
UNETHICAL WORK BEHAVIOR AS A STRESSOR

LAURENZ L. MEIER, NORBERT K. SEMMER, AND
PAUL E. SPECTOR

A large and growing body of research on occupational stress has established the existence of a variety of environmental conditions termed stressors that have detrimental physical and psychological effects on people, termed strains. Whereas some stressors are inherent in the nature of job tasks (e.g., role ambiguity and role conflict, see Katz and Kahn, 1978), social stressors involve interpersonal interactions among people and are considered as particularly stressful (e.g., Bolger et al., 1989). Social stressors have been studied under different labels, such as interpersonal conflict (Spector and Jex, 1998), bullying (Einarsen et al., 2010), injustice (Greenberg, 2004), incivility (Andersson and Pearson, 1999), emotional abuse (Keashly and Harvey, 2005), social undermining (Duffy, Ganster, and Pagon, 2002), abusive supervision (Tepper, 2007), and sexual harassment (Fitzgerald et al., 1997). A common feature of all these stressors is that they can involve instances of unethical behavior, which in many cases imply threats to self-esteem through expressions of disrespect, a lack of acceptance, and social exclusion. Such behaviors are unethical when they are intended to harm others for no legitimate purpose, or when they aim at attaining illegitimate advantages at the expense of others. In this chapter we will discuss various mechanisms regarding how social stressors arising from unethical behavior of one employee toward others lead to strains, integrating the ethics literature with the theory of stress as offense to self (for an overview, see Figure 11.1).

STRESS AS OFFENSE TO SELF

Maintaining a positive self-evaluation and receiving positive evaluations by others are strong motives for most people (Sedikides and Strube, 1997). People strive to perceive themselves and to convince others that they are worthwhile, competent, and moral individuals. Given that it is so important for people to preserve a positive self-worth, threats to self-esteem may serve as particularly salient stressors, a point emphasized by Lazarus (e.g., 1999). Surprisingly, however, threats to self-esteem as a stressor have not played a prominent role in occupational stress research. Typically, self-esteem is either investigated as a resource that attenuates the effects of stressful situations (e.g., Jex and Elacqua, 2004) or as outcome, in that stress may impede self-esteem (e.g., Frone, 2000). However, it is rarely conceptualized as a core element of the stress experience itself. To fill this gap, Semmer and colleagues (e.g., Semmer et al., 2007; Semmer, McGrath, and Beehr, 2005) have introduced the “stress as offense to self” (SOS) perspective to stress research. On a general level, this perspective suggests that many aversive work conditions are perceived as stressful because they threaten people’s positive self-view. On the one hand, people’s self-esteem may be threatened by internally attributed failure experiences, for instance, to a lack of competence or to a lack of moral strength (“stress as insufficiency,” SIN); on the other hand, people’s self-esteem

may be threatened by others' behavior that signals disrespect, such as various forms of unethical behavior ("stress as disrespect," SAD). It follows that being a target of unethical behavior is likely to create an offense to self in terms of stress as disrespect.¹ Realizing that one is reacting to such behavior in an inappropriate way (e.g., incivility against innocent others), may, however, lead to moral self-blame, and thus stress through insufficiency.

People have a strong need to be accepted and socially included by significant others, and one's self-esteem is strongly affected by the approval of others (Baumeister and Leary, 1995; Leary and Baumeister, 2000). Penhaglion, Louis, and Restubog (2009) showed that mistreatment by coworkers was related to depression and (organizational-based) self-esteem, and that this relationship was mediated by perceived rejection. We therefore assume that unethical behavior, which signals disrespect, unfairness, and social exclusion, threatens one's self-esteem and hence causes stress (path a in Figure 11.1). It is important to note that we do not assume that an unethical act necessarily has to actually diminish one's self-esteem. People use various strategies to protect and enhance their self-esteem (e.g., Crocker and Park, 2004), which may be effective at least in the short run. Unethical behavior that signals disrespect and rejection might therefore represent a threat to self-esteem, but people are often able to dismiss such isolated threats and find ways to maintain their self-esteem. In line with this, in experimental studies, rejected individuals reported more negative affect (i.e., strain) but not a lower state self-esteem than individuals in the control group; however, in studies of exclusion in field settings, people who are chronically rejected by others report lower trait self-esteem than nonrejected people (Blackhart et al., 2009). The lack of effects on self-esteem in experimental studies may be because the threat to self-esteem is too weak (due to ethical considerations), or it might be due to successful strategies in warding off the threat. In any case, according to the SOS perspective, unethical behavior is stressful because it is a threat to self-esteem, even if an actual drop in self-esteem is successfully averted. In other words, the threat itself is sufficient to induce strain.

UNETHICAL BEHAVIOR AND THE TARGET'S WELL-BEING

In the following section, we present some selected studies that suggest that the experience of unethical behavior by others is stressful and may cause impaired well-being. Because relatively few studies have focused explicitly on unethical behavior and well-being, we incorporate research about related constructs such as deviance, bullying, and injustice, which can all be regarded as instances of violating commonly agreed ethical norms. Two recent meta-analyses show that various forms of unethical behavior targeted against the employee are related to indicators of well-being such as depression, burnout, self-esteem, and physical symptoms (Bowling and Beehr, 2006; Hershcovis and Barling, 2009). Most of this research has utilized cross-sectional designs, which strongly limits insight into the direction and duration of a proposed effect. However, some studies have examined across-time associations between unethical behavior and well-being. For example, bullying (e.g., Finne, Knardahl, and Lau, 2011; Kivimäki et al., 2003), injustice (e.g., Ylipaavalniemi et al., 2005), and interpersonal stressors (e.g., Dormann and Zapf, 1999) have been prospectively linked to depression. The effects are not restricted to psychological well-being. Lack of justice (Kivimäki et al., 2006), and bullying (Kivimäki et al., 2003) have also been shown to be related to cardiovascular disease (CVD), and Berset et al. (2011) have shown that interpersonal stressors are also linked to the body-mass index, which is predictive for many health outcomes such as diabetes and CVD. Thus, previous research suggests that chronic experience of unethical behavior by others may negatively impair chronic psychological and physical well-being in the long run. Furthermore, recent diary studies show that not only chronic experience of unethical

behavior impairs well-being. In addition, even the experience of isolated unethical behavior can deteriorate well-being in the short run. For example, daily fluctuations of unfairness and conflicts have been linked to negative mood (Ilies, Johnson, and Judge, 2011; Meier et al., 2011), job satisfaction, and impaired sleep quality (Meier et al., 2011).

A special case of unethical behavior can arise when one is expected to perform immoral acts (path b in Figure 11.1). For instance, the expectation to promote selling of a product by making unrealistic promises may induce a moral dilemma. Such situations would constitute a role conflict, more specifically a person–role conflict (Kahn et al., 1964; cf. Beehr and Glazer, 2005). Unfortunately, person–role conflict has not been prominent in research on role conflict, which “is typically envisaged as disagreement between two or more role-senders” (Katz and Kahn, 1978, p. 204). Perceived pressure to perform in an unethical way is therefore a research domain that deserves more attention.

Note that pressure to perform in an unethical way can imply both facets of stress as offense to self, first, feeling pressured represents stress as disrespect, since the role sender disregards one’s moral standards and, thus, one’s interests as a person. Second, giving in to such pressure would lead to self-blame, as one would not be fulfilling one’s moral standards; in the SOS model, this situation should lead to stress through insufficiency.

UNETHICAL BEHAVIOR EXPOSURE THAT EXTENDS BEYOND THE TARGET

So far, we have presented the theoretical background and empirical findings for negative effects of unethical behavior on the target person’s well-being. In the following section, we outline that the effects of such unethical behavior can extend beyond the original target. First, we present research showing that the victim may become a perpetrator and that threatened self-esteem and hence strain plays a prominent role in this transformation. Second, we illustrate that unethical behavior may also be stressful for observers or third parties who merely witness the unethical behavior directed toward others and that third parties may also imitate such acts and hence unethical behavior becomes widespread.

When the Victim Becomes a Perpetrator

Exposure to unethical behavior can be a threat to self-esteem. However, an experienced threat to self-esteem not only leads to physical and psychological strains but also can affect behavior. According to Baumeister, Smart, and Boden (1996), threatened self-esteem can cause either withdrawal or aggressive behavior, depending on whether the person accepts or rejects the negative evaluation. If the person accepts the negative evaluation, the person revises his or her self-esteem, which causes negative emotions toward the self (e.g., sadness) and withdrawal behavior. However, if the person rejects the negative evaluation and hence maintains his or her self-esteem, negative emotions toward the source of the threat (e.g., anger) are triggered, which can lead to aggressive behavior directed toward the source of the threat. Because people are highly motivated to protect and maintain their self-esteem, as mentioned above, the latter reaction is likely. Thus, aggressive behavior, as an act of self-affirmation (see also Steele, 1988), is a common reaction to threatened self-esteem. Aggression can be directed against the perpetrator (path c in Figure 11.1). With acts of revenge, people try to restore justice (Bies, Tripp, and Kramer, 1997; Jones, 2009) and to discourage further unethical behavior, whether from the perpetrator or from third parties who should learn that such behavior may not be tolerated (Tedeschi and Felson, 1994).

However, aggression against the perpetrator is an option only if no further punishment is expected (e.g., Aquino, Tripp, and Bies, 2001). The perpetrator may be too powerful or not available. Since anger is associated with a general tendency toward being aggressive (Berkowitz, 2003; Haidt, 2003), aggression may be displaced against others, such as coworkers, who were not involved in the original unethical behavior (path d in Figure 11.1) or family members (path e in Figure 11.1) (Marcus-Newhall et al., 2000; Miller et al., 2003). Previous research indicates that experienced unethical behavior by the supervisor may cause unethical behavior toward family members. For example, Hoobler and Brass (2006) showed that abusive supervision (reported by the employee) is positively related to undermining behavior against family members (reported by the spouse). In two studies, Restubog, Scott, and Zagencyzk (2011) showed that this relationship might be mediated by the employee's level of distress. Thus, the experience of unethical behavior can cause strain, and particularly anger, which can trigger unethical behavior toward third parties.

However, unethical behavior against third parties does not have to be driven by a conscious decision to harm; it may also be driven by an impaired capacity to control one's impulses, including impulses to behave in an aggressive, inconsiderate, or selfish way. Unethical behavior represents behavior that breaches norms of mutual respect. Following norms often requires self-control, which depends on a limited energy resource (see Muraven and Baumeister, 2000). This resource determines how successfully one can regulate one's behavior, but also becomes depleted by self-control acts. The experience of unethical behavior is assumed to deplete self-control capacities. According to Baumeister, Vohs, and Tice (2007), dealing with difficult people, including being kind in response to others' bad behavior and managing negative emotions, requires self-control resources. If this self-control breaks down, individuals tend to act in a more selfish, impulsive, or antisocial way (see Baumeister and Exline, 1999). Consistent with these assumptions, experimental lab studies (e.g., DeBono, Shmueli, and Muraven, 2010; Gino et al., 2011) as well as a field study in the work context (Barnes et al., 2011) found that individuals show more unethical behavior when their self-control resources have been depleted.

However, the indirect effects of being treated in an unethical way are not confined to showing unethical behavior toward others; they can also induce a general reduction of the quality of social interactions. The fact that a person is stressed and in a bad mood may influence what is attended to, and it may color perceptions and appraisals of events in a negative way (Forgas, 2002; Frijda, 2009). Such a mood-congruent appraisal may instigate behaviors that are less friendly, considerate, and supportive than the person's normal behaviors; the person may not show unethical behavior, yet deprive others of prosocial behavior or positive feedback, which can still imply harm to others and to social relationships. Furthermore, the person might appraise more negatively the behavior of others that might constitute a norm violation—for instance, by being more prone to attribute intent rather than clumsiness or mindlessness; or by interpreting negative feedback as an attack on oneself; as a consequence, he or she might feel hurt, or provoked, more easily. A person may even interpret a positive behavior negatively, as when a smile is interpreted as an arrogant grin (Forgas, Bower, and Krantz, 1984) and, in line with this appraisal, react negatively.

In sum, the experience of unethical behavior may trigger further unethical behavior that is targeted against the perpetrator or against others such as coworkers or family members who were not involved in the original unethical behavior. The experience of stress—including feelings of anger and depleted self-regulatory resources—caused by a threat to self-esteem plays an important role in how the experience of unethical behavior leads to further unethical behavior. Furthermore, it may color appraisal of events and behaviors in a negative way and reduce the quality of social interactions in general.

In terms of the SOS model, such reactions are triggered by stress as disrespect. At the same time, they entail the danger of stress through insufficiency. If we realize that we are hurting in-

nocent others by acting unethically, we are likely to blame ourselves, which is the core of the SIN facet of SOS. Such blame may be in terms of moral categories (“I am punishing an innocent”), or in terms of competence (“I am not able to show the politeness and respect toward others that I usually do”).

Witnessing Unethical Behavior

Unethical behavior may affect third parties (e.g., coworkers) who merely witness it (path *f* in Figure 11.1). Experimental studies show that the observation of injustice against others causes negative affect (De Cremer and van Hiel, 2006). Moreover, work group (Lim, Cortina, and Magley, 2008) and organizational (Griffin, 2010) incivility is related to impaired well-being over and above personal incivility and general job stress. Furthermore, research on the so-called survivor effect has shown that downsizing associated with perceived unfairness in dismissing employees may be stressful for the “survivors,” inducing insecurity, mistrust, cynicism, and guilt in them (Appelbaum et al., 1997; Appelbaum and Donia, 2000; Brockner, 1988; Brockner et al., 1994). Thus, not only unethical behavior directed against an employee him- or herself (see above) but also witnessing unethical behavior against coworkers seems to impact well-being. Several theoretical explanations for such an effect are plausible.

First, the moral virtue model assumes that people care about justice because they have a basic respect for human dignity and worth (e.g., Cropanzano et al., 2001; Folger, 1998). Proposing that justice is beyond personal interest and that it affirms people’s identity and positive self-view within valued groups (relational model; Tyler and Lind, 1992), this model complements previous fairness theories assuming that people concern themselves with justice because it is in their economic interest (instrumental model; Thibaut and Walker, 1975). According to Williams (1997), human beings have at least four psychological needs, namely, control, belonging, self-esteem, and finding meaning in their lives. Moral purpose is one manifestation of the search for meaning (Becker, 1973; see also Cropanzano et al., 2001). Cropanzano et al. (2001) mapped these four needs onto the three models of justice: Control is integrated in the instrumental model, belonging and self-esteem in the relational model, and meaningful existence in the moral virtue model. Thus, experienced injustice is a threat to several basic needs, including meaningful existence, and hence stressful, even if the person only observes injustice without being directly affected by it.

Second, observers of unethical behavior may fear becoming victims as well in the future. Thus, fear of being laid off oneself is considered part of the “survivor syndrome” (Appelbaum et al., 1997; Appelbaum and Donia, 2000). Fear also plays an important role in how experienced violence causes negative outcomes in the long run (Barling, 1996). A recent study by Mueller and Tschan (2011) showed that the relationship between experienced workplace violence and well-being was mediated by the fear of future violence. More specifically, the experience of violence was related to the perceived likelihood of future violence, which, in turn, was linked to fear of future violence, and the fear of future violence was directly related to impaired well-being. Thus, observing unethical behavior in the workplace may increase the perception of the probability of becoming a victim in the future, which triggers fear and impairs well-being.

Third, a person’s affective experience has an impact on the affective experience of other individuals and the work group (see Kelly and Barsade, 2001). Both laboratory (e.g., Barsade, 2000, cited in Kelly and Barsade, 2001) and field studies (Totterdell et al., 1998, 2004) indicate that the moods and emotions of one person may be transferred to nearby others (i.e., emotional

contagion). One mechanism that has been proposed as an explanation of this phenomenon is that people automatically mimic and synchronize manifestations of emotional behavior such as facial expression and the postures of others (see Hatfield, Cacioppo, and Rapson, 1994), which then shapes their emotional states (e.g., Strack, Martin, and Stepper, 1988). Another possible mechanism refers to empathy with the victim (De Waal, 2008). Thus, the negative affective state of a victim of unethical behavior may spread to other employees; however, it may also spill over into private life and affect family members (cross-over; cf. Allen et al., 2000; Amstad and Semmer, 2009; Bakker and Demerouti, 2009; Bakker, Westman, and Van Emmerik, 2009; cf. also the remarks concerning the impact on the quality of social interactions above; these can also be triggered by observing unethical behavior).

Finally, those who have witnessed unethical behavior may model similar unethical behavior in their interactions with the target, the instigator, or other organizational members (Andersson and Pearson, 1999; path *g* in Figure 11.1). The observation may change norms for respect and negatively affect the organizational (violence) climate. It is important to note that a bad climate is related to impaired well-being (Kessler et al., 2008).

In contrast to being the target of unethical behavior, which indicates stress as disrespect, and in contrast to a victim's turning into a perpetrator, which may induce stress through insufficiency, the stress induced by witnessing unethical behavior is not readily explained by the SOS model but constitutes a path in its own right. With regard to the last mechanism mentioned, however, SOS is pertinent again: If one starts modeling unethical behavior oneself, stress through insufficiency may result if one realizes what one is doing ("How could I ever lower my standards to such an extent?"). Furthermore, someone who is witnessing unethical behavior has to decide about how to react. Not reporting a theft, for instance, may induce guilt and constitute an offense to self in terms of personal insufficiency. Guilt is even more likely if one witnesses unethical behavior toward a third person but does not intervene to support the victim (cf. the research on "bystander apathy"; Darley and Latané, 1968; Latané and Nida, 1981).

FUTURE RESEARCH

In the following section we present some avenues for future research. First, different types of unethical behavior and their relationship with well-being have already been examined. But, as outlined above, perceived pressure to perform in an unethical way has not been investigated in detail, although it is reasonable to assume that this type of person–role conflict is stressful and—at least in certain types of jobs—not uncommon. Second, individuals differ in how they interpret and react to stressful work situations (see Semmer and Meier, 2009; Spector, 2003), and future research should examine which individuals react particularly strongly to unethical behavior. One might consider the usual suspects such as neuroticism and negative affectivity; however, we suggest focusing on personality variables that are more directly linked to the core of the stressful experience of unethical behavior. For example, as we assume that unethical behavior is often a threat to self-esteem, people with fragile self-esteem may react particularly strongly to unethical behavior (e.g., Meier, Semmer, and Hupfeld, 2009). Third, specific emotional reactions to unethical behavior deserve a stronger research focus; this includes reactions such as feeling deprecatd by unethical behavior, feeling guilty about overacting either toward the source of the unethical behavior or toward others, and it may include feelings of guilt after conforming to pressure to perform in an unethical way. Furthermore, feelings of guilt as a result of not supporting others who are being treated in an unethical way are worth investigating, as are emotional reactions to not having reported unethical behavior (e.g., a theft).

CONCLUSION

Exposure to unethical behavior can be considered a stressor that can negatively affect both the psychological and physical well-being of the direct target in the short and long run. Many forms of unethical behavior signal disrespect and rejection and therefore represent a threat to one's positive self-view and social standing. As people strive for a positive self-view and have a strong need to be accepted by others (Baumeister and Leary, 1995; Sedikides and Strube, 1997), being the target of unethical behavior should be particularly stressful (see also the SOS perspective by Semmer et al., 2007). Furthermore, witnessing unethical behavior can induce stress in observers, and the decisions they have to make in that situation (reporting or not; supporting a victim or not) may not only involve considerable stress during the situation but also imply the risk of regret and guilt in the aftermath.

Moreover, unethical behavior also negatively affects the well-being of third parties such as coworkers and spouses, because the victim becomes a perpetrator of unethical behavior that is displaced to more available targets, both at work and in private life (i.e., crossover). In addition, being a victim or witness of unethical behavior may lower the quality of social interactions in general. Thus, the experience of unethical behavior can start a vicious circle that causes harm beyond the original target. Organizations and supervisors are therefore urged to reduce the amount of unethical behavior at the workplace. On the one hand, they should be concerned with their own behavior (e.g., abusive supervision; inducing person–role conflict by communicating expectations to behave in an unethical way); on the other hand, they should try to prevent unethical behavior by their employees (e.g., bullying). It is important to note that unethical behavior among employees may often not be immediately visible for supervisors, as employees often hide bad news from supervisors (Tourish and Robson, 2006). In a similar way, employees may not communicate to supervisors that they perceive their behavior as unethical. Supervisors therefore have to actively seek information and feedback about possible unethical behavior by themselves and their employees. Establishing a system of protecting whistle-blowers also seems important. Accusations should be taken seriously yet not at face value, lest inaccurate accusations cause stress in the accused. By demonstrating normatively appropriate conduct and promoting such conduct to followers (i.e., ethical leadership; Brown, Treviño, and Harrison, 2005), supervisors can positively affect the work environment, which can then reduce various forms of unethical behavior (e.g., Hauge, Skogstad, and Einarsen, 2007, 2009; Stouten et al., 2010). In the end, such efforts are likely to result in less stress and better well-being.

NOTE

1. This should be true for unethical behavior that is directed against the focal person such as discrimination. Based on the notion that maintaining a positive self-evaluation and a positive evaluation by others are strong motives, we assume that this type of unethical behavior is particularly stressful. Witnessing unethical behavior toward others (e.g., bullying of coworkers), the organization (e.g., theft), or larger units (e.g., society or nature, such as in terms of, environmental irresponsibility) may also be stressful but mainly for reasons other than a threat to self-esteem. As outlined in more detail later, possible reasons are moral outrage, fear of becoming a victim in the future, and emotional contagion.

REFERENCES

Allen, T.D.; Herst, D.E.L.; Bruck, C.S.; and Sutton, M. 2000. Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, 278–308.

- Amstad, F.T., and Semmer, N.K. 2009. Recovery and the work-family interface. In *Research in Occupational Stress and Well-Being*, vol. 7: *Current Perspectives on Job-Stress Recovery*, ed. P.L. Perrewé, D.C. Ganster, and S. Sonnentag, 125–166. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group.
- Andersson, L., and Pearson, C. 1999. Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 452–471.
- Aquino, K.; Tripp, T.M.; and Bies, R.J. 2001. How employees respond to personal offense: The effects of blame attribution, victim status, and offender status on revenge and reconciliation in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 52–59.
- Appelbaum, S.H., and Donia, M. 2000. The realistic downsizing preview: A management intervention in the prevention of survivor syndrome (Part I). *Career Development International*, 2, 278–286.
- Appelbaum, S.H.; Delage, C.; Labib, N.; and Gault, G. 1997. The survivor syndrome: Aftermath of downsizing. *Career Development International*, 2, 333–350.
- Bakker, A.B., and Demerouti, E. 2009. The crossover of work engagement between working couples: A closer look at the role of empathy. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24, 220–236.
- Bakker, A.B.; Westman, M.; and Van Emmerik, I.J.H. 2009. Advances in crossover theory. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24, 206–219.
- Barling, J. 1996. The prediction, experience, and consequences of workplace violence. In *Violence on the Job: Identifying Risks and Developing Solutions*, ed. G.R. VandenBos and E.Q. Bulatao, 29–49. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Barnes, C.M.; Schaubroeck, J.; Huth, M.; and Ghumman, S. 2011. Lack of sleep and unethical conduct. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 115, 169–180.
- Baumeister, R.F., and Exline, J. 1999. Virtue, personality, and social relations: Self-control as the moral muscle. *Journal of Personality*, 67, 1165–1194.
- Baumeister, R.F., and Leary, M.R. 1995. The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497–529.
- Baumeister, R.F.; Smart, L.; and Boden, J.M. 1996. Relation of threatened egotism to violence and aggression: The dark side of high self-esteem. *Psychological Review*, 103, 5–33.
- Baumeister, R.F.; Vohs, K.; and Tice, D. 2007. The strength model of self-control. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16, 351–355.
- Becker, E. 1973. *The Denial of Death*. New York: The Free Press.
- Beehr, T.A., and Glazer, S. 2005. Organizational role stress. In *Handbook of Work Stress*, ed. J. Barling, E.K. Kelloway, and M.R. Frone, 7–33. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Berkowitz, L. 2003. Affect, aggression, and antisocial behavior. In *Handbook of Affective Sciences*, ed. R.J. Davidson, K.R. Scherer, and H.H. Goldsmith, 804–823. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Berset, M.; Semmer, N.K.; Elfering, A.; Jacobshagen, N.; and Meier, L. 2011. Does stress at work make you gain weight? A two-year longitudinal study. *Scandinavian Journal of Work and Environmental Health*, 37, 45–53.
- Bies, R.J.; Tripp, T.M.; and Kramer, R.M. 1997. At the breaking point: Cognitive and social dynamics of revenge in organizations. In *Antisocial Behavior in Organizations*, ed. R.A. Giacalone and J. Greenberg, 18–36. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Blackhart, G.C.; Nelson, B.C.; Knowles, M.L.; and Baumeister, R.F. 2009. Rejection elicits emotional reactions but neither causes immediate distress nor lowers self-esteem: A meta-analytic review of 192 studies on social exclusion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 13, 269–309.
- Bolger, N.; DeLongis, A.; Kessler, R.C.; and Schilling, A. 1989. Effects of daily stress on negative mood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 808–818.
- Bowling, N.A., and Beehr, T.A. 2006. Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: A theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 998–1012.
- Brockner, J. 1988. The effects of work layoffs on survivors: Research, theory and practice. In *Research in Organizational Behavior*, vol. 10, ed. B.M. Staw and L.L. Cummings, 213–255.
- Brockner, J.; Konovsky, M.; Cooper-Schneider, R.; Folger, R.; Martin, C.; and Bies, R.J. 1994. Interactive effects of procedural justice and outcome negativity on victims and survivors of job loss. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 397–409.
- Brown, M.E.; Treviño, L.K.; and Harrison, D.A. 2005. Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97, 117–134.
- Crocker, J., and Park, L.E. 2004. The costly pursuit of self-esteem. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 392–414.

- Cropanzano, R.; Byrne, Z.S.; Bobocel, D.R.; and Rupp, D.E. 2001. Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities, and other denizens of organizational justice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 164–209.
- Darley, J.M., and Latané, B. 1968. Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8, 377–383.
- De Cremer, D., and van Hiel, A. 2006. Effects of another person's fair treatment on one's own emotions and behaviors: The moderating role of how much the other cares for you. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 100, 231–249.
- DeBono, A.; Shmueli, D.; and Muraven, M. 2010. Rude and inappropriate: The role of self-control in following social norms. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37, 136–146.
- De Waal, F.B.M. 2008. Putting the altruism back into altruism: The evolution of empathy. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59, 297–300.
- Dormann, C., and Zapf, D. 1999. Social support, social stressors at work, and depressive symptoms: Testing for main and moderating effects with structural equations in a three-wave longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 874–884.
- Duffy, M.K.; Ganster, D.C.; and Pagon, M. 2002. Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 2, 331–351.
- Einarsen, S.E.; Hoel, H.; Zapf, D.; and Cooper, C.L. 2010. The concept of bullying at work: The European tradition. In *Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace: Developments in Theory, Research, and Practice*, 2d ed., ed. S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, and C.L. Cooper, 3–39. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Finne, L.B.; Knardahl, S.; and Lau, B. 2011. Workplace bullying and mental distress: A prospective study of Norwegian employees. *Scandinavian Journal of Work and Environmental Health*, 37, 276–286.
- Fitzgerald, L.F.; Drasgow, F.; Hulin, C.L.; Gelfand, J.J.; and Magley, V.J. 1997. Antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations: A test of an integrated model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 578–589.
- Folger, R. 1998. Fairness as a moral virtue. In *Managerial Ethics: Moral Management of People and Processes*, ed. M. Schminke, 13–34. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Forgas, J. P. 2002. Feeling and doing: Affective influences on interpersonal behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13, 1–28.
- Forgas, J.P.; Bower, G.H.; and Krantz, S. 1984. The influence of mood on perceptions of social interactions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 20, 497–513.
- Frijda, N.H. 2009. Mood. In *The Oxford Companion to Emotion and the Affective Sciences*, ed. D. Sander and K.R. Scherer, 258–259. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Frone, M.R. 2000. Interpersonal conflict at work and psychological outcomes: Testing a model among young workers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, 246–255.
- Gino, F.; Schweitzer, M.E.; Mead, N.L.; and Ariely, D. 2011. Unable to resist temptation: How self-control depletion promotes unethical behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 115, 191–203.
- Greenberg, J. 2004. Stress fairness to fare no stress: Managing workplace stress by promoting organizational justice. *Organizational Dynamics*, 33, 352–365.
- Griffin, B. 2010. Multilevel relationships between organizational-level incivility, justice and intention to stay. *Work and Stress*, 24, 309–323.
- Haidt, J. 2003. The moral emotions. In *Handbook of Affective Sciences*, ed. R.J. Davidson, K.R. Scherer, and H.H. Goldsmith, 852–870. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hatfield, E.; Cacioppo, J.; and Rapson, R.L. 1994. *Emotional Contagion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hauge, L.J.; Skogstad, A.; and Einarsen, S. 2007. Relationships between stressful work environments and bullying: Results of a large representative study. *Work and Stress*, 21, 220–242.
- . 2009. Individual and situational predictors of workplace bullying: Why do perpetrators engage in the bullying of others? *Work and Stress*, 23, 349–358.
- Hershcovis, M.S., and Barling, J. 2009. Towards a multi-foci approach to workplace aggression: A meta-analytic review of outcomes from different perpetrators. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 24–44.
- Hoobler, J.M., and Brass, D.J. 2006. Abusive supervision and family undermining as displaced aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 1125–1133.
- Ilies, R.; Johnson, M.; and Judge, T. 2011. A within-individual study of interpersonal conflict as a work stressor: Dispositional and situational moderators. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32, 44–64.
- Jex, S.M., and Elacqua, T.C. 2004. Self-esteem as a moderator: A comparison of global and organization-based measures. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 71–81.

- Jones, D.A. 2009. Getting even with one's supervisor and one's organization: Relationships among types of injustice, desires for revenge, and counterproductive work behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 525–542.
- Kahn, R.L.; Wolfe, D.M.; Quinn, R.P.; Snoek, J.D.; and Rosenthal, R.A. 1964. *Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity*. New York: Wiley.
- Karasek, R.A., and Theorell, T. 1990. *Healthy Work. Stress, Productivity, and the Reconstruction of Working Life Practice*. 2d ed. New York: Basic Books.
- Katz, D., and Kahn, R.L. 1978. *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Keashly, L., and Harvey, S. 2005. Emotional abuse in the workplace. In *Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets*, ed. S. Fox and P.E. Spector, 201–236. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Kelly, J.R., and Barsade, S.G. 2001. Mood and emotions in small groups and work teams. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86, 99–130.
- Kessler, S.R.; Spector, P.E.; Chang, C.-H.; and Parr, A.D. 2008. Organizational violence and aggression: Development of the three-factor Violence Climate Survey. *Work and Stress*, 22, 108–124.
- Kivimäki, M.; Virtanen, M.; Vartiainen, M.; Elovainio, M.; Vahtera, J.; and Keltikangas-Jarvinen, L. 2003. Workplace bullying and the risk of cardiovascular disease and depression. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 60, 779–783.
- Kivimäki, M.; Virtanen, M.; Elovainio, M.; Kuoronen, A.; Väänänen, A.; and Vahtera, J. 2006. Work stress in the etiology of coronary heart disease: A meta-analysis. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment and Health*, 32, 431–442.
- Latané, B., and Nida, S. 1981. Ten years of research on group size and helping. *Psychological Bulletin*, 89, 308–324.
- Lazarus, R.S. 1999. *Stress and Emotion*. London: Free Association Books.
- Leary, M.R., and Baumeister R.F. 2000. The nature and function of self-esteem: Sociometer theory. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 32, 1–62.
- Lim, S.; Cortina, L.M.; and Magley, V.J. 2008. Personal and workgroup incivility: Impact on work and health outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 95–107.
- Marcus-Newhall, A.; Pedersen, W.C.; Carlson, M.; and Miller, N. 2000. Displaced aggression is alive and well: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 670–689.
- Meier, L.L.; Semmer, N.K.; and Hupfeld, J. 2009. The impact of unfair treatment on depressive mood: The moderating role of self-esteem level and self-esteem instability. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35, 643–655.
- Meier, L.L.; Gross, S.; Spector, P.E.; and Semmer, N.K. 2011. Conflicts at work and well-being: Reciprocal short-term effects. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Miller, N.; Pedersen, W.; Earleywine, M.; and Pollock, V.E. 2003. A theoretical model of triggered displaced aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7, 75–97.
- Mueller, S., and Tschan, F. 2011. Consequences of client-initiated workplace violence: The role of fear and perceived prevention. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16, 217–229.
- Muraven, M., and Baumeister, R.F. 2000. Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources: Does self-control resemble a muscle. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 247–259.
- Penhaligon, N.L.; Louis, W.R.; and Restubog, S.L.D. 2009. Emotional anguish at work: The mediating role of perceived rejection on workgroup mistreatment and affective outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14, 34–45.
- Restubog, S.L.D.; Scott, K.L.; and Zagenczyk, T.J. 2011. When distress hits home: The role of contextual factors and psychological distress in predicting employees' responses to abusive supervision. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 4, 713–729.
- Sedikides, C., and Strube, M.J. 1997. Self-evaluation: To thine own self be good, to thine own self be sure, to thine own self be true, and to thine own self be better. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 29, ed. M.P. Zanna, 209–269. New York: Academic Press.
- Semmer, N.K., and Meier, L.L. 2009. Individual differences, work stress and health. In *Handbook of Work and Health Psychology*, 3d ed., ed. M.J. Schabracq, J.A. Winnubst, and C.L. Cooper, 99–122. Chichester: Wiley.
- Semmer, N.K.; McGrath, J.E.; and Beehr, T.A. 2005. Conceptual issues in research on stress and health. In *Handbook of Stress and Health*, 2d ed., ed. C.L. Cooper, 1–43. New York: CRC Press.
- Semmer, N.K.; Jacobshagen, N.; Meier, L.L.; and Elfering, A. 2007. Occupational stress research: The “Stress-as-Offense-to-Self” perspective. In *Occupational Health Psychology: European Perspectives on*

- Research, Education and Practice*, vol. 2, ed. J. Houdmont and S. McIntyre, 43–60. Castelo da Maia, Portugal: ISMAI.
- Spector, P.E. 2003. Individual differences in health and well-being in organizations. In *Health and Safety in Organizations: A Multilevel Perspective*, ed. D.A. Hofmann, and L.E. Tetrick, 29–55. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Spector, P.E., and Jex, S.M. 1998. Development of four self-report measures of job stressors and strain: Interpersonal conflict at work scale, organizational constraints scale, quantitative workload inventory, and physical symptoms inventory. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3, 356–367.
- Steele, C.M. 1988. The psychology of self-affirmation: Sustaining the integrity of the self. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 21, ed. L. Berkowitz, 261–302. New York: Academic Press.
- Stouten, J.; Baillien, E.; van den Broeck, A.; Camps, J.; de Witte, H.; and Euwema, M. 2010. Discouraging bullying: The role of ethical leadership and its effects on the work environment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95, 17–27.
- Strack, F.; Martin, L.L.; and Stepper, S. 1988. Inhibiting and facilitating conditions of the human smile: A nonobtrusive test of the facial feedback hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 768–776.
- Tedeschi, J.T., and Felson, R.B. 1994. *Violence, Aggression, and Coercive Actions*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Tepper, B.J. 2007. Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 33, 261–289.
- Thibaut, J., and Walker, L. 1975. *Procedural Justice: a Psychological Analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Totterdell, P.; Kellett, S.; Teuchmann, K.; and Briner, R.B. 1998. Evidence of mood linkage in work groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1504–1515.
- Totterdell, P.; Wall, T.; Holman, D.; Diamond, H.; and Epitropaki, O. 2004. Affect networks: A structural analysis of the relationship between work ties and job-related affect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 854–867.
- Tourish, D., and Robson, P. 2006. Sensemaking and the distortion of critical upward communication in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43, 711–730.
- Tyler, T.R., and Lind, E.A. 1992. A relational model of authority in groups. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 25, ed. M. Zanna, 115–191. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Williams, K.D. 1997. Social ostracism. In *Aversive Interpersonal Behaviors*, ed. R.M. Kowalski, 133–170. New York: Plenum Press.
- Ylipaavalniemi, J.; Kivimäki, M.; Elovainio, M.; Virtanen, M.; Keltikangas-Järvinen, L.; and Vahtera, J. 2005. Psychosocial work characteristics and incidence of newly diagnosed depression: A prospective cohort study of three different models. *Social Science and Medicine*, 61, 111–122.