meurs, & Kacmar, 2007). Also, research by Hochwarter and Byrne (2010) suggests that employees' chronic pain that limits their work contributions can produce employee guilt that leads to higher job tension and reduced job satisfaction, but mostly when these employees feel high levels (instead of low levels) of external pressure to demonstrate competence. Additionally, when people handle their guilt by trying to compensate a victim, they are less likely to give resources to nonvictims (de Hooge et al., 2011).

Research also has investigated conditions that may mitigate guilt. When people view their transgressions as helping themselves *and* others, they experience less guilt and are able to preserve a moral image (Gino, Ayal, & Ariely, 2013). In addition, when the organization engages in unethical conduct, employees experience less guilt and in turn are less likely to engage in reparative actions, because they can blame the transgression on the third party (Rothschild, Landau, Sullivan, & Keefer, 2012). Thus, even though guilt can lead to compensation, research indicates that this relationship is conditional and that guilt can have personal ramifications (e.g., increased tension).

A person's expressions of guilt can also have a bearing on third-party observers. People who expressed guilt were viewed by others as more empathic than were those who expressed shame or no emotion (Stearns & Parrott, 2012). Also, when coworkers expressed guilt at work, employees were less likely to escalate their commitment to a bad decision (O'Neill, 2009). However, in a negotiation context, a negotiator's expressions of guilt, which implied acquiescence, led the other party to stand firm in his or her demands rather than make concessions (van Kleef, de Dreu, & Manstead, 2006). Thus, guilt expressions may make a person come across as more cooperative, which can be good or bad, depending on the context.

Future directions

Future research could examine guilt with respect to work–family balance and violations of parental identities. While at work, parents may experience parental identity violations, which could spawn guilt as a result of failing to live up to society's standards associated with proper parenting. In turn, it would be interesting to see if such guilt could spawn greater work productivity as a way of compensating for parental failures. Future research could also examine conditions under which organizational "pleasures" (e.g., elaborate work perks, such as expensive dinners) result in feelings of guilt and subsequent withdrawal from such events. Employees may view these activities as being excessive and ostentatious, which could motivate guilt. Future research could also consider organizational requirements related to altruistic behaviors. Some scholars contend that altruistic behaviors often reflect "giving in" to the organization's requests more so than actual desires to help (Cain, Dana, & Newman, 2014). In such cases, it would be interesting to see if guilt prompts "giving in," and then whether giving in to altruistic requests spawns resentment.

4 | GENERAL DISCUSSION

Our research contributes to the organizational behavior literature by offering a comprehensive review of organizationally relevant moral emotions research. With the growth of scholarly interest in both morality (e.g., Treviño, den Nieuwenboer, & Kish-Gephart, 2014) and emotions (Barsade, Brief, & Spataro, 2003), the management field has developed a steady stream of research on moral emotions. Yet this research has not been systematically reviewed, and controversies have not been resolved. To further develop moral emotions research in the management field, a review was in order to clarify the meaning behind moral emotions, to provide recommendations to overcome key debates, especially with respect to construct clarity, to synthesize the literature so that future research can move beyond known findings, and to provoke future research in an effort to further develop this evolving topic. Through our review, we addressed these important areas to advance moral emotions scholarship. We approached our review with a focus on the "trees" by examining each family of emotions in isolation. In the next section, we focus on the "forest" by offering general theoretical insights and future directions that may be applied to a range of moral emotions research more broadly.

4.1 | Developing theoretical perspectives and general future research

First, to advance moral emotions research, scholars may consider key insights from the neuroscience literature (e.g., Beugré, 2009; Reynolds, 2006; Salvador & Folger, 2009). Research in neuroscience suggests that certain areas of the brain are activated in response to moral dilemmas and that some emotions (e.g., guilt and anger) are especially relevant to morality (Greene & Haidt, 2002; Salvador & Folger, 2009). In fact, research has shown that damage or reduced activation to certain regions of the brain (e.g., medial frontal gyrus) can reduce a person's sympathy to another's distress (Anderson, Bechara, Damasio, Tranel, & Damasio, 1999). Additionally, brain scans of sociopaths demonstrated abnormal brain activity and reduced gray matter in the brain (Moll, Zahn, de Oliveira-Souza, Krueger, & Grafman, 2005), which may explain their impaired ability to experience moral emotions (Blair et al., 1995).

Interestingly, brain regions that are commonly activated in moral situations (i.e., frontal lobe and subcortical-limbic structures) appear to be associated with social perceptions and norm compliance (Moll et al., 2002; Spitzer, Fischbacher, Herrnberger, Grön, & Fehr, 2007), suggesting that moral emotions serve to support relational considerations. For example, people who witnessed an unfair person (vs. a fair person) receive electric shocks demonstrated less sympathy and expressed stronger desires for revenge (Singer et al., 2006), presumably because unfair behaviors infringe on other people's rights and deteriorate relationships. Additionally, unfair events prompted victims to experience heightened activity in areas of the brain associated with negative emotional states, such as anger and disgust (Sanfey, Rilling, Aronson, Nystrom, & Cohen, 2003), with these emotions conveying that the transgressor should be punished or avoided. We suggest that this literature supports a neurological basis for experiencing moral emotions, which may be useful for understanding moral issues in organizational contexts. For example, it could be that cognitive orientations, such as zero-sum construals (i.e., believing that there can only be one winner; Sirola & Pitesa, 2017) or bottom-line mentalities (e.g., solely focusing on bottom-line outcomes; Greenbaum, Mawritz, & Eissa, 2012), hinder areas of the brain that typically prompt moral emotions and ethical considerations.

Second, the moral emotions literature could be advanced by considering an intuitionist perspective (e.g., Haidt, 2001; Reynolds, 2006; Sonenshein, 2007). Haidt's (2001) social intuitionist approach to moral judgment is starting to receive attention in the management literature (e.g., Andersen, Zuber, & Hill, 2015; Dedeke, 2015; Huang, Greenbaum, Bonner, & Wang, in press; Provis, 2017; Zuber & Andersen, 2016). Haidt defined moral intuition as "… the sudden appearance in consciousness of a moral judgment, including an affective valence (good–bad, like–dislike), without any conscious awareness of having gone through steps of searching, weighing evidence, or inferring a conclusion" (p. 818). Intuition includes emotional reactions that propel people to respond to events relatively quickly and efficiently, without having to go through a cognitively complex process. In this respect, future research could examine why people respond to eliciting events in ways that seem contrary to sound moral reasoning. As demonstrated by Huang, Greenbaum, Bonner, and Wang (in press), people may impulsively act on their moral emotions, without fully thinking through their feelings and resulting behaviors. For example, an unemployed person may forgo an opportunity to work in a "dirty" industry (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999) because of strong disgust reactions, even though, rationally, the job would provide financial security. Moving forward, we encourage research to further test intuitive perspectives in relation to moral emotions.

Finally, theories that suggest that emotions activate and energize behaviors could be useful for understanding the effectiveness of moral emotions in organizations. Organizational research has described some emotional experiences as capturing energetic activation, or "… the degree to which people feel energized" (Quinn, Spreitzer, & Lam, 2012, p. 342) to behave in positive or negative ways. In this respect, Quinn, Spreitzer, and Lam (2012) reviewed a number of theories that indicate that emotions activate people to approach or to avoid situations (e.g., Watson, Wiese, Vaidya, & Tellegen, 1999). For example, the interaction ritual chain theory (Collins, 1993, 2004) proposes that people respond to interactions with others by experiencing positive (or negative) emotions, which then encourages them to seek out (or avoid) similar social interactions moving forward. This theory could explain why employees experiencing elevation, for example, desire subsequent interactions with the source of elevation, which could result in a reinforcing process that supports prosocial attitudes and behaviors among several colleagues. Conversely, being exposed to immoral customers may elicit chronic contempt, a de-energizing force that may prompt employees to exit the profession as a way of avoiding negative social interactions.

In addition to utilizing new theories, future research would benefit from systematically examining the co-occurrence of moral emotions and moral cognitions (Narvaez, 2010; Russell, 2003). As an example, gratitude appears to propel cognitive, social exchange tendencies. To provide a more complete picture of reactions to morally pleasing events, both emotions (e.g., gratitude) and cognitions (e.g., felt obligation) could be examined, with each process spawning similar, yet motivationally distinct, behavioral outcomes (e.g., helping out of thankfulness vs. out of obligation). The examination of dual processes (i.e., emotions and cognitions) would allow the management field to better understand moral emotions with respect to how they actually play out in real-life human experiences.

Furthermore, future research could consider the notion that moral events may activate multiple moral emotions from different families. For example, Mroz and Allen (2017) examined personal responsibility with respect to feelings of both anger and sympathy. Similarly, future research could investigate how employees who benefit from another's goodwill may jointly experience gratitude and guilt. It would be particularly interesting to study which emotion "wins," and under what conditions, in terms of propelling the most desirable organizational behaviors. Research could also investigate conditions under which one moral emotion may trigger others. For example, initial feelings of contempt or anger could result in subsequent feelings of guilt or shame. Having experienced contempt, people may reflect on this emotion and then feel guilty for harshly criticizing another person. Additionally, a person's moral convictions could play into this transference of emotions (e.g., the need to forgive vs. the need to punish).

With respect to examining events that spark multiple moral emotions, the field may consider the possibility that moral emotions do not operate independently of one another (i.e., a categorical view) but instead fall along a continuum of emotions (i.e., a constructionist view), with some emotions serving as more intense representations of a particular affective state. For example, anger and contempt may be captured as negative affective states, with anger being higher in arousal than contempt. With this in mind, future research could examine the moral emotions in relation to a circumplex model of affect (e.g., Russell, 1980), in which case emotions are not examined as separate categories, but rather as affective continuums with varying degrees of activation (Watson & Tellegen, 1985). Although we typically think of moral emotions as being temporarily activated due to certain circumstances, these highly activated emotions could give way to a more enduring period of affect that shifts the emotional experience towards a "mood" that is less intense in nature. In this respect, future research could try to integrate the moral emotions into existing circumplex models of emotions, or new models could be created to better understand the relationships between moral emotions and how they are actually experienced in everyday life (e.g., in a discrete or integrated manner).

5 | CONCLUSION

The growth of research on moral emotions calls for a systematic review of the literature. Our research provides such a review, attempts to resolves debates, and offers ideas for future research. We hope our work serves as an important reference guide for incumbent and new scholars wishing to understand past research findings, as well as to receive encouragement regarding future scholarship.

ORCID

Rebecca Greenbaum https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5594-8606

REFERENCES

Albert, S., & Whetten, D. A. (1985). Organizational identity. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *7*, 263–295.

Algoe, S. B., & Haidt, J. (2009). Witnessing excellence in action: The 'other-praising' emotions of elevation, gratitude, and admiration. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *4*(2), 105–127.

Andersen, M. L., Zuber, J. M., & Hill, B. D. (2015). Moral foundations theory: An exploratory study with accounting and other business students. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *132*(3), 525–538.

Anderson, S. W., Bechara, A., Damasio, H., Tranel, D., & Damasio, A. R. (1999). Impairment of social and moral behavior related to early damage in human prefrontal cortex. *Nature Neuroscience*, *2*(11), 1032.

Andersson, L. M., Giacalone, R. A., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2007). On the relationship of hope and gratitude to corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *70*(4), 401–409.

Aquino, K., Douglas, S., & Martinko, M. J. (2004). Overt anger in response to victimization: Attributional style and organizational norms as moderators. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *9*(2), 152–164.

Aquino, K., McFerran, B., & Laven, M. (2011). Moral identity and the experience of moral elevation in response to acts of uncommon goodness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *100*(4), 703–718.

Ashforth, B. E., & Kreiner, G. E. (1999). "How can you do it?": Dirty work and the challenge of constructing a positive identity. *Academy of Management Review*, *24*(3), 413–434.

Ausubel, D. P. (1955). Relationships between shame and guilt in the socializing process. *Psychological Review*, *62*(5), 378–390.

Bagozzi, R. P., Sekerka, L. E., & Sguera, F. (2018). Understanding the consequences of pride and shame: How self-evaluations guide moral decision making in business. *Journal of Business Research*, *84*, 271–284.

Bagozzi, R. P., Verbeke, W., & Gavino, J. C. (2003). Culture moderates the self-regulation of shame and its effects on performance: The case of salespersons in the Netherlands and Philippines. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(2), 219–233.

Barclay, L. J., Skarlicki, D. P., & Pugh, S. D. (2005). Exploring the role of emotions in injustice perceptions and retaliation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*(4), 629–643.

Baron, R. A. (1984). Reducing organizational conflict: An incompatible response approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *69*(2), 272–279.

Barsade, S. G., Brief, A. P., & Spataro, S. E. (2003). The affective revolution in organizational behavior: The emergence of a paradigm. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational behavior: The state of the science* (pp. 3–52). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Barsade, S. G., & O'Neill, O. A. (2014). What's love got to do with it? A longitudinal study of the culture of compassionate love and employee and client outcomes in a long-term care setting. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *59*(4), 551–598.

Bartlett, M. Y., & DeSteno, D. (2006). Gratitude and prosocial behavior: Helping when it costs you. *Psychological Science*, *17*(4), 319–325.

Batson, C. D. (2009). These things called empathy: Eight related but distinct phenomena. In J. Decety, & W. Ickes (Eds.), *Social neuroscience.*

The social neuroscience of empathy (pp. 3–15). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Behrendt, H., & Ben-Ari, R. (2012). The positive side of negative emotion: The role of guilt and shame in coping with interpersonal conflict. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *55*(6), 1116–1138.

Beugré, C. D. (2009). Exploring the neural basis of fairness: A model of neuro-organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *110*(2), 129–139.

Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (2002). "Hot flashes, open wounds": Injustice and the tyranny of its emotions. In S. W. Gilliland, D. D. Steiner, & D. P. Skarlicki (Eds.), *Emerging perspectives on managing organizational justice* (pp. 203–221). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Blair, R. J. R., Sellars, C., Strickland, I., Clark, F., Williams, A. O., Smith, M., & Jones, L. (1995). Emotion attributions in the psychopath. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *19*(4), 431–437.

Bloom, P. (2013). *Just babies: The origins of good and evil*. New York: Crown.

Bohns, V. K., & Flynn, F. J. (2012). Guilt by design: Structuring organizations to elicit guilt as an affective reaction to failure. *Organization Science*, *24*(4), 1157–1173.

Bonner, J. M., Greenbaum, R. L., & Quade, M. J. (2017). Employee unethical behavior to shame as an indicator of self-image threat and exemplification as a form of self-image protection: The exacerbating role of supervisor bottom-line mentality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*(8), 1203–1221.

Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review*, *11*(4), 710–725.

Brockner, J., Greenberg, J., Brockner, A., Bortz, J., Davy, J., & Carter, C. (1986). Layoffs, equity theory, and work performance: Further evidence of the impact of survivor guilt. *Academy of Management Journal*, *29*(2), 373–384.

Cain, D. M., Dana, J., & Newman, G. E. (2014). Giving versus giving in. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *8*(1), 505–533.

Carton, A. M., Murphy, C., & Clark, J. R. (2014). A (blurry) vision of the future: How leader rhetoric about ultimate goals influences performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *57*(6), 1544–1570.

Carver, C. S., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2009). Anger is an approach-related affect: Evidence and implications. *Psychological Bulletin*, *135*(2), 183–204.

Chan, D. W. (2010). Gratitude, gratitude intervention and subjective well-being among Chinese school teachers in Hong Kong. *Educational Psychology*, *30*(2), 139–153.

Cheng, S. T., Tsui, P. K., & Lam, J. H. M. (2015). Improving mental health in health care practitioners: Randomized controlled trial of a gratitude intervention. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *83*(1), 177–186.

Cianci, A. M., Hannah, S. T., Roberts, R. P., & Tsakumis, G. T. (2014). The effects of authentic leadership on followers' ethical decision-making in the face of temptation: An experimental study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *25*(3), 581–594.

Cohen, T. R. (2010). Moral emotions and unethical bargaining: The differential effects of empathy and perspective taking in deterring deceitful negotiation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *94*(4), 569–579.

Collins, R. (1993). Emotional energy as the common denominator of rational action. *Rationality and Society*, *5*(2), 203–230.

Collins, R. (2004). Rituals of solidarity and security in the wake of terrorist attack. *Sociological Theory*, *22*(1), 53–87.

Cropanzano, R., Dasborough, M. T., & Weiss, H. M. (2017). Affective events and the development of leader–member exchange. *Academy of Management Review*, *42*(2), 233–258.

Daniels, K., Glover, J., & Mellor, N. (2014). An experience sampling study of expressing affect, daily affective well-being, relationship quality, and perceived performance. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *87*(4), 781–805.

de Hooge, I. E., Breugelmans, S. M., & Zeelenberg, M. (2008). Not so ugly after all: When shame acts as a commitment device. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *95*(4), 933–943.

de Hooge, I. E., Nelissen, R. M. A., Breugelmans, S. M., & Zeelenberg, M. (2011). What is moral about guilt? Acting "prosocially" at the disadvantage of others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *100*(3), 462–473. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021459

de Hooge, I. E., Zeelenberg, M., & Breugelmans, S. M. (2011). A functionalist account of shame-induced behavior. *Cognition and Emotion*, *25*(5), 939–946.

de Waal, F. (2006). *Primates and philosophers: How morality evolved*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

de Waal, F. B. M. (2005). Homo homini lupus? Morality, the social instincts, and our fellow primates. In *Neurobiology of human values* (pp. 17–35). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.

Dedeke, A. (2015). A cognitive-intuitionist model of moral judgement. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *126*(3), 437–457.

Domagalski, T., & Steelman, L. (2005). The impact of work events and disposition on the experience and expression of employee anger. *Organizational Analysis*, *13*(1), 31–52.

Dunn, J. R., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2005). Feeling and believing: The influence of emotion in trust. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*(5), 736–748.

Dutton, J. E., Frost, P. J., Worline, M. C., Lilius, J. M., & Kanov, J. M. (2002). Leading in times of trauma. *Harvard Business Review*, *80*(1), 54–61.

Dutton, J. E., Workman, K., & Hardin, A. E. (2014). Compassion at work. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *1*, 277–304.

Dutton, J. E., Worline, M. C., Frost, P. J., & Lilius, J. (2006). Explaining compassion organizing. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *51*(1), 59–96.

Ekman, P. (1992). An argument for basic emotions. *Cognition and Emotion*, *6*, 169–200.

Eldor, L., & Shoshani, A. (2016). Caring relationships in school staff: Exploring the link between compassion and teacher work engagement. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *59*, 126–136.

Emmons, R. A. (2003). Acts of gratitude in organizations. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline* (pp. 81–92). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Emmons, R. A., & McCullough, M. E. (2003). Counting blessings versus burdens: An experimental investigation of gratitude and subjective well-being in daily life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*(2), 377–389.

Fagley, N. S., & Adler, M. G. (2012). Appreciation: A spiritual path to finding value and meaning in the workplace. *Journal of Management, Spirituality, & Religion*, *9*(2), 167–187.

Fehr, R., Fulmer, A., Awtrey, E., & Miller, J. A. (2017). The grateful workplace: A multilevel model of gratitude in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *42*(2), 361–381.

Fischer, A. H., & Roseman, I. J. (2007). Beat them or ban them: The characteristics and social functions of anger and contempt. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*(1), 103–115.

Fitness, J. (2000). Anger in the workplace: An emotion script approach to anger episodes between workers and their superiors, co-workers and subordinates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*(2), 147–162.

Folger, R. (2001). Fairness as deonance. In S. W. Gilliland, D. D. Steiner, & D. P. Skarlicki (Eds.), *Research in social issues in management* (pp. 3–33). New York: Information Age.

Ford, M. T., Agosta, J. P., Huang, J., & Shannon, C. (2018). Moral emotions towards others at work and implications for employee behavior: A qualitative analysis using critical incidents. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *33*(1), 155–190.

Ford, M. T., Wang, Y., Jin, J., & Eisenberger, R. (2018). Chronic and episodic anger and gratitude towards the organization: Relationships with organizational and supervisor supportiveness and extrarole behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *23*(2), 175–187.

Frijda, N. C. (1987). Emotion, cognitive structure, and action tendency. *Cognition and Emotion*, *1*(2), 115–143.

Frost, P., Dutton, J., Worline, M., & Wilson, A. (2000). Narratives of compassion in organizations. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotions in organizations* (pp. 25–45). London: Sage.

George, G., Howard-Grenville, J., Joshi, A., & Tihanyi, L. (2016). Understanding and tackling societal grand challenges through management research. *Academy of Management Journal*, *59*(6), 1880–1895.

Geraci, A., & Surian, L. (2011). The developmental roots of fairness: Infant's reactions to equal and unequal distributions of resources. *Developmental Science*, *14*(5), 1012–1020.

Ghorbani, M., Liao, Y., Çayköylü, S., & Chand, M. (2013). Guilt, shame, and reparative behavior: The effect of psychological proximity. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *114*(2), 311–323.

Gibson, D. E., & Callister, R. R. (2010). Anger in organizations: Review and integration. *Journal of Management*, *36*(1), 66–93.

Giner-Sorolla, R., Castano, E., Espinosa, P., & Brown, R. (2008). Shame expressions reduce the recipient's insult from outgroup reparations. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *44*(3), 519–526.

Gino, F., Ayal, S., & Ariely, D. (2013). Self-serving altruism? The lure of unethical actions that benefit others. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, *93*, 285–292.

Goetz, J. L., Keltner, D., & Simon-Thomas, E. (2010). Compassion: An evolutionary analysis and empirical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *136*(3), 351–374.

González-Gómez, H. V., & Richter, A. W. (2015). Turning shame into creativity: The importance of exposure to creative team environments. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *126*, 142–161.

Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, *25*(2), 161–178.

Grant, A. M. (2012). Giving time, time after time: Work design and sustained employee participation in corporate volunteering. *Academy of Management Review*, *37*(4), 589–615.

Grant, A. M., & Gino, F. (2010). A little thanks goes a long way: Explaining why gratitude expressions motivate prosocial behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *98*(6), 946–955.

Grant, A. M., & Patil, S. V. (2012). Challenging the norm of self-interest: Minority influence and transitions to helping norms in work units. *Academy of Management Review*, *37*(4), 547–568.

Grant, A. M., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2010). I won't let you down … or will I? Core self-evaluations, other-orientation, anticipated guilt and gratitude, and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*(1), 108–121.

Grappi, S., Romani, S., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2013). The effects of company offshoring strategies on consumer reports. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *41*(6), 683–704.

Greenbaum, R. L., Mawritz, M. B., & Eissa, G. (2012). Bottom-line mentality as an antecedent of social undermining and the moderating roles of core self-evaluations and conscientiousness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *97*(2), 343–359.

Greene, J., & Haidt, J. (2002). How (and where) does moral judgment work? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *6*(12), 517–523.

Gruenewald, T. L., Dickerson, S. S., & Kemeny, M. E. (2007). A social function for self-conscious emotions: The social self-preservation theory. In J. L. Tracy, R. W. Robins, & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *The self-conscious emotions: Theory and research* (pp. 68–87). New York: Guilford Press.

Haidt, J. (2001). The emotional dog and its rational tail: A social intuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review*, *108*(4), 814–834.

Haidt, J. (2003). The moral emotions. In R. J. Davison, K. R. Scherer, & H. H. Goldsmith (Eds.), *Handbook of affective sciences* (pp. 852–870). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Halali, E., Kogut, T., & Ritov, I. (2017). Reciprocating (more) specifically to you: The role of benefactor's identifiability on direct upstream reciprocity. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, *30*(2), 473–483.

Harder, D. H., & Zalma, A. (1990). Two promising shame and guilt scales: A construct validity comparison. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *55*(3/4), 729–745.

Hareli, S., Shomrat, N., & Biger, N. (2005). The role of emotions in employees' explanations for failure in the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *20*(8), 663–680.

Harvey, P., Martinko, M. J., & Borkowski, N. (2017). Justifying deviant behavior: The role of attributions and moral emotions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *141*(4), 779–795.

Hekman, D. R., Johnson, S. K., Foo, M. D., & Yang, W. (2017). Does diversity-valuing behavior result in diminished performance ratings for non-white and female leaders? *Academy of Management Journal*, *60*(2), 771–797.

Hershcovis, M. S., & Bhatnagar, N. (2017). When fellow customers behave badly: Witness reaction to employee mistreatment by customers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*(11), 1528–1544.

Hochwarter, W. A., & Byrne, Z. S. (2010). The interactive effects of chronic pain, guilt, and perfectionism, on work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *40*(1), 76–100.

Hochwarter, W. A., Perrewé, P. L., Meurs, J. A., & Kacmar, C. (2007). The interactive effects of work-induced guilt and ability to manage resources on job and life satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *12*(2), 125–135.

Huang, S., Greenbaum, R. L., Bonner, J. M., & Wang, C. (2019). Why sabotage customers who mistreat you? The roles of activated hostility and devaluation of targets as a moral disengagement mechanism. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. *104*, 495–510. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2018-51216-001

Hutcherson, C. A., & Gross, J. J. (2011). The moral emotions: A social–functionalist account of anger, disgust, and contempt. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *100*(4), 719–737.

Ilies, R., Peng, A. C., Savani, K., & Dimotakis, N. (2013). Guilty and helpful: An emotion-based reparatory model of voluntary work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *98*(6), 1051–1059.

Ingram, P., & Zou, Z. (2008). Business friends. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *28*, 167–184.

Izard, C. E. (1977). *Human emotions*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Joireman, J., Kamdar, D., Daniels, D., & Duell, B. (2006). Good citizens to the end? It depends: Empathy and concern with future consequences moderate the impact of a short-term time horizon on organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(6), 1307–1320.

Kanov, J. M., Maitlis, S., Worline, M. C., Dutton, J. E., Frost, P. J., & Lilius, J. M. (2004). Compassion in organizational life. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *47*(6), 808–827.

Kanter, R. M. (1968). Commitment and social organization: A study of commitment mechanisms in utopian communities. *American Sociological Review*, *33*(4), 499–517.

Kaplan, E. M., & Cowen, E. L. (1981). Interpersonal helping behavior of industrial foremen. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *66*(5), 633–638.

Kaplan, S., Bradley-Geist, J. C., Ahmad, A., Anderson, A., Hargrove, A. K., & Lindsey, A. (2014). A test of two positive psychological interventions to increase well-being. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *29*(3), 367–380.

Keltner, D. (1996). Evidence for the distinctness of embarrassment, shame, and guilt: A study of recalled antecedents and facial expressions of emotion. *Cognition & Emotion*, *10*(2), 155–172.

Keltner, D., & Buswell, B. N. (1997). Embarrassment: its distinct form and appeasement functions. *Psychological Bulletin*, *122*(3), 250.

Keltner, D., & Haidt, J. (2003). Approaching awe, a moral, spiritual, and aesthetic emotion. *Cognition and Emotion*, *17*(2), 297–314.

Ketelaar, T., & Au, W. T. (2003). The effects of feelings of guilt on the behavior of uncooperative individuals in repeated social bargaining games: An affect-as-information interpretation of the role of emotion in social interaction. *Cognition and Emotion*, *17*(3), 429–453.

Kollen, T. (2016). Acting out of compassion, egoism, and malice: A Schopenhauerian view of the moral worth of CSR and diversity management practices. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *138*(2), 215–229.

Krehbiel, P. J., & Cropanzano, R. (2000). Procedural justice, outcome favorability and emotion. *Social Justice Research*, *13*(4), 339–360.

Lagattuta, K. H., & Thompson, R. A. (2007). The development of self-conscious emotions: Cognitive processes and social influences. In J. L. Tracy, R. W. Robins, & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *The self-conscious emotions: Theory and research* (pp. 91–113). New York: Guilford.

Lam, C. K., Huang, X., Walter, F., & Chan, S. C. H. (2016). Coworkers' relationship quality and interpersonal emotions in team-member dyads in China: The moderating role of cooperative team goals. *Management and Organization Review*, *12*(4), 687–716.

Lanham, M. E., Rye, M. S., Rimsky, L. S., & Weill, S. R. (2012). How gratitude relates to burnout and job satisfaction in mental health professionals. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, *34*(4), 341–354.

Lazarus, R. S. (1991). Cognition and motivation in emotion. *American Psychologist*, *46*, 352–367.

Leary, M. R. (2002). When selves collide: The nature of the self and the dynamics of interpersonal relationships. In A. Tesser, D. A. Stapel, & J. V. Wood (Eds.), *Self and motivation* (pp. 119–145). Washington, DC: APA.

Leary, M. R., & Miller, R. S. (2000). Self-presentational perspectives on personal relationships. In W. Ickes, & S. Duck (Eds.), *The social psychology of personal relationships* (pp. 129–154). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Lee, S., & Chung, S. (2012). Corporate apology and crisis communication: The effect of responsibility admittance and sympathetic expression on public's anger relief. *Public Relations Review*, *38*(5), 932–934.

Leith, K. P., & Baumeister, R. F. (2008). Empathy, shame, guilt, and narratives of interpersonal conflicts: Guilt-prone people are better at perspective taking. *Journal of Personality*, *66*(1), 1–37.

Lewis, H. B. (1971). *Shame and guilt in neurosis*. New York: International Universities Press.

Lickel, B., Kushlev, K., Savalei, V., Matta, S., & Schmader, T. (2014). Shame and the motivation to change the self. *Emotion*, *14*(6), 1049–1061.

Lickel, B., Schmader, T., Curtis, M., Scarnier, M., & Ames, D. R. (2005). Vicarious shame and guilt. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *8*(2), 145–157.

Lickel, B., Steele, R. R., & Schmader, T. (2011). Group-based shame and guilt: Emerging directions in research. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *5*(3), 153–163.

Lilius, J. M., Worline, M. C., Dutton, J. E., Kanov, J. M., & Maitlis, S. (2011). Understanding compassion capability. *Human Relations*, *64*(7), 873–899.

Lilius, J. M., Worline, M. C., Maitlis, S., Kanov, J., Dutton, J. E., & Frost, P. (2008). The contours and consequences of compassion at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *29*(2), 193–218.

Lindebaum, D., & Geddes, D. (2016). The place and role of (moral) anger in organizational behavior studies. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *37*(5), 738–757.

Lindsay-Hartz, J. (1984). Contrasting experiences of shame and guilt. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *27*(6), 689–704.

Mangus, S. M., Bock, D. E., Jones, E., & Folse, J. A. G. (2017). Gratitude in buyer–seller relationships: A dyadic investigation. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, *37*(3), 250–257.

Martens, J. P., Tracy, J. L., & Shariff, A. F. (2012). Status signals: Adaptive benefits of displaying and observing the nonverbal expressions of pride and shame. *Cognition and Emotion*, *26*(3), 390–406.

McCullough, M. E., Kilpatrick, S. D., Emmons, R. A., & Larson, D. B. (2001). Is gratitude moral affect? *Psychological Bulletin*, *127*(2), 249–266.

McNeely, B. L., & Meglino, B. M. (1994). The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial organizational behavior: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *79*(6), 836–844.

Meier, L. L., & Semmer, N. K. (2013). Lack of reciprocity, narcissism, anger, and instigated workplace incivility: A moderated mediation model. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *22*(4), 461–475.

Melwani, S., & Barsade, S. G. (2011). Held in contempt: The psychological, interpersonal, and performance consequences of contempt in a work context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*(3), 503–520.

Michie, S. (2009). Pride and gratitude: How positive emotions influence the prosocial behaviors of organizational leaders. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *15*(4), 393–403.

Miller, T. L., Grimes, M. G., McMullen, J. S., & Vogus, T. J. (2012). Venturing for others with heart and head: How compassion encourages social entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Review*, *37*(4), 616–640.

Mitchell, M. S., Vogel, R. M., & Folger, R. (2015). Third parties' reactions to the abusive supervision of coworkers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(4), 1040–1055.

Molho, C., Tybur, J. M., Güler, E., Balliet, W., & Hofmann, W. (2017). Disgust and anger relate to different aggressive responses to moral violations. *Psychological Science*, *28*(5), 609–619.

Moll, J., de Oliveira-Souza, R., Eslinger, P. J., Bramati, I. E., Mourão-Miranda, J., Andreiuolo, P. A., & Pessoa, L. (2002). The neural correlates of moral sensitivity: A functional magnetic resonance imaging investigation of basic and moral emotions. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *22*, 2730–2736.

Moll, J., Zahn, R., de Oliveira-Souza, R., Krueger, F., & Grafman, J. (2005). The neural basis of human moral cognition. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *6*(10), 799.

Morris, M. W., & Keltner, D. (2000). How emotions work: The social functions of emotional expression in negotiations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *22*, 1–50.

Mroz, J. E., & Allen, J. A. (2017). An experimental investigation of the interpersonal ramifications of lateness to workplace meetings. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *90*(4), 508–534.

Mulder, R., Bos, A. E. R., Pouwelse, M., & van Dam, K. (2017). Workplace mobbing: How the victim's coping behavior influences bystander responses. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *157*(1), 16–29.

Narvaez, D. (2010). Moral complexity: The fatal attraction of truthiness and the importance of mature moral functioning. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *5*(2), 163–181.

Neumeier, L. M., Brook, L., Ditchburn, G., & Sckopke, P. (2017). Delivering your daily dose of well-being to the workplace: A randomized controlled trial of an online well-being programme for employees. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *26*(4), 555–573.

Ng, T. W. H. (2016). Embedding employees early on: The importance of workplace respect. *Personnel Psychology*, *69*(3), 599–633.

O'Donohoe, S., & Turley, D. (2006). Compassion at the counter: Service providers and bereaved consumers. *Human Relations*, *59*(10), 1429–1448.

O'Neill, O. A. (2009). Workplace expressions of emotions and escalation of commitment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *39*(10), 2396–2424.

O'Reilly, J., Aquino, K., & Skarlicki, D. (2016). The lives of others: Third parties' responses to others' injustice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *101*(2), 171–189.

Oc, B., Bashshur, M. R., & Moore, C. (2015). Speaking truth to power: The effect of candid feedback on how individuals with power allocate resources. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(2), 450–463.

Ollier-Malaterre, A., Rothbard, N. P., & Berg, J. M. (2013). When worlds collide in cyberspace: How boundary work in online social networks impacts professional relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, *38*(4), 645–659.

Osborne, D., Smith, H. J., & Huo, Y. J. (2012). More than a feeling: Discrete emotions mediate the relationship between relative deprivation and reactions to workplace furloughs. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *38*(5), 628–641.

Patient, D. L., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2010). Increasing interpersonal and informational justice when communicating negative news: The role of manager's empathic concern and moral development. *Journal of Management*, *36*(2), 555–578.

Pond, R. S., DeWall, N. C., Lambert, N. M., Deckman, T., Bonser, I. M., & Fincham, F. D. (2012). Repulsed by violence: Disgust sensitivity buffers trait, behavioral, and daily aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *102*(1), 175–188.

Porath, C. L., & Pearson, C. M. (2012). Emotional and behavioral responses to workplace incivility and the impact of hierarchical status. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *42*(s1), 326–357.

Provis, C. (2017). Intuition, analysis, and reflection in business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *140*(1), 5–15.

Quinn, R. W., Spreitzer, G. M., & Lam, C. F. (2012). Building a sustainable model of human energy in organizations: Exploring the critical role of resources. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *1*, 337–396.

Rai, T. S., & Diermeier, D. (2015). Corporations are cyborgs: Organizations elicit anger but not sympathy when they think can think but cannot feel. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *126*, 18–26.

Reynolds, S. J. (2006). A neurocognitive model of the ethical decision-making process: Implications for study and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*, 737–748.

Robertson, C. J., Lamin, A., & Livanis, G. (2010). Stakeholder perceptions of offshoring and outsourcing: The role of embedded issues. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *95*(2), 167–189.

Romani, S., & Grappi, S. (2014). How companies' good deeds encourage consumers to adopt pro-social behavior. *European Journal of Marketing*, *48*(5/6), 943–963.

Romani, S., Grappi, S., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2013). Corporate socially responsible initiatives and their effects on consumption of green products. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *135*(2), 253–264.

Romani, S., Grappi, S., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2016). Corporate socially responsible initiatives and their effects on consumption of green products. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *125*(2), 253–264. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2485-0

Rothschild, Z. K., Landau, M. J., Sullivan, D., & Keefer, L. A. (2012). A dual-motive model of scapegoating: Displacing blame to reduce guilt or increase control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *102*(6), 1148–1163.

Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(1), 66–80.

Rousseau, D. M., & McLean Parks, J. (1993). The contracts of individuals and organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *15*, 1–43.

Rozin, P., Lowery, L., Imada, S., & Haidt, J. (1999). The CAD triad hypothesis: A mapping between three moral emotions (contempt, anger, disgust) and three moral codes (community, autonomy, divinity). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *76*(4), 574–586.

Rudolph, U., Roesch, S., Greitemeyer, T., & Weiner, B. (2004). A meta-analytic review of help giving and aggression from an attributional perspective: Contributions to a general theory of motivation. *Cognition and Emotion*, *18*(6), 815–848.

Rupp, D. E., & Spencer, S. (2006). When customers lash out: The effects of customer interactional injustice on emotional labor and the mediating role of discrete emotions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(4), 971–978.

Russell, J. A. (1980). A circumplex model of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *39*, 1161–1178.

Russell, J. A. (2003). Core affect and the psychological construction of emotion. *Psychological Review*, *110*(1), 145–172.

Russell, P. S., & Giner-Sorolla, R. (2011). Moral anger, but not moral disgust, responds to intentionality. *Emotion*, *11*(2), 233–240.

Rynes, S. L., Bartunek, J. M., Dutton, J. E., & Margolis, J. D. (2012). Care and compassion through an organizational lens: Opening up new possibilities. *Academy of Management Review*, *37*(4), 503–523.

Sagi, A., & Hoffman, M. L. (1976). Empathic distress in the newborn. *Developmental Psychology*, *12*(2), 175–176.

Salvador, R., & Folger, R. G. (2009). Business ethics and the brain: Rommel Salvador and Robert G. Folger. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *19*(1), 1–31.

Sanfey, A. G., Rilling, J. K., Aronson, J. A., Nystrom, L. E., & Cohen, J. D. (2003). The neural basis of economic decision-making in the ultimatum game. *Science*, *300*(5626), 1755–1758.

Scherer, K. R., & Wallbott, H. G. (1994). Evidence for universality and cultural variation of differential emotion response patterning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *66*(2), 310–328.

Schmader, T., & Lickel, B. (2006). The approach and avoidance functions of guilt and shame emotions: Comparing reactions to self-caused and other-caused wrongdoing. *Motivation and Emotion*, *30*(1), 42–55.

Schnall, S., & Cannon, P. R. (2012). The clean conscience at work: Emotions, intuitions and morality. *Journal of Management, Spirituality, & Religion*, *9*(4), 295–315.

Schnall, S., Roper, J., & Fessler, D. M. T. (2010). Elevation leads to altruistic behavior. *Psychological Science*, *21*(3), 315–320.

Schweitzer, M. E., & Gibson, D. E. (2008). Fairness, feelings, and ethical decision-making: Consequences of violating community standards of fairness. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *77*(3), 287–301.

Shirako, A., Kilduff, G. J., & Kray, L. J. (2015). Is there a place for sympathy in negotiation? Finding strength in weakness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *131*, 95–109.

Singer, T., Seymour, B., O'doherty, J. P., Stephan, K. E., Dolan, R. J., & Frith, C. D. (2006). Empathic neural responses are modulated by the perceived fairness of others. *Nature*, *439*(7075), 466.

Sirola, N., & Pitesa, M. (2017). Economic downturns undermine workplace helping by promoting a zero-sum construal of success. *Academy of Management Journal*, *60*(4), 1339–1359.

Skarlicki, D. P., Hoegg, J., Aquino, K., & Nadisic, T. (2013). Does injustice affect your sense of taste and smell? The mediating role of moral disgust. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *49*(5), 852–859.

Smith, C. A., & Ellsworth, P. C. (1985). Patterns of cognitive appraisal in emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *48*(4), 813–838.

Smith, R. H., Webster, M. J., Parrott, G. W., & Eyre, H. L. (2002). The role of public exposure in moral and nonmoral shame and guilt. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*(1), 138–159.

Smith-Crowe, K., & Warren, D. E. (2014). The emotion-evoked collective corruption model: The role of emotion in the spread of corruption within organization. *Organization Science*, *25*(4), 1154–1171.

Sonenshein, S. (2007). The role of construction, intuition, and justification in responding to ethical issues at work: The sensemaking-intuition model. *Academy of Management Review*, *32*, 1022–1040.

Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *68*, 446–460.

Spence, J. R., Brown, D. J., Keeping, L. M., & Lian, H. (2014). Helpful today, but not tomorrow? Feeling grateful as a predictor of daily organizational citizenship behaviors. *Personnel Psychology*, *67*, 705–738.

Spitzer, M., Fischbacher, U., Herrnberger, B., Grön, G., & Fehr, E. (2007). The neural signature of social norm compliance. *Neuron*, *56*, 185–196.

Stearns, D. C., & Parrott, G. W. (2012). When feeling bad makes you look good: Guilt, shame, and person perception. *Cognition and Emotion*, *26*(3), 407–430.

Stickney, L. T., & Geddes, D. (2016). More than just "blowing off steam": The roles of anger and advocacy in promoting positive outcomes at work. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, *9*(2), 141–157.

Struthers, C. W., Eaton, J., Czyznielewski, A., & Dupuis, R. (2005). Judging up the corporate ladder: Understanding the social conduct of workers. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *35*(6), 1223–1245.

Tangney, J. P. (1992). Situational detenninants of shame and guilt in young adulthood. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *18*(2), 199–206.

Tangney, J. P. (1999). The self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment and pride. In T. Dalgleish, & M. J. Power (Eds.), *Handbook of cognition and emotion* (pp. 541–568). Chichester, England: Wiley.

Tangney, J. P., & Dearing, R. L. (2002). *Shame and guilt*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Tangney, J. P., Miller, R. S., Flicker, L., & Barlow, D. H. (1996). Are shame, guilt, and embarrassment distinct emotions? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 1256–1269.

Tangney, J. P., Stuewig, J., & Mashek, D. J. (2007). Moral emotions and moral behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *58*, 345–372.

Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P. E., Hill-Barlow, D., Marschall, D. E., & Gramzow, R. (1996). Relation of shame and guilt to constructive versus destructive responses to anger across the lifespan. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 797–809.

Tausch, N., Becker, J. C., Spears, R., Christ, O., Saab, R., Singh, P., & Siddiqui, R. N. (2011). Explaining radical group behavior: Developing emotion and efficacy routes to normative and nonnormative collective action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*(1), 129–148.

Tesser, A., Gatewood, R., & Driver, M. (1968). Some determinants of gratitude. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *9*(3), 233–236.

Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An "interpretive" model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, *15*(4), 666–681.

Thompson, J. A., & Bunderson, J. S. (2003). Violations of principal: Ideological currency in the psychological contract. *Academy of Management Review*, *28*(4), 571–568.

Tiedens, L. Z., Ellsworth, P. C., & Mesquita, B. (2000). Sentimental stereotypes: Emotional expectations for high- and low-status group members. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*(5), 560–575.

Toubiana, M., & Zietsma, C. (2016). The message is on the wall? Emotions, social media, and the dynamics of institutional complexity. *Academy of Management Journal*, *60*(3), 922–953.

Treviño, L. K., den Nieuwenboer, N. A., & Kish-Gephart, J. J. (2014). (Un) ethical behavior in organizations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *65*, 635–660.

Treviño, L. K., Weaver, G. R., & Reynolds, S. J. (2006). Behavioral ethics in organizations: A review. *Journal of Management*, *32*(6), 951–990.

Tse, H. H. M., Lam, C. K., Lawrence, S. A., & Huang, X. (2013). When my supervisor dislikes you more than me: The effect of dissimilarity in leader–member exchange on coworkers' interpersonal emotion and perceived help. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *98*(6), 974–988.

Turillo, C. J., Folger, R., Lavelle, J. J., Umphress, E. E., & Gee, J. O. (2002). Is virtue its own reward? Self-sacrificial decisions for the sake of fairness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *89*(1), 839–865.

Umphress, E. E., & Bingham, J. B. (2011). When employees do bad things for good reasons: Examining unethical pro-organizational behaviors. *Organization Science*, *22*(3), 621–640.

van Kleef, G. A., de Dreu, C. K. W., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2006). Supplication and appeasement in conflict and negotiation: The interpersonal effects of disappointment, worry, guilt, and regret. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*(1), 124–142.

Verbeke, W., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2002). A situational analysis on how salespeople experience and cope with shame and embarrassment. *Psychology & Marketing*, *19*(9), 713–741.

Vess, M., Schlegel, R. J., Hicks, J. A., & Arndt, J. (2014). Guilty, but not ashamed: "True" self-conceptions influence affective responses to personal shortcomings. *Journal of Personality*, *82*(3), 213–224.

Vianello, M., Galliani, E. M., & Haidt, J. (2010). Elevation at work: The effects of leaders' moral excellence. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *5*(5), 390–411.

Warren, D. E. (2003). Constructive and destructive deviance in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *28*(4), 622–632.

Waters, L. (2012). Predicting job satisfaction: Contributions of individual gratitude and institutionalized gratitude. *Psychology*, *3*(12), 1174–1176.

Watson, D., & Tellegen, A. (1985). Toward a consensual structure of mood. *Psychological Bulletin*, *98*(2), 219.

Watson, D., Wiese, D., Vaidya, J., & Tellegen, A. (1999). The two general activation systems of affect: Structural findings, evolutionary considerations, and psychological evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *76*(5), 820–838.

Weiss, H. M., Suckow, K., & Cropanzano, R. (1999). Effects of justice conditions on discrete emotions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *84*(5), 786–794.

Wicker, F. W., Payne, G. C., & Morgan, R. D. (1983). Participant descriptions of guilt and shame. *Motivation and Emotion*, *7*(1), 25–39.

Winslow, C. J., Kaplan, S. A., Bradley-Geist, J. C., Lindsey, A. P., Ahmad, A. S., & Hargrove, A. K. (2017). An examination of two positive organizational interventions: For whom do these interventions work? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *22*(2), 129–137.

Wolf, S. T., Cohen, T. R., Panter, A. T., & Insko, C. A. (2010). Shame proneness and guilt proneness: Toward the further understanding of reactions to public and private transgressions. *Self and Identity*, *9*(4), 337–362.

Wolff, S. B., Pescosolido, A. T., & Druskat, V. U. (2002). Emotional intelligence as the basis of leader emergence in self-managing teams. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*(5), 505–522.

Wu, L., & Dodoo, N. A. (2017). Researching good and doing good: Exploring consumer responses to meaningful advertisements. *Journal of Promotion Management*, *23*(4), 592–613.

Xie, C., Bagozzi, R. P., & Grønhaug, K. (2015). The role of moral emotions and individual differences in consumer responses to corporate green and non-green actions. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *43*(3), 333–356.

Yam, K. C., & Reynolds, S. J. (2016). The effects of victim anonymity on unethical behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *136*(1), 13–22.

Zhang, A., Reyna, C., Qian, Z., & Yu, G. (2008). Interpersonal attributes of responsibility in the Chinese workplace: A test of western models in a collectivistic context. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *38*(9), 2361–2377.

Zuber, J. M., & Andersen, M. L. (2016). Moral foundations theory: An exploratory study of politics and decision-making. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability, and Ethics*, *13*(2), 74–92.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Rebecca L. Greenbaum is a professor in the Human Resources Management Department of the School of Management and Labor Relations at Rutgers University. Her research interests include behavioral ethics, dysfunctional leadership, workplace deviance, and organizational justice.

Julena M. Bonner is an assistant professor of management in the Huntsman School of Business at Utah State University. Her research interests include behavioral ethics, moral emotions, ethical leadership, and workplace deviance.

Truit W. Gray is a PhD student in the Department of Management of the Spears School of Business at Oklahoma State University. His research interests include emotions, team dynamics, shared leadership, and status conflict.

Mary B. Mawritz is an associate professor in the Management Department of the LeBow College of Business at Drexel University. Her current research focuses on the "dark side" of organizational behavior, with a specific focus on dysfunctional leadership and workplace deviance.

How to cite this article: Greenbaum R, Bonner J, Gray T, Mawritz M. Moral emotions: A review and research agenda for management scholarship. *J Organ Behav*. 2020;41:95–114. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2367