ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR:
Affect in the Workplace

Arthur P. Brief[1] and Howard M. Weiss[2]

[1]*A. B. Freeman School of Business and Department of Psychology, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118; e-mail: artbrief@tulane.edu*
[2]*Department of Psychological Sciences, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907; e-mail: weiss@psych.purdue.edu*

Key Words   moods and emotions, job satisfaction, positive and negative affectivity, work environments, job performance

■ **Abstract**   The study of affect in the workplace began and peaked in the 1930s, with the decades that followed up to the 1990s not being particularly fertile. Whereas job satisfaction generally continues to be loosely but not carefully thought of and measured as an affective state, critical work in the 1990s has raised serious questions about the affective status of job satisfaction in terms of its causes as well as its definition and measurement. Recent research has focused on the production of moods and emotions at work, with an emphasis, at least conceptually, on stressful events, leaders, work groups, physical settings, and rewards/punishment. Other recent research has addressed the consequences of workers' feelings, in particular, a variety of performance outcomes (e.g., helping behaviors and creativity). Even though recent interest in affect in the workplace has been intense, many theoretical and methodological opportunities and challenges remain.

CONTENTS

279

INTRODUCTION

The organizations in which people work affect their thoughts, feelings, and actions in the workplace and away from it. Likewise, people's thoughts, feelings, and actions affect the organizations in which they work. Organizational behavior is an area of inquiry concerned with both sorts of influence: work organizations on people and people on work organizations. The slice of the organizational behavior literature this paper addresses has to do with the feelings of workers, how organizations affect them and how they affect organizations. As should become clear in the following section, we choose to focus on the affective dimensions of organizational behavior because, after a lapse of more than half a century, organizational researchers have begun to demonstrate a serious interest in moods and emotions in the workplace.

The remainder of the paper unfolds as follows. First, the study of workers' feelings is placed in a historical context and, thereby, the boundaries of the chapter are delineated further. Second, the affective status of the job satisfaction construct is assessed very briefly. Third, recent literature pertaining to the production of moods and emotions in the workplace is reviewed, followed by a survey of the effects of moods and emotions experienced in the workplace. Finally, conceptual concerns about workers' feelings not adequately addressed in the organizational literature are raised, and suggestions for how to approach these concerns methodologically are provided. Overall, the intents of the paper are to appraise what is known about affective experiences in organizational settings, to highlight existing gaps in the literature, and to suggest how those gaps might be filled.

THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The Rich 1930s and the Leaner Years

The study of affect at work clearly emerged as a scientific research concern in the 1930s, principally in the United States; this likely was made possible by earlier developments that philosophically justified the application of scientific principles to the study of social phenomenon, that supplied the methodological tools necessary to conduct such research, and that created the perceived need for understanding workers' feelings in the minds of those who managed them. Examples of now-classic studies from this period that focused on affect per se or job satisfaction include Fisher & Hanna's (1931) *The Dissatisfied Worker*, Kornhauser & Sharp's (1932) "Employee attitudes; suggestions from a study in a factory," Hersey's (1932) *Workers' Emotions in Shop and Home: A Study of Individual Workers from the Psychological and Physiological Standpoint*, Hoppock's (1935) *Job Satisfaction*, and Roethlisberger & Dickson's (1939) *Management and the Worker*.

The 1930s were exciting times for the study of affect at work, characterized by innovation and discovery as well as a diversity of ideas and methods. For instance, Fisher & Hanna (1931), relying on the findings of a number of case studies, characterized job dissatisfaction as the product of "nonadjustive emotional tendencies" whose associated unrest is misattributed by workers to their job situations. Kornhauser & Sharp (1932) conducted an attitude survey of Kimberly Clark employees, supplemented by interviews, and concluded that "efficiency ratings of employees showed no relationship to their attitudes" (p. 402). Hersey (1932), using a repeated measures design with a small group of skilled workers, observed, among many other things, a clear relationship between daily affect levels and daily performance levels as well as considerable influence of workers' emotional lives at home on their work behaviors. Hoppock (1935), using surveys and interviews of workers in one community (New Hope, Pennsylvania) and in one occupation (teachers), in part found elements of the work environment (e.g., supervision), family expectations, and "emotional maladjustment," all to influence job satisfaction. Roethlisberger & Dickson (1939), based upon a series of studies using a variety of methods in the Hawthorne plant of AT&T's Western Electric division, concluded, for instance, that the workplace's social organization and the individual's interaction with that organization, more than individual differences per se, determined worker adjustment.

The diversity evident in the 1930s soon faded and was replaced by an approach that was conceptually and methodologically narrow. This approach entailed (*a*) construing of affect at work almost exclusively in terms of job satisfaction; (*b*) measuring constructs of interest with structured questionnaires, largely ignoring, for instance, more clinical or qualitative methods; (*c*) focusing on empirical observables to such an extent that adequate attention to theory building too often was excluded; and (*d*) examining the facets of the work environment as causes of job

satisfaction while generally neglecting dispositional and extra-work factors such as family and economic circumstances.

Whereas one could speculate on the causes of this narrowing [e.g., the reliance on questionnaires may have been attributable to developments in the measurement of attitudes, and the almost exclusive concern with work environment causes of job satisfaction might have been due to the desire of industrial psychologists to aid management in controlling the workplace (Baritz 1960)], here we address only the results of the narrowing (for more details on the 1930s, see Weiss & Brief 2002). For almost the next half century one workplace event, condition, or outcome after another was correlated with pencil-and-paper measures of job satisfaction, typically not guided by a well-articulated theoretical frame of reference, yielding well in excess of 10,000 studies (Spector 1996)! We will review that literature here; for such reviews see, for example, Locke (1976) and Spector (1997). In the next section, however, we do take a brief look at job satisfaction but only through an affective lens, considering recent approaches that recognize that job satisfaction does not equal affect.

The Hot 1990s

In the mid-1980s and the 1990s, organizational researchers rediscovered affect, expressing interest in both moods and emotions. Here, "moods" are considered to be generalized feeling states that are not typically identified with a particular stimulus and not sufficiently intense to interrupt ongoing thought processes (e.g., Clark & Isen 1982, Thayer 1989); alternatively, "emotions" normally are associated with specific events or occurrences and are intense enough to disrupt thought processes (e.g., Frijda 1993, Simon 1982; for a review of the emotions literature, see Zajonc 1998). Moreover, whereas moods often [but not always (e.g., Russell & Barrett 1999)] are described in terms of their underlying dimensions (e.g., positive and negative) (e.g., Watson 2000), emotions tend to be treated in their discrete forms (e.g., anger, fear, and joy) (e.g., Plutchik 1994). This review focuses on research in organizations on such moods and emotions. Why such research re-emerged as an area of inquiry in organizational behavior is not known, but it likely had a lot to do with the seemingly intense interests moods and emotions were (and are) attracting generally in psychology (e.g., the American Psychological Association launched a new journal, *Emotion*, in 2001). Whatever the cause, there now exists a contemporary literature concerned with affective experiences in organizational settings, to which we now turn.

THE AFFECTIVE STATUS OF JOB SATISFACTION

Definitional Concerns

In 1976, Locke advanced what came to be a highly influential definition of job satisfaction. He defined it as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting

from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (p. 1300). Thus, job satisfaction came to be considered an affective reaction to one's job. Almost a decade later Organ & Near (1985) recognized that job satisfaction has a cognitive as well as an affective dimension and questioned the extent to which commonly used measures of the construct capture both (also see Pekrun & Frese 1992, Sandelands 1988). Brief & Roberson (1989) empirically explored the affective and cognitive content of three commonly used measures of job satisfaction. They observed that only the Faces scale (Kunin 1955) captured the affective and cognitive components about equally and that the other two highly popular measures investigated mostly tapped the cognitive components. Thus, Brief & Roberson discovered a paradox that remains troublesome today: Job satisfaction generally is construed in affective terms, but typically only its cognitive aspects are measured (also see Porac 1987).

Progress towards a more balanced treatment of job satisfaction, at least conceptually, was made during the 1990s. Motowidlo (1996) defined self-reports of job satisfaction as "*judgments* about the *favorability* of the *work environment*" (p. 176) (also see Pratkanis & Turner 1994). Consistently, but more explicitly, adopting a construal of job satisfaction as an attitude, Weiss (2002) defined it as "a positive (or negative) evaluative judgment one makes about one's job or job situation" (p. 6). Perhaps most closely aligned with the attitude construct is Brief's (1998) definition. Based on Eagly & Chaiken's (1993) assertion that an attitude is "*a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor* or *disfavor*," with "evaluating" referring to "all classes of evaluative responding, whether overt or covert, cognitive, affective, or behavioral" (p. 1), he defined job satisfaction as "*an internal state that is expressed by affectively and/or cognitively evaluating an experienced job with some degree of favor or disfavor*" (p. 86). Brief, like Bagozzi & Burnkrant (1979), as well as others, excluded evaluative responses of the behavioral type because they often are treated as dependent effects of the attitude.

The distinction between job satisfaction as an evaluative judgment and as an attitude with affective as well as cognitive components is not trivial. For example, Weiss (2002, Weiss & Cropanzano 1996) asserted that affective experiences on the job are a cause of job satisfaction (construed as an evaluative judgment); Weiss et al. (1999a) have demonstrated empirically this is so (also see Fisher 2000, Kelloway et al. 1993). It also has been asserted that self-reported affect at work [for example, as gauged by Burke and associates' (1989) Job Affect Scale] is an indicator of the affective component of job satisfaction; Moorman (1993), consistent with the reasoning for instance of Millar & Tesser (1986), has shown that so-called affective- and cognitive-based measures of job satisfaction differentially predict the same criterion. He found a cognitive-based measure to predict "organizational citizenship behaviors" (e.g., Organ 1988) better than an affective-based measure of job satisfaction. Thus, it appears that job satisfaction may be approached productively in at least two ways: (*a*) If job satisfaction is taken as an evaluative judgment, then affect at work can be seen as an antecedent to it, and (*b*) if job satisfaction is taken to have an affective component, then affect at work

can be seen to be an indicator of it. Researchers, in the future, should recognize explicitly that these approaches, while distinctive, may not be in conflict (i.e., moods and emotions experienced on the job may be both a cause of job attitudes and an indicator of them) and that each has its own merits.

Regarding the merits of the "affect as a cause approach," for example as advanced in affective events theory (Weiss & Cropanzano 1996), it draws much needed attention to streams of events that can unfold in workplaces and that generate emotional reactions or mood changes. Regarding the merits of the "affect as indicator approach," it, for example, encourages one to consider the components of job satisfaction and how they might be related to consequent behaviors that may be more affectively than cognitively driven or vice versa. Either approach indicates that job satisfaction's affective status was elevated in such a way during the 1990s that it no longer should be acceptable to define job satisfaction one way (affectively) and blindly measure it another (cognitively).

Dispositional Influences

Another way the affective status of job satisfaction has been elevated in recent years is by the recognition that it is influenced by "affective dispositions" (e.g., Judge 1992) or, more precisely, by personality traits that have been labeled temperaments (Watson 2000). These traits are neuroticism [or negative affectivity (NA)] and extraversion [or positive affectivity (PA)], both components of the five-factor model of personality (e.g., Watson & Clark 1992), with individuals high in the former prone to experience a diverse array of negative mood states (e.g., anxiety, depression, hostility, and guilt) and individuals high in the latter prone to describe themselves as cheerful, enthusiastic, confident, active, and energetic. Organizational interest in these traits stems from Staw and associates' (1986) attention-grabbing demonstration that affective disposition gauged when participants were 15 to 18 years of age correlated significantly ($r = 0.35\ p \le 0.01$) with a measure of job satisfaction taken when the participants ranged from about 54 to 62 years of age. Although Staw et al.'s results and dispositional interpretations have not gone uncriticized (e.g., Davis-Blake & Pfeffer 1996, Williams et al. 1996), detected relationships between negative and/or positive affectivity and job satisfaction now are commonplace in the literature (e.g., Agho et al. 1992; Cropanzano et al. 1993; Necowitz & Roznowski 1994; Schaubroeck et al. 1992, 1998; Watson & Slack 1993). Various explanations for these empirical observations have been advanced (Arvey et al. 1991, House et al. 1996, Judge 1992); recent examples of these are presented below.

Following the lead of Schmitt & Bedeian (1982), Watson & Slack (1993), reasoned that job satisfaction and general temperament mutually influence one another. That is, affective dispositions broadly influence the extent to which people are satisfied with and derive pleasure from their jobs (as well as other aspects of their lives), and because job satisfaction is an important life domain, it may lead to more general life satisfaction and better emotional adjustment (i.e., higher trait

positive affect and lower trait negative affect). To our knowledge, such a reciprocal relationship remains to be tested.

Drawing on the "instrumental" and "temperamental" views described by McCrae & Costa (1991), Brief et al. (1995) reasoned that high NA individuals (*a*) because of their tendency to dwell on failures and shortcomings of themselves and others, may alienate their co-workers and managers, resulting in more negative interpersonal interactions, thus lowering job satisfaction (also see Burke et al. 1993) and (*b*) because they are more sensitive to negative stimuli, may react with more extreme emotion when experiencing negative job events, thus lowering job satisfaction (also see Parkes 1990). Brief et al. also posited that high NA individuals might respond with diminished pleasure when experiencing positive job events. They attributed such a possibility to high NA individuals (*a*) having a higher threshold for positive stimuli, (*b*) having a lower-magnitude positive mood reaction to positive events, and/or (*c*) experiencing the effects of positive mood–inducing events for shorter periods of time than those low in NA. Brief et al., in a field experiment, did observe an interaction between NA and a positive mood induction such that the induction had less of an effect on job satisfaction among individuals high in NA. This observed interaction, however, could have been attributable to any or all of the three underlying mechanisms they posited.

After Weiss & Cropanzano (1996), Weiss et al. (1999a), as noted earlier, hypothesized that global satisfaction judgments are, in part, a function of "true affective experiences at work or 'the preponderance of pleasant affect' over time" (p. 4); they supported this prediction with daily accounts of mood-at-work data. Moreover, Weiss et al. hypothesized and observed that "dispositional happiness" predicts "average state levels of pleasant-unpleasant mood at work over the course of the mood assessment period" (p. 5). Their results are consistent with a personality–mood at work–job satisfaction causal chain. Brief (1998), in his integrated model of job satisfaction, proposed a somewhat different causal chain: personality–interpretations of job circumstances–job satisfaction, with "interpretations" referring "to how a person construes or apprehends the objective circumstances of his or her job" (p. 96). Whereas one could empirically pit one model against the other, it appears more reasonable to consider that temperaments influence job satisfaction through both mood at work and interpretations of job circumstances, recognizing that moods and interpretations are unlikely to be independent.

Shaw et al. (1999) creatively pursued Larsen & Ketalaar's (1989) assertion that PA and NA represent reward-signal sensitivity and punishment-signal sensitivity, respectively. They argued that not all elements of job satisfaction evolve both sensitivities; in particular, pay evokes reward sensitivity only. Moreover, Shaw et al. hypothesized and, to a considerable degree, empirically demonstrated that NA is unrelated to pay satisfaction and that PA is associated with it; additionally, PA interacted with actual salary level to predict some dimensions of pay satisfaction. The form of the interactions, as predicted, indicated that low PA individuals are much more satisfied with high rather than low pay relative to high PA individuals.

Whereas it is clear that temperaments can influence job satisfaction, the processes by which this happens are not yet well understood. It appears that personality operates through multiple channels to affect job satisfaction, and different elements of job satisfaction may be differentially affected by the same affective trait. Whatever mechanisms may be discovered, the affective status of job satisfaction has been elevated merely by the repeated demonstration that affective dispositional traits such as NA and PA (along with environmental stimuli) are associated with job satisfaction.

Summary

In a knee-jerk fashion, job satisfaction generally continues to be loosely but not carefully thought of as an affective reaction and to be measured in ways that have been assumed, largely uncritically for decades, to tap how workers feel. In the 1990s, however, the construct began to be examined closely in affective terms. Moods and emotions experienced at work have been shown to influence job satisfaction. Can these same moods and emotions also be taken as indicators of job satisfaction? Should job satisfaction be construed as an evaluative judgment or as an attitude with affective and cognitive components? Job satisfaction has been shown to be influenced by temperaments. What are the processes that underlie these relationships? Do these processes vary by the focal job element being evaluated (e.g., pay versus job security)? We have seen the beginnings of a change in the way the relationship between affect and job satisfaction is construed. Whether or not it fully materializes depends on how vigorously answers to the sorts of questions posed here are pursued and, more importantly, the extent to which as yet unasked questions about the affective status of job satisfaction are advanced in ways that capture the interests of researchers.

THE PRODUCTION OF MOODS AND EMOTIONS IN THE WORKPLACE

Exogenous Factors

Obviously, the feelings people experience at work may have been produced elsewhere (e.g., marital problems at home may spill over and affect how one feels at work) (e.g., Hersey 1932). Such carryover states, although important for understanding behaviors in organizations, are not of concern here; rather, this section focuses on factors in the workplace that influence the feelings experienced there. Also exogenous to the workplace and, thus, not the focus of attention are two factors worthy of mention, for they have been considered in the organizational literature: (*a*) diurnal and other recurring cycles in feelings over time and (*b*) dispositional influences on affective states.

Cycles in feelings (i.e., moods) can arise from rhythms related to lifestyle, to sociocultural factors, and to biological factors (e.g., Watson 2000). Weiss et al. (1999a) have conducted perhaps the only modern study designed to examine mood

cycles at work. Based upon affective events theory (Weiss & Cropanzano 1996), they expected and observed in a sample of 24 middle managers that mood cycles at work do exist and that individuals differ in their cycles of pleasantness and activation at work. Weiss et al. recognized that "the causes and consequences of these differences remain to be explored," and that more generally, "it is important to emphasize that identifying these cycles is not the same as explaining them" (p. 21).

In the previous sections, we addressed, albeit rather briefly, historical interest in the dispositional basis of affect at work and contemporary concern with dispositional approaches to job satisfaction. Consistent with these observations, we note that, in the 1990s, statistically significant correlations between NA and workplace-experienced depressed mood, anxiety, and other indicators of negative affect were commonplace (e.g., Fortunato et al. 1999, George et al. 1993, Hart et al. 1995, Heinisch & Jex 1997, Schaubroeck et al. 1992, Spector & O'Connell 1994). Typically, these correlations were found in investigations appearing in the job stress literature, in which it is well known that personality plays multiple, influential roles in stress and coping processes whose outcomes often are construed in terms of affect (e.g., George & Brief 2001, Lazarus & Cohen-Charash 2001). George's (1990) demonstration that characteristic levels of the personality traits of PA and NA, within work groups, are positively associated with their corresponding (positive and negative) affective tones. George's (e.g., 1996) work takes affect up to a more aggregate level of analysis with its focus on "group affective tone," which she defines as "consistent or homogenous affective reactions within a group" (p. 78).

Stressful Events/Conditions at Work

Conceptually at least, workplace endogenous factors that produce moods and emotions have been grouped into several not necessarily mutually exclusive categories (e.g., George 1996, George & Brief 1992, Weiss & Cropanzano 1996). Examples of these categories include stressful events (or aversive stimuli), leaders, workgroup characteristics, physical settings, and organizational rewards and punishments. We begin by considering stressful events. The job-related stress literature is massive (with at least one journal, *Work & Stress*, exclusively devoted to the topic), populated by a diversity of theoretical orientations (e.g., Cooper 1998), and too often methodologically muddled (e.g., Hurrell et al. 1998). Because the focus of this chapter is on affect, not job stress per se, we provide examples only of those stress studies that explicitly examined affect. Several studies in the 1990s sought to ascertain if NA is a nuisance in the analysis of job stress because it inflates relationships between self-reports of stressors and strains (e.g., Schaubroeck et al. 1992). These studies, while providing evidence of personality-affect linkages, otherwise have contributed little to understanding the production of moods and emotions at work. The attention focused on NA by job stress researchers may have distracted from efforts aimed at systematically identifying those events/conditions in the workplace associated with negative feelings. It is time to move on.

Signs of the direction of that movement are evident. In an experience sampling study of employed mothers, Williams et al. (1991) observed that self-reported

multiple role juggling (i.e., simultaneously attending to demands of different roles) had immediate negative effects on mood; however, habituation to role juggling occurred when mood was examined over time. Moreover, Williams & Alliger (1994), in an experience sampling study of employed parents, found that unpleasant mood spilled over from family to work but pleasant moods had little spillover. (For a conceptual treatment of juggling and emotions, see Wharton & Erickson 1993.) George et al. (1993) observed that the extent of a nurses' exposure to AIDS patients, as part of the nursing role, is positively associated with negative mood at work and that this relationship is moderated by organizational and social support. Hart et al. (1995), among a sample of police officers, found that self-reports of emotion-focused coping with work events was associated with more negative job experiences, which, in turn, were associated with more negative and less positive affect. The most important negative job experiences were shown to be organizationally related (e.g., dealing with administration and supervision) rather than operationally related (e.g., dealing with victims and danger). Zohar (1999), using pooled-time series analysis on daily records of a sample of military parachute trainers, observed that daily occupational hassle severity, measured independently by an expert, predicted end-of-day negative mood. Teuchmann et al. (1999), using an experience sampling methodology with a small sample of accountants, found self-reported time pressure to be associated with negative mood and that perceived control may alleviate this negative effect.

The above six studies exemplify what we believe to be good and bad about what appears to be emerging in the job stress literature pertaining to moods and emotions. On the positive side, the literature seems to be advancing methodologically, with the increased use of experience sampling resulting in less reliance on cross-sectional designs that make inferences about process hazardous. Substantially, on the positive side, with physically threatening conditions of work (e.g., AIDS) being considered, an interest in the social environment at work as a source of distress is being placed in a more proper perspective; that is, threats to physical well-being are beginning to receive the attention they deserve.

On the negative side, several substantive concerns are evident: Discrete emotions tend not to be the focus of study; economic events/conditions have not taken their appropriate place alongside social and physical factors as potential job stressors; and, consistently, the search for potential job stressors is not guided by a widely accepted theoretical frame of reference or even a small set of competitive theories—rather, each empirical investigation seems to be driven by a somewhat unique theoretical orientation. Thus, the job stress literature has yielded relatively little, in a cumulative sense, toward understanding the production of moods and emotions in the workplace, and without theoretical guidance, it is unlikely to do so.

Leaders

Leaders, in various ways, have been theorized to affect how their followers feel (e.g., George 2000). For example, George (1996), following George & Brief

(1992), asserted, "Leaders who feel excited, enthusiastic, and energetic themselves are likely to similarly energize their followers, as are leaders who feel distressed and hostile likely to negatively activate their followers" (p. 84). This idea clearly is evident in the transformational leadership literature, in which the claim is made that these types of leaders use strong emotions to arouse similar feelings in their audiences (e.g., Conger & Kanungo 1998); others have reasoned that managers can foster and shape the arousal of their subordinates through the use of symbols (e.g., Ashforth & Humphrey 1995). Some recent evidence does support the role of leaders in the production of moods and emotions. Fitness (2000), for instance, observed that what angered people depended upon their organizational position. For lower-power workers (e.g., followers), anger was a product of unjust treatment by higher-power workers (e.g., leaders). If the offenses from above involved humiliation, low-power workers experienced moderate to high levels of hate for offenders. Lewis (2000b), in a laboratory study, found that followers observing a leader expressing anger felt more nervous and less relaxed than followers observing a leader expressing sadness or no emotion. In addition, she found that followers observing a leader expressing sadness felt less enthusiasm and more fatigue then followers observing a leader expressing anger or no emotion. Although results like these are interesting, it is clear that the organizational literature is populated with many more ideas about the leader's role in the production of moods and emotions than it is with relevant data.

Work Group Characteristics

Preliminary research suggests that work groups commonly have consistent or homogeneous affective reactions (e.g., George 1990, 1995; conceptually, also see Barsade & Gibson 1998, Sandelands & St. Clair 1993; for counter-evidence, see Barsade et al. 2000); as was noted above, this "group affective tone" is influenced by characteristic levels of personality traits within groups. These characteristic levels of personality have been theorized to be brought about by member similarity resulting from attraction-selection-attrition processes described by Schneider (1987, George 1990). Beyond personality, a number of other factors have been posited to explain why work group members tend to share moods and emotions (e.g., Bartel & Saavedra 2000, George 1996, George & Brief 1992), for example, (*a*) common socialization experiences and common social influences (Hackman 1992); (*b*) similarity of tasks and high task interdependence (see Gallupe et al. 1991, Heath & Jourden 1997 on group task activity per se); (*c*) membership stability; (*d*) mood regulation norms and rules [see, e.g., the literature on emotional labor (e.g., Sutton 1991)]; and (*d*) after Hatfield et al. (1994), emotional contagion (see Pugh 2001 for a study of emotional contagion from employees to customers).

Regarding these work group characteristics, we again observe that ideas far outstrip data. The following examples of recent studies do demonstrate considerable promise, however. Totterdell et al. (1998) showed, in two studies (with community nurses and accountants), that people's moods are influenced by the collective

mood of their co-workers over time. Moreover, for the nurses, this result was not dependent on common daily hassles, but was, for instance, on age (with a greater association for older nurses) and commitment to teams (with a greater association for more committed nurses). In a follow-up study of two professional cricket teams, Totterdell (2000) found, with pooled time-series analyses, significant associations between the average of teammates' happy moods and the players' own moods. In addition, these results were independent of hassles and favorable standing in the match and, like Totterdell et al., dependent on player age and commitment to the team. Bartel & Saavedra (2000), based upon a study of 70 work groups, found convergence between observers' reports and self-report indicators of eight distinct mood categories, with the weakest relationships detected for mood categories characterized by low arousal. Convergence in members' mood increased with task and social interdependence, membership stability, and mood regulation norms. We hope the research by Bartel & Saavedra and by Totterdell and his colleagues will help provide the impetus for more research on how work group characteristics affect the production of moods and emotions.

Physical Settings

Very little is known about how physical settings, even broadly construed, affect feelings in the workplace. Oldham et al. (1995) used a quasi-experimental design to observe that music improved the mood states of workers and that this effect was stronger for workers performing relatively simple jobs. Also addressing job complexity were Spector & Jex (1991), who observed that incumbent (but not independent) ratings of job characteristics were associated with anxiety and frustration, leading them to urge caution in the use of incumbent self-reports of job characteristics as indicators of actual work environments. This warning seems not to have been heeded by Saavedra & Kwun (2000), who found, in their sample of managers, that self-reports of job characteristics were related to both independent assessments of activated pleasant and unpleasant affect and went on to treat these results as if they entailed job characteristics, by addressing the implications of them for the actual design of managerial work in their discussion.

A few other studies exemplify what can be considered as falling into the physical setting domain. Rafaeli & Sutton (1990), using structured observations of 194 transactions between cashiers and customers in 5 supermarkets, found store busyness to be related negatively to cashiers' displayed positive emotion, and customer demand (i.e., the extent to which a transaction required a prolonged and complex cashier response) to be related positively to displayed positive emotions. Of course, one must question the degree to which such displayed emotions are congruent with those felt. Locke (1996) provides another example of the study of the "emotional labor" (e.g., Hochschild 1983) process, which concerns the production of displayed feelings. During a year-long study in a pediatric department, she observed the interplay between emotions expressed by patients and their families and those expressed by physicians. Locke found that physicians tended to enact comedic

performances in response to families' negative emotions, presumably to display and generate fun, which is incompatible with the anxiety, fear, and despondence patients' families may bring to medical encounters.

As a final example, Wasserman et al. (2000; also see, e.g., Strati 1992, 1996; White 1996), drawing on both qualitative and quantitative data, demonstrated links between the aesthetics of physical cues or symbols in organizations (restaurants and bars) and the emotions felt by potential participants. For instance, research participants reacting to photographs of eclectically designed establishments reported largely pleasant emotions, whereas the reactions to monomorphic designs were considerably more mixed.

In sum, recent organizational research on the relationship between the properties of physical settings and the experience of mood and emotions has been slim and characterized by highly varied theoretical and methodological orientations; little knowledge has accumulated. Obvious properties like temperature, noise, and lighting appear to have been ignored, at least recently, in the organizational literature [for a glimpse of the literature on physical settings outside the organizational arena, see, for example, Sundstrom et al. (1996).]

Organizational Rewards/Punishments

The final category of factors we previously identified as theorized to produce moods and emotions is organizational rewards and punishments. Surprisingly, given their potential import (e.g., Brief & Aldag 1994), we found very few empirical studies in the 1990s and beyond in the organizational literature that addressed linkages between rewards/punishments and workers' feelings. What we did isolate was research that adopted a justice frame of reference (e.g., Folger & Cropanzano 1998, Greenberg 1990). For example, Weiss et al. (1999b) found that happiness was influenced by outcomes, with procedural fairness playing little role; alternatively, guilt, anger, and, to a lesser extent, pride were influenced by specific combinations of outcomes and procedures (also see Bies 2001, Bies & Tripp 2001; see Miller 2001 for a more general treatment of the topic). Whereas these results, because of their provocative nature, suggest that a justice orientation to understanding affective reactions to organizational rewards/punishments is worthwhile, it is most clear that rewards/punishments from an affect standpoint largely have been ignored. This sad state of affairs likely will be best corrected by pursuing multitheoretical avenues, justice being one of them.

Summary

The above treatment of the literature by the categories we identified should not be taken as encompassing all existing approaches to understanding the production of moods and emotions in the workplace. Other, more isolated approaches do exist. For example, we found papers that compared the moods of unemployed and unsatisfactory employed young adults over time (Winefield et al. 1991) and that theorized about the causes of jealousy and envy at work (Vecchio 1995). Even

though our review of the recent organizational literature was not comprehensive, several observations appear warranted.

First, personality as a determinant of workplace moods (but not workplace emotions) seems relatively well established; how attributes of the workplace might interact with personality to affect feelings has been approached too narrowly, theoretically, and empirically. Second, in the job stress literature, threats to physical well-being as a source of negative moods and emotions are beginning to draw needed attention; however, as is characteristic of the job stress literature in general, this research has not been conducted with the intent of developing a meta-theory of job stress—a framework to guide the search for those conditions of work likely to produce negative moods and emotions. Third, empirical research on how leaders may affect the feelings of their followers is embryonic; however, it exhibits tremendous promise on theoretical grounds. Fourth, perhaps the most exciting new area of research is that pertaining to group affective tone. Available theory is provocative, and the few empirical results now available generally are supportive of the ideas that have been advanced to explain how work group members come to share their feelings. Fifth, research on affective reactions to the physical work environment is small and eclectic, but interesting. Research that recognizes that customers/clients/patients can be construed as mood and emotion generators and that focuses on the mood and emotional consequences of the workplace aesthetics (including music) seems to be especially intriguing. Sixth, virtually no progress has been made in the past decade toward understanding the effects of organizational rewards and punishments on how workers feel. Finally, the research reviewed here admirably often relied upon longitudinal designs that could allow for the study of process (i.e., how the production of moods and emotions unfolds); however, rarely did studies include objective indicators of those workplace features thought to produce moods and emotions, thereby leaving us too dependent on self-reports, which may not be congruent with more independent measures of the workplace and may, themselves, be influenced by the feelings workers experience (the dependent variables of interest).

In closing, for the past ten years or more, organizational researchers have raised many more questions than they have answered about the production of moods and emotions. We interpret this state of affairs opportunistically, as a beginning or, in light of our earlier historical analysis, as a rebirth. After considering below the consequences of workers' feeling, we turn to gaps in the literature in need of filling; thus, the production of moods and emotions will surface again.

CONSEQUENCES OF MOODS AND EMOTIONS IN THE WORKPLACE

Conceptual Orientations

In the past decade several conceptual discussions of affect appeared that focused either on the organizational consequences of affective states or traits or included

discussions of consequences within broader discussions of mood and emotion at work. Stimulated partly by these organizationally focused conceptual pieces and partly by more basic research, empirical work appeared demonstrating the attitudinal or behavioral consequences of affect at work. Among the conceptual pieces published, three stand out. Isen & Baron (1991) presented a wide-ranging discussion of the potential effects of positive affect on a variety of work-relevant attitudes, behaviors, and cognitive processes. Their discussion is notable for its effort to connect organizational issues to basic research on mood, particularly Isen's (1987, 1999, 2000) body of work on positive affect. At the same time, its exclusive focus on positive affect makes it less useful for understanding the effects of negative mood states or discrete emotions. George & Brief (1992) examined the relationship between affective states and what they called "organizational spontaneity," a variant on what has come to be known as extra-role or organizational citizenship behaviors. They argued that mood at work is a proximal cause of spontaneity and that individual mood is, in turn, influenced by individual mood-generating factors both on and off the job as well as group affective tone.

Weiss & Cropanzano (1996) presented a broad discussion of the consequences of affective states and traits at work. Of particular interest is their distinction between affect-driven and judgment-driven behaviors. According to Weiss & Cropanzano, affect-driven behaviors are relatively immediate behavioral and cognitive outcomes of affective states. These effects generally are bounded in time and unmediated by overall evaluative judgments about jobs as a whole or elements of the job experience. Judgment-driven behaviors are outcomes influenced by overall or particular evaluative judgments such as job or facet satisfaction. They further argued that some satisfaction-outcome relationships reported in the literature may be the spurious result of affective states influencing both satisfaction and the particular outcome in question.

Judgments

Most organizational research closely follows findings from the basic research literature on the behavioral and cognitive effects of affective states, particularly moods. That organizational research shows, as we demonstrate, that affective states can influence a variety of performance-relevant outcomes including judgments, attitudinal responses, creativity, helping behavior, and risk taking. We begin by considering judgments.

The effects of affect on judgments have been studied in a number of ways. DeNisi and his associates (Robbins & DeNisi 1994, 1998; Varma et al. 1996) examined the relationship between what they referred to as "interpersonal affect" and performance evaluations. Similar research by Judge & Ferris (1993) examined supervisor liking for a subordinate and supervisor ratings of the subordinate's performance. In aggregate, these kinds of studies showed interpersonal affect and liking to be related to both performance ratings and certain intervening cognitive processes. However, as measured, interpersonal affect and liking seem more assessments of attitudes held toward a subordinate than assessments of any real

affective experiences with the subordinate or affective responses to the subordinate. As such, these studies do demonstrate that attitudinal consistency can bias performance judgments, but provide less clarity regarding affective influences on appraisals.

In an interesting twist on the affect-performance evaluation relationship, Fried et al. (1999) examined the relationship between NA and deliberate rating inflation. They argued that raters high on NA would generally produce higher ratings than raters low on NA, through such automatic processes as biased recall. The consequence of these automatic distortions is that high NA raters would have less room or inclination to deliberately inflate their ratings and, therefore, more inflation would be seen among raters low in NA. Whereas Fried et al. did not measure distortion per se, their results did show that NA was positively correlated with self-reports of distortion and that this relationship was moderated by the extent to which supervisors were required to document subordinates' work behaviors and the extent to which appraisals were visible among peers.

Other performance-relevant judgments have been shown to be influenced by affect. Saavedra & Earley (1991) showed that self-efficacy was higher among subjects exposed to a positive affect manipulation than it was among subjects exposed to a negative affect manipulation. Unfortunately, the absence of a neutral affect control group precludes the ability to determine whether positive affect enhances efficacy, negative affect reduces efficacy, or both. Brief et al. (1995) had two groups of employees complete a typical job satisfaction measure. One group was put in a positive mood by the receipt of small gifts. The other group served as a control. Employees in a positive mood reported higher levels of job satisfaction than did employees in the control group. Note that this may be a demonstration of the biasing effects of immediate mood on judgment, rather than of the substantive influence of work-relevant affect on the formation of job attitudes.

Creative Problem Solving

A longstanding laboratory finding is that being in a positive mood can enhance creative problem solving (Isen 1999). This relationship has been tested in the field: Estrada et al. (1997) showed that physicians placed in a positive mood scored better on a test of creativity. Madjar et al. (2001) demonstrated that positive mood, but not negative mood, predicted on the job ratings of creativity and mediated the effects of social support on creativity ratings.

Helping Behaviors

A substantial body of social psychological research has shown that being in a positive mood state generally encourages the display of helping behavior and cooperation and reduces aggression (Isen & Baron 1991). The clear relevance of cooperative, prosocial behaviors to organizations has produced a lot of research

examining affect and various forms of helping behavior at work. In a series of studies, George looked at the relationship between positive mood at both individual (George 1991) and group (George 1990, George & Bettenhausen 1990) levels, with prosocial behavior directed at both co-workers and customers. George (1991) found that a self-report of positive mood in the previous week predicted supervisor ratings of altruism on the job and customer service. Moreover, it did so after controlling for beliefs about justice and fairness in the workplace and more dispositional measures of affect. George (1990) found that the negative group affective tone was associated with the level of prosocial behaviors in the group; George & Bettenhausen (1990) found that a leader's positive mood predicted group members' self-reports of customer service behavior.

General Performance

Staw and his colleagues' (Staw & Barsade 1993, Staw et al. 1994, Wright & Staw 1999) research is notable for its thoughtful explication of affect processes that may influence performance. Some of these processes, as the Staw group notes, suggest conflicting predictions about the effects of positive and negative affective states. So, for example, research indicates that positive affective states facilitate creativity and efficacy judgments whereas other research suggests that negative affective states can lead to more thorough canvassing of problem solutions and more accurate judgments. By and large, Staw and his colleagues' research demonstrates a performance facilitation of positive rather than negative affect. For instance, Staw & Barsade (1993) showed facilitative effects of positive affect on decision quality and interpersonal performance, as well as more general indicators of performance.

Negotiations

The negotiation context, with its emphasis on the receipt of favorable or unfavorable outcomes and its opportunity for interpersonal conflict, should be a natural setting for the study of affect. Somewhat surprisingly, few studies of true affect in negotiations context have been conducted (Barry & Oliver 1996, Thompson et al. 1999). Those studies mostly have focused on negotiator tactics and generally find that positive affect enhances cooperation and the search for creative solutions (see, e.g., Baron 1990, Forgas 1998, Pruitt & Carnevale 1993) as well as confidence in being able to achieve positive outcomes (Baron 1990, Kramer et al. 1993). Additionally, Pillutla & Murnighan (1996) have opened up a new line of research focused more on discrete emotions than general affective states. They find that anger reactions can lead negotiators to reject offers that are in their best interests as judged by pure economic standards. Recent conceptual treatments of affect in negotiation processes (e.g., Barry & Oliver 1996, George et al. 1998, Kumar 1997, Thompson, et al. 1999), as well as Pillutla & Murnighan's work on anger, should stimulate more research in this area.

Withdrawal Behaviors

In 1989, George showed that positive, but not negative, moods predicted absenteeism and that positive and negative moods predicted turnover intentions. Research on affect, both state and trait, and withdrawal continued in the 1990s. Cropanzano et al. (1993) argued that commitment was the consequence of affective experiences at work, and because negative affectivity (NA) and positive affectivity (PA) influence emotional reactivity, both traits should predict turnover intentions as mediated by commitment. In two studies they found that NA and PA correlated with turnover intentions, with commitment mediating the effect of PA in both studies and NA in one. George & Jones (1996) examined the interactive effects of values, positive moods, and satisfaction in predicting turnover intentions and found that positive mood predicted turnover intentions both in isolation and interacting with satisfaction and value fulfillment. In a longitudinal field study, Pelled & Xin (1999) showed that both positive and negative mood at work predicted subsequent absenteeism, although positive mood was more influential. In contrast, only negative mood states predicted subsequent turnover. In the aggregate, these studies all point to the importance of examining affective experiences when studying withdrawal behaviors, although the somewhat conflicting findings regarding positive and negative states indicate a need for more research on the processes that explain these effects.

Summary

It seems fair to say that examinations of the performance consequences of affect have been characterized by somewhat more sophisticated discussions of process than have traditional examinations of satisfaction-performance relationships. Much of the affect research has been well grounded in basic research, particularly that pertaining to the behavioral and judgment consequences of mood states. Specific affect studies have been as likely to focus on specific performance–related behaviors or judgments (e.g., creativity, goal persistence, and helping behavior) as on general performance assessments. Overall, thus far, the results appear more positive than what the field has been used to with job satisfaction. That being said, there have been certain limitations to the research on outcomes of affective states, which are addressed below.

OVERALL CONCLUSIONS AND RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

The Narrowness of Organizational Research

The study of affect across psychology is wide-ranging in terms of its research programs: the problems identified, the methods used in seeking solutions to those problems, and the tentative solutions that have been produced. The study of affect in organizations is narrow in its problems and methods. That narrowness could be

considered appropriate if it was the consequence of a thoughtful examination of the breadth of basic research followed by a series of judgments about what is and is not relevant to understanding behavior in organizations. Unfortunately, that does not appear to be the reason for the discrepancy. Our goal in this section is not to review basic research on moods and emotions. Rather, we wish to highlight some of the ways in which we believe organizational research has been overly narrow and point to directions for broadening research activities.

Perhaps the most glaring example of the narrowness of organizational research is the overemphasis of the study of mood at the expense of discrete emotions. Research on dispositional affect examines tendencies to experience positive or negative mood states over time. Research on the determinants of affect looks at the way leaders, work environments, or stress influence mood states. Research on the consequences of affect looks at the effects of positive mood states on creativity or helping behavior. Certainly, counterexamples can be found [for example, research on anger (Allred et al. 1997, Fitness 2000, Glomb & Hulin 1997, Pillutla & Murnighan 1996) or the discrete emotional consequences of justice conditions (Weiss et al. 1999b)], but the overwhelming emphasis is on mood states.

A number of reasons can be offered for this imbalance. First, the groundbreaking work of Isen (e.g., 1987) provided a compelling framework for examining the consequences of positive mood states on performance-relevant organizational behaviors. Perhaps no other program of basic research on affect has been as influential for organizational scholars as Isen's. Of equal importance has been the ready availability of measures of mood, particularly measures of positive and negative affect. That is, much of the organizational research on the consequences of affect has used the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) (Watson et al. 1988) or modifications of it (e.g., Burke et al. 1989) as the measurement instrument and Isen's work as the theoretical framework, likely resulting in narrower than desirable methodological and theoretical orientations.

This imbalance in studies of mood and discrete emotions is unfortunate for two reasons. First, an enormous amount of research on emotions has accumulated, and this research highlights processes and outcomes of clear relevance to individual functioning in work settings. Second, it is apparent that discrete emotions are important, frequently occurring elements of everyday experience. Even at work—perhaps especially at work—people feel angry, happy, guilty, jealous, proud, etc. Neither the experiences themselves, nor their consequences, can be subsumed easily under a simple structure of positive or negative states.

The research on discrete emotions is diverse. Evolutionarily influenced psychologists have looked at the universality of basic emotions, including characteristic response patterns as well as the functional value of emotional displays (e.g., Cosmides & Tooby 2000, Fridlund 1994, Izard 1997, Keltner & Ekman 2000). This research can inform studies of emotional contagion and group affective tone and the behavioral and performance consequences of emotional states. Cognitively influenced psychologists examine the appraisal processes that generate emotional states (e.g., Clore & Ortony 2000, Dalgleish & Power 1999, Lazarus 1991). This

research can inform the study of emotion generating working conditions and emotional climates. Research programs on particular emotions such as anger, or what have been referred to as "self-conscious emotions" (guilt, shame, pride) (Lewis 2000a), can inform understanding of how these particular emotions play out in organizational contexts. We hope the next few years will see a shift in emphasis to balance the interest in moods with an interest in discrete emotions.

Dispositional affect research in organizational behavior also has been dominated by PA and NA. Measures of PA or NA have been controlled for in stress research and have been correlated with satisfaction and performance and mood states. As we already have noted, in all of this research very little empirical work has been done on the processes by which dispositional affect influences various outcomes. More importantly, there has been little connection between organizational research on dispositional affect and the burgeoning research on the physiology of affect concerning the delineation of multiple affective systems (e.g., Cacioppo et al. 1999, Davidson 1992, Gray 1994) and the development of alternative measures of dispositional affect tied to those systems (Avila 2001, Carver & White 1994). That research points to two systems that control reactivity for positive and negative events. Although these systems are approximately consistent with the PA/NA structure, they are not entirely so. In addition, they suggest more precise ways of examining affective dispositions and may provide for better understanding of how those dispositions operate to produce immediate affective states.

A Process Orientation

Although we asserted that affect-outcome process discussions are more sophisticated than typical satisfaction-outcome process discussions of the past, it is still true that these process analyses can and need to be even more sophisticated. Current research is driven by particular criteria. That is, researchers lay out the important dimensions of performance, look to see what the basic literature says about affect influencing those dimensions, and then demonstrate in the work setting the particular relationship. For example, positive affect enhances helping, so why not show that positive affect at work enhances helping at work? This is a perfectly reasonable activity, both theoretically and practically, and serves as a first step in the study of affect-performance relationships.

What has received less attention, but ultimately may be more useful, is research that is less focused on particular performance dimensions and more focused on broader affect processes. For example, people engage in emotional regulation. These regulatory activities can deplete resources necessary for task performance (Muraven & Baumeister 2000). In a very interesting study, Richards & Gross (1999) showed that attempts to suppress the display of emotional states, a common requirement in many organizations, impaired memory for information encountered during the period of suppression. Similarly, rumination about emotional events can interfere with performance (Mikulincer 1996), and there are measurable individual

differences in rumination tendencies (Sarason et al. 1996a). Of course, because people are just as likely to ruminate about positive as negative events, significant emotional events of either valence may negatively impede performance. Such possibilities, derived from a process orientation, have yet to be considered in the organizational literature.

A process orientation requires a better grasp of the state-trait distinction. Few organizational studies have focused on the immediate consequences of momentary affective states, yet many of the outcome processes described in the literature are relatively immediate and time bound. A number of studies have used extended time frames of a week or more (e.g., George 1991, George & Jones 1996, Madjar et al. 2001) to gauge affect at work; even more troublesome, others ask about mood at work but leave the time frame unspecified (e.g., Pelled & Xin 1999). Often, the justification is that moods can be long lasting (hours or days); however, moods also can be rather short lived, fluctuating dramatically over a single day. In addition, although some researchers attempt to use the PANAS structure for state affect, it is not clear that this positive/negative structure is appropriate for describing momentary mood states. Overall, the extent to which these methods adequately operationalize time- and situation-bound processes is unknown.

Some organizational studies have been conducted using experience-sampling methods in which data are collected daily or throughout the day. These designs can have the advantage of better operationalizing affective states, looking at immediate affect processes and better partitioning within subject and between subject effects. However, the studies reported so far in the organizational literature using experience-sampling methods are few in number and generally have not included within-subject outcome or process data commensurate with the level of affect measurement. We think these should and will come, with affect gauged at the moment as well as at other theoretically appropriate levels.

Appreciating Organizational Context

We also see research needs not as directly tied to developments in understanding moods and emotions in other areas of psychology. These needs, in large part, stem from organizational behavior's focus on a particular context, the workplace. First, it is apparent that we know less than we should about features of work environments that are likely to produce particular (positive and negative) moods and emotions among those who spend perhaps the majority of their working hours in them, five or more days a week. We do have narrowly focused theories that tell us, for instance, that if workers are treated unfairly by their employers, they somehow feel bad. What we do not have and need are theories that guide us in identifying specific kinds of work conditions and/or events (physical, social, or economic) associated with specific affective states. For example, it would be helpful to know the kinds of "organizational climates" (e.g., James & Jones 1974) that can be associated with experiencing fear at work. This need for theory likely should be met, in part, by

methodological approaches more qualitatively rich (e.g., Fineman 1993) than the ones we have reviewed here, for it seems that the theories required must be built from the ground up rather than imported from other areas of psychology.

Second, research stemming from these meta-theories should recognize that a worker's perceptions of his/her work environment are not necessarily equivalent to more objective (e.g., independent) assessments of work events and conditions. Indeed, workers' perceptions of their work environments may be influenced by their affective traits and/or states, and it is those states that supposedly constitute the dependent variables of interest.

Third, returning to the more general literature on moods and emotions, but not leaving behind the problem of worker self-reports, it is important to at least note that workers' reports of how they feel may not adequately tap the constructs of experienced moods and emotions. That is, it appears that affect can be non-consciously processed (e.g., LeDoux 1995, Murphy 2001); affect so processed, although presumably not subject to self-reports, may influence how organizational members think and act. If this may be the case, then organizational researchers are faced with a sizable methodological challenge, incorporating physiological indicators of affect into their research.

Fourth, given that affect at the work group level has been demonstrated to be a meaningful construct, more effort, following the lead of Bartel & Saavedra (2000), ought to be expended to understand the processes by which feelings do and do not come to be shared in the workplace. Moreover, such research should not be limited to work groups. Can, for example, organizations, like work groups, have an affective tone? If so, under what conditions does it come about?

Closing Thoughts

After too many decades, the study of affect in organizational behavior is alive and well. Indeed, Mowday & Sutton's (1993) charge, in an *Annual Review of Psychology* chapter, that organizational behavior's preoccupation with cognitive processes "can lead to theory and research that portrays organization members as cognitive stick figures whose behavior is unaffected by emotions" (p. 197) no longer appears applicable. Considerable change in the field has been initiated in the past few years. Although in their infancy, some recently initiated research programs show considerable promise (for example, those concerned with the effects of leaders on the affective experiences of their followers, with the antecedents and consequences of group affective tone, and with assessing the many hypotheses derived from affective events theory). Much more importantly, we are confident that many, many important questions about the production and consequences of moods and emotions in the workplace have yet to be posed. The opportunity (the challenge) is in front of us. If we are duly enticed by it, then organizational behavior will evolve to and beyond considering workers as people who think and feel; we will more fully appreciate that the groups and organizations to which they belong also exhibit these person-like characteristics.

Visit the Annual Reviews home page at www.AnnualReviews.org

LITERATURE CITED

Agho AO, Price JL, Mueller CW. 1992. Discriminant validity of measures of job satisfaction, positive affectivity and negative affectivity. *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.* 65(3):185–96

Allred KG, Mallozzi JS, Matsui F, Raia CP. 1997. The influence of anger and compassion on negotiation performance. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.* 70(3):175–87

Arvey RD, Carter GW, Buerkley DK. 1991. Job satisfaction: dispositional and situational influences. In *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, ed. CL Cooper, IT Robertson, 6:359–83. New York: Wiley

Ashforth BE, Humphrey RH. 1995. Emotion in the workplace: a reappraisal. *Hum. Relat.* 48:97–125

Avila C. 2001. Distinguishing BIS-mediated and BAS-mediated disinhibition mechanisms: a comparison of disinhibition models of Gray (1981,1987) and of Patterson and Newman (1993). *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 80:311–24

Bagozzi RP, Burnkrant RE. 1979. Attitude organization and the attitude behavior relationship. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 37(6):913–29

Baritz L. 1960. *The Servants of Power: A History of the Use of Social Sciences in American Industry*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan Univ. Press. 273 pp.

Baron RA. 1990. Environmentally induced positive affect—its impact on self-efficacy, task-performance, negotiation, and conflict. *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* 20:368–84

Barry B, Oliver RL. 1996. Affect in dyadic negotiation: a model and propositions. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.* 67:127–43

Barsade SG, Gibson DE. 1998. Group emotion: a view from top and bottom. In *Research on Managing Groups and Teams*, ed. DH Gruenfeld, 1:81–102. Stamford, CT: JAI. 272 pp.

Barsade SG, Ward AJ, Turner JD, Sonnenfeld JA. 2000. To your heart's content: a model of affective diversity in top management teams. *Admin. Sci. Q.* 45(4):802–36

Bartel CA, Saavedra R. 2000. The collective construction of work group moods. *Admin. Sci. Q.* 45(2):197–231

Bies RJ. 2001. Interactional (in)justice: the sacred and the profane. In *Advances in Organizational Justice*, ed. J Greenberg, R Cropanzano. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press

Bies RJ, Tripp TM. 2001. A passion for justice: the rationality and morality of revenge. In *Justice in the Workplace: From Theory to Practice: Series in Applied Psychology*, ed. R Cropanzano, 2:197–208. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Brief AP. 1998. *Attitudes in and Around Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Brief AP, Aldag RJ. 1994. The study of work values: a call for a more balanced perspective. In *Trends and Perspectives in Empirical Social Research*, ed. I Borg, PP Mohler, pp. 99–124. New York: de Gruyter. 375 pp.

Brief AP, Butcher AH, Roberson L. 1995. Cookies, disposition, and job attitudes: the effects of positive mood-inducing events and negative affectivity on job satisfaction in a field experiment. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.* 62(1):55–62

Brief AP, Roberson L. 1989. Job attitude organization: an exploratory study. *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* 19:717–27

Burke MJ, Brief AP, George JM. 1993. The role of negative affectivity in understanding relations between self-reports of stressors and strains: a comment on the applied psychology literature. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 78(3):402–12

Burke MJ, Brief AP, George JM, Roberson L, Webster J. 1989. Measuring affect at work: confirmatory analyses of competing mood structures with conceptual linkage to cortical regulatory systems. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 57:1091–102

Cacioppo JT, Gardner WL, Berntson GG. 1999. The affect system has parallel and integrative processing components: form follows function. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 76:839–55

Carver CS, White TL. 1994. Behavioral-inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment—the BIS/BAS scales. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 67:319–33

Clark MS, Isen AM. 1982. Toward understanding the relationship between feeling states and social behavior. In *Cognitive Social Psychology*, ed. A Hastorf, AM Isen, pp. 73–108. New York: Elsevier

Clore GL, Ortony A. 2000. Cognition in emotion: always, sometimes, never. In *Cognitive Neuroscience of Emotion*, ed. RD Lane, L Nadel, pp. 24–61. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Conger JA, Kanungo RN. 1998. *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 288 pp.

Cooper CL. 1998. *Theories of Organizational Stress*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press. 275 pp.

Cosmides L, Tooby J. 2000. Evolutionary psychology and the emotions. See Lewis & Haviland 2000, pp. 91–115

Cropanzano R, James K, Konovsky MA. 1993. Dispositional affectivity as a predictor of work attitudes and job performance. *J. Organ. Behav.* 14:595–606

Dalgleish T, Power M. 1999. *Handbook of Cognition and Emotion*. Chichester, UK: Wiley

Davidson RJ. 1992. Emotion and affective style: hemispheric substrates. *Psychol. Sci.* 3:39–43

Davis-Blake A, Pfeffer J. 1996. Two steps forward, one step back. *Acad. Manage. Rev.* 21(2):340–43

Eagly AH, Chaiken S. 1993. *The Psychology of Attitudes*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publ.

Estrada CA, Isen AM, Young MJ. 1997. Positive affect facilitates integration of information and decreases anchoring in reasoning among physicians. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.* 72:117–35

Fineman S. 1993. *Emotion in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 230 pp.

Fisher CD. 2000. Mood and emotions while working: missing pieces of job satisfaction? *J. Organ. Behav.* 21:185–202

Fisher VE, Hanna JV. 1931. *The Dissatisfied Worker*. New York: Macmillan. 260 pp.

Fitness J. 2000. Anger in the workplace: an emotion script approach to anger episodes between workers and their superiors, co-workers and subordinates. *J. Organ. Behav.* 21:147–62

Folger R, Cropanzano R. 1998. *Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 278 pp.

Forgas JP. 1998. On feeling good and getting your way: mood effects on negotiator cognition and bargaining strategies. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 74:565–77

Fortunato VJ, Jex SM, Heinisch DA. 1999. An examination of the discriminant validity of the Strain-Free Negative Affectivity Scale. *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.* 72(4):503–22

Fridlund AJ. 1994. *Human Facial Expression: An Evolutionary View*. San Diego, CA: Academic

Fried Y, Levi AS, Ben David HA, Tiegs RB. 1999. Inflation of subordinates' performance ratings: main and interactive effects of rater negative affectivity, documentation of work behavior, and appraisal visibility. *J. Organ. Behav.* 20:431–44

Frijda NH. 1993. The place of appraisal in emotion. *Cogn. Emot.* 7(3-4):357–87

Gallupe RB, Bastianatti LM, Cooper WH. 1991. Unblocking brainstorms. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 76(1):137–42

George JM. 1989. Mood and absence. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 74:317–24

George JM. 1990. Personality, affect, and behavior in groups. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 75:107–16

George JM. 1991. State or trait: effects of positive mood on prosocial behaviors at work. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 76:299–307

George JM. 1995. Leader positive mood and group performance: the case of customer service. *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* 25(9):778–94

George JM. 1996. Group affective tone. In *Handbook of Work Group Psychology*, ed. M West. Sussex, UK: Wiley. 642 pp.

George JM. 2000. Emotions and leadership: the role of emotional intelligence. *Hum. Relat.* 53(8):1027–55

George JM, Bettenhausen K. 1990. Understanding prosocial behavior, sales performance, and turnover: a group-level analysis in a service context. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 75:698–709

George JM, Brief AP. 1992. Feeling good-doing good: a conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychol. Bull.* 112(2):310–29

George JM, Brief AP. 2001. Personality and work-related distress. In *Personality and Organizations*, ed. B Schneider, B Smith. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. In press

George JM, Jones GR. 1996. The experience of work and turnover intentions: interactive effects of value attainment, job satisfaction, and positive mood. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 81:318–25

George JM, Jones GR, Gonzalez JA. 1998. The role of affect in cross-cultural negotiations. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* 29:749–72

George JM, Reed TF, Ballard KA, Colin J, Fielding J. 1993. Contact with AIDS patients as a source of work-related distress: effects of organizational and social support. *Acad. Manage. J.* 36(1):157–71

Glomb TM, Hulin CL. 1997. Anger and gender effects in observed supervisor-subordinate dyadic interactions. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.* 72(3):281–307

Gray JA. 1994. Three fundamental emotion systems. In *The Nature of Emotions: Fundamental Questions*, ed. P Ekman, RJ Davidson, pp. 243–47. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Greenberg J. 1990. Organizational justice: yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *J. Manage.* 16:399–432

Hackman JR. 1992. Group influences on individuals in organizations. In *Handbook of I/O Psychology*, ed. MD Dunnette, LM Hough, 3:199–267. Palo Alto, CA: Consult. Psychol. Press. 1095 pp.

Hart PM, Wearing AJ, Headey B. 1995. Police stress and well-being: integrating personality, coping and daily work experiences. *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.* 68(2):133–56

Hatfield E, Cacioppo JT, Rapson RL. 1994. *Emotional Contagion*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press. 240 pp.

Heath C, Jourden FJ. 1997. Illusion, disillusion, and the buffering effect of groups. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.* 69(2):103–16

Heinisch DA, Jex SM. 1997. Negative affectivity and gender as moderators of the relationship between work-related stressors and depressed mood at work. *Work Stress* 11(1):46–57

Hersey RB. 1932. *Workers' Emotions in Shop and Home: A Study of Individual Workers from the Psychological and Physiological Standpoint*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press

Hochschild A. 1983. Comment on Kemper's "social constructionist and positivist approaches to the sociology of emotions." *Am. J. Soc.* 89(2):432–34

Hoppock R. 1935. *Job Satisfaction*. New York: Harper. 303 pp.

House RJ, Shane SA, Herold DM. 1996. Rumors of the death of dispositional research are vastly exaggerated. *Acad. Manage. Rev.* 21:203–24

Hurrell JJ, Nelson DL, Simmons BL. 1998. Measuring job stressors and strains: Where we have been, where we are, and where we need to go. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* 3(4):368–89

Isen AM. 1987. Positive affect, cognitive-processes, and social-behavior. *Adv. Exp. Soc. Psychol.* 20:203–53

Isen AM. 1999. Positive affect and creativity. In *Affect*, *Creative Experience*, *and Psychological Adjustment*, ed. S Russ, pp. 3–17. Philadelphia: Bruner/Mazel

Isen AM. 2000. Positive affect and decision making. See Lewis & Haviland 2000, pp. 417–35

Isen AM, Baron RA. 1991. Positive affect as a factor in organizational-behavior. In *Research in Organizational Behavior*, ed. BM

Staw, LL Cummings, 13:1–53. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press

Izard CE. 1997. Emotions and facial expressions: a perspective from Differential Emotions Theory. In *The Psychology of Facial Expressions*, ed. JA Russell, JM Fernandez-Dols, pp. 57–77. Paris: Cambridge Univ. Press

James LR, Jones AP. 1974. Organizational climate: a review of theory and research. *Psychol. Bull.* 81:1096–112

Judge TA. 1992. The dispositional perspective in human resource research. In *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, ed. GR Ferris, KM Rowland, 11:31–72. Greenwich, CT: JAI

Judge TA, Ferris GR. 1993. Social-context of performance evaluation decisions. *Acad. Manage. J.* 36:80–105

Kelloway EK, Barling J, Shah A. 1993. Industrial relations stress and job satisfaction: concurrent effects and mediation. *J. Organ. Behav.* 14:447–57

Keltner D, Ekman P. 2000. Facial expression of emotion. See Lewis & Haviland 2000, pp. 236–49

Kornhauser AW, Sharp AA. 1932. Employee attitudes: suggestions from a study in a factory. *Pers. J.* 10:393–404

Kramer RM, Newton E, Pommerenke PL. 1993. Self-enhancement biases and negotiator judgment: effects of self-esteem and mood. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.* 56:110–33

Kumar R. 1997. The role of affect in negotiations. *J. Appl. Behav. Sci.* 33:84–100

Kunin T. 1955. The construction of a new type of attitude measure. *Pers. Psychol.* 8:65–77

Larsen RJ, Ketelaar T. 1989. Extraversion, neuroticism, and susceptibility to positive and negative mood induction procedures. *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 10:1221–28

Lazarus RS. 1991. *Emotion and Adaptation.* New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Lazarus RS, Cohon-Charash Y. 2001. Discrete emotions in organizational life. In *Emotions in Organizations*, ed. R Payne, CL Cooper. Chichester, UK: Wiley. In press

LeDoux JE. 1995. Emotion: clues from the brain. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 46:209–35

Lewis KM. 2000a. Self-conscious emotions: embarrassment, pride, shame and guilt. See Lewis & Haviland 2000, pp. 623–36

Lewis KM. 2000b. When leaders display emotion: How followers respond to negative emotional expression of male and female leaders. *J. Organ. Behav.* 21:221–34

Lewis KM, Haviland JM, eds. 2000. *Handbook of Emotions.* New York: Guilford. 2nd ed.

Locke EA. 1976. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In *Handbook of I/O Psychology*, ed. MD Dunnette, pp. 1297–349. Chicago: Rand-McNally. 1st ed.

Locke K. 1996. A funny thing happened! The management of consumer emotions in service encounters. *Organ. Sci.* 7(1):40–59

Madjar N, Oldham GR, Pratt MG. 2001. There's no place like home: the contributions of work and non-work creativity support to employees' creative performance. *Acad. Manage. J.* In press

McCrae RR, Costa PT. 1991. Adding Liebe und Arbeit: the full five-factor model and well-being. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 17(2): 227–32

Mikulincer M. 1996. Mental rumination and learned helplessness: cognitive shifts during helplessness training and their behavioral consequences. See Sarason et al. 1996b, pp. 191–210

Millar MG, Tesser A. 1986. Effects of affective and cognitive focus on the attitude-behavior relation. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 51:270–76

Miller DT. 2001. Disrespect and the experience of injustice. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 52:527–55

Moorman RH. 1993. The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Hum. Relat.* 46(6):759–76

Motowidlo SJ. 1996. Orientation toward the job and organization. In *Individual Differences and Behavior in Organizations*, ed. KR Murphy, pp. 175–208. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Mowday RT, Sutton RI. 1993. Organizational behavior: linking individuals and groups to organizational context. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 44:195–229

Muraven M, Baumeister RF. 2000. Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources: Does self-control resemble a muscle? *Psychol. Bull.* 126:247–59

Murphy ST. 2001. Feeling without thinking: affective primacy and the nonconscious processing of emotion. In *Unraveling the Complexities of Social Life: A Festschrift in Honor of Robert B. Zajonc*, ed. JA Bargh, DK Apsley, pp. 39–53. Washington, DC: Am. Psychol. Assoc. 209 pp.

Necowitz LB, Roznowski M. 1994. Negative affectivity and job satisfaction: cognitive processes underlying the relationship and effects on employee behaviors. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 45(3):270–94

Oldham GR, Cummings A, Mischel LJ, Schmidtke JM, Zhou J. 1995. Listen while you work? Quasi-experimental relations between personal-stereo headset use and employee work responses. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 80(5):547–64

Organ DW. 1988. A restatement of the satisfaction-performance hypothesis. *J. Manage.* 14(4):547–57

Organ DW, Near JP. 1985. Cognitive vs. affect measures of job satisfaction. *Int. J. Psychol.* 20:241–54

Parkes J. 1990. Coping, negative affectivity, and the work environment: additive and interactive predictors of mental health. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 75:399–409

Pekrun R, Frese M. 1992. Emotions in work and achievement. In *International Review of I/O Psychology*, Vol. 7, Chap. 5, pp. 153–200. New York: Wiley

Pelled LH, Xin KR. 1999. Down and out: an investigation of the relationship between mood and employee withdrawal behavior. *J. Manage.* 25:875–95

Pillutla MM, Murnighan JK. 1996. Unfairness, anger, and spite: emotional rejections of ultimatum offers. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.* 68:208–24

Plutchik R. 1994. *The Psychology and Biology of Emotion*. New York: Harper Collins Coll. Publ. 396 pp.

Porac JF. 1987. The job satisfaction questionnaire as a cognitive event: first- and second-order processes in affective commentary. In *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, ed. KM Rowland, GR Ferris, 5:51–102. Greenwich, CT: JAI

Pratkanis AR, Turner ME. 1994. Of what value is a job attitude? A socio-cognitive analysis. *Hum. Relat.* 47(12):1545–76

Pruitt DG, Carnevale PJ. 1993. *Negotiation in Social Conflict*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks-Cole

Pugh SD. 2001. Service with a smile: emotional contagion in the service encounter. *Acad. Manage. J.* In press

Rafaeli A, Sutton RI. 1990. Busy stores and demanding customers: How do they affect the display of positive emotion? *Acad. Manage. J.* 33(3):623–37

Richards JM, Gross JJ. 1999. Composure at any cost? The cognitive consequences of emotion suppression. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 25:1033–44

Robbins TL, DeNisi AS. 1994. A closer look at interpersonal affect as a distinct influence on cognitive processing in performance evaluations. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 79:341–53

Robbins TL, DeNisi AS. 1998. Mood vs. interpersonal affect: identifying process and rating distortions in performance appraisal. *J. Bus. Psychol.* 12:313–25

Roethlisberger FJ, Dickson WJ. 1939. *Management and the Worker*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press. 615 pp.

Russell JA, Barrett LF. 1999. Core affect, prototypical emotional episodes, and other things called emotion: dissecting the elephant. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 76(5):805–19

Saavedra R, Earley PC. 1991. Choice of task and goal under conditions of general and specific affective inducement. *Motiv. Emot.* 15:45–65

Saavedra R, Kwun SK. 2000. Affective states in job characteristic theory. *J. Organ. Behav.* 21:131–46

Sandelands L, St. Clair L. 1993. Toward an empirical concept of group. *J. Theory Soc. Behav.* 23(4):423–58

Sandelands LE. 1988. The concept of work feeling. *J. Theor. Soc. Behav.* 18(4):437–57

Sarason IG, Pierce GR, Sarason BR. 1996a. Domains of cognitive interference. See Sarason et al. 1996b, pp. 139–52

Sarason IG, Pierce GR, Sarason BR, eds. 1996b. *Cognitive Interference: Theories, Methods and Findings.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Schaubroeck J, Ganster DC, Fox ML. 1992. Dispositional affect and work-related stress. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 77(3):322–35

Schaubroeck J, Judge TA, Taylor LA III. 1998. Influences of trait negative affect and situational similarity on correlation and convergence of work attitudes and job stress perceptions across two jobs. *J. Manage.* 24(4):553–76

Schmitt N, Bedeian AG. 1982. A comparison of LISREL and two-stage least squares analysis of a hypothesized life-job satisfaction reciprocal relationship. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 67(6):806–17

Schneider B. 1987. The people make the place. *Pers. Psychol.* 40(3):437–53

Shaw JD, Duffy MK, Jenkins GD Jr, Gupta N. 1999. Positive and negative affect, signal sensitivity, and pay satisfaction. *J. Manage.* 25(2):189–206

Simon HA. 1982. Comments. In *Affect and Cognition: The Seventeenth Annual Carnegie Symposium on Cognition*, ed. MS Clark, ST Fiske, pp. 333–42. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

Spector PE. 1996. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Research and Practice.* New York: Wiley. 420 pp.

Spector PE. 1997. *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 96 pp.

Spector PE, Jex SM. 1991. Relations of job characteristics from multiple data sources with employee affect, absence, turnover intentions, and health. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 76(1):46–53

Spector PE, O'Connell BJ. 1994. The contribution of personality traits, negative affectivity, locus of control and Type A to the subsequent reports of job stressors and job strains. *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.* 67(1):1–12

Staw BM, Barsade SG. 1993. Affect and managerial performance: a test of the sadder-but-wiser vs. happier-and-smarter hypotheses. *Admin. Sci. Q.* 38:304–31

Staw BM, Bell NE, Clausen JA. 1986. The dispositional approach to job attitudes: a lifetime longitudinal test. *Admin. Sci. Q.* 31:56–77

Staw BM, Sutton RI, Pelled LH. 1994. Employee positive emotion and favorable outcomes at the workplace. *Organ. Sci.* 5:51–71

Strati A. 1992. Aesthetic understanding of organizational life. *Acad. Manage. Rev.* 17(3):568–81

Strati A. 1996. Organizations viewed through the lens of aesthetics. *Organization* 3(2): 209–18

Sundstrom E, Bell PA, Busby PL, Asmus C. 1996. Environmental psychology: 1989–1994. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 47:485–512

Sutton RI. 1991. Maintaining norms about expressed emotions: the case of bill collectors. *Admin. Sci. Q.* 36(2):245–68

Teuchmann K, Totterdell P, Parker SK. 1999. Rushed, unhappy, and drained: an experience sampling study of relations between time pressure, perceived control, mood, and emotional exhaustion in a group of accountants. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* 4(1):37–54

Thayer RE. 1989. *The Biopsychology of Mood and Arousal.* New York: Oxford Univ. Press. 234 pp.

Thompson LL, Nadler J, Kim PH. 1999. Some like it hot: the case for the emotional negotiator. In *Shared Cognition in Organizations: The Management of Knowledge*, ed. LL Thompson, JM Levin, DM Messick, pp. 139–61. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Totterdell P. 2000. Catching moods and hitting runs: mood linkage and subjective performance in professional sport teams. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 85(6):848–59

Totterdell P, Kellett S, Teuchmann K, Briner BB. 1998. Evidence of mood linkage in work

groups. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 74(6):1504–15

Varma A, Denisi AS, Peters LH. 1996. Interpersonal affect and performance appraisal: a field study. *Pers. Psychol.* 49:341–60

Vecchio RP. 1995. The impact of referral sources on employee attitudes: evidence from a national sample. *J. Manage.* 21(5):953–65

Wasserman V, Rafaeli A, Kluger AN. 2000. Aesthetic symbols as emotional cues. In *Emotion in Organizations*, ed. S Fineman. London: Sage. 2nd ed.

Watson D. 2000. *Mood and Temperament*. New York: Guilford. 340 pp.

Watson D, Clark LA. 1992. On traits and temperament: general and specific factors of emotional experience and their relation to the five-factor model. *J. Pers.* 60(2):441–76

Watson D, Clark LA Tellegen A. 1988. Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: the PANAS scales. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 54(6):1063–70

Watson D, Slack AK. 1993. General factors of affective temperament and their relation to job satisfaction over time. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.* 54:181–202

Weiss HM. 2002. Deconstructing job satisfaction: separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences. *Hum. Resource Manage. Rev.* In press

Weiss HM, Brief AP. 2002. Affect at work: an historical perspective. In *Emotions at Work: Theory*, *Research*, *and Application in Management*, ed. RL Payne, CL Cooper. Chichester, UK: Wiley. In press

Weiss HM, Cropanzano R. 1996. Affective Events Theory: a theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. In *Research in Organization Behavior: An Annual Series of Analytical Essays and Critical Reviews*, ed. BM Staw, LL Cummings, 18:1–74. Greenwich, CT: JAI. 373 pp.

Weiss HM, Nicholas JP, Daus CS. 1999a. An examination of the joint effects of affective experiences and job beliefs on job satisfaction and variations in affective experiences over time. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.* 78(1):1–24

Weiss HM, Suckow K, Cropanzano R. 1999b. Effects of justice conditions on discrete emotions. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 84:786–94

Wharton AS, Erickson RJ. 1993. Managing emotions on the job and at home: understanding the consequences of multiple emotional roles. *Acad. Manage. Rev.* 18(3):457–86

White DA. 1996. "It's working beautifully!" Philosophical reflections on aesthetics and organization theory. *Organization* 3(2):195–208

Williams KJ, Alliger GM. 1994. Role stressors, mood spillover, and perceptions of work-family conflict in employed parents. *Acad. Manage. J.* 37(4):837–68

Williams KJ, Suls J, Alliger GM, Learner SM, Wan CK. 1991. Multiple role juggling and daily mood states in working mothers: an experience sampling study. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 76(5):664–74

Williams LJ, Gavin MB, Williams ML. 1996. Measurement and nonmeasurement processes with negative affectivity and employee attitudes. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 81(1):88–101

Winefield AH, Winefield HR, Tiggemann M, Goldney RD. 1991. A longitudinal study of the psychological effects of unemployment and unsatisfactory employment on young adults. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 76(3):424–31

Wright TA, Staw BM. 1999. Affect and favorable work outcomes: two longitudinal tests of the happy-productive worker thesis. *J. Organ. Behav.* 20:1–23

Zajonc RB. 1998. Emotions. In *Handbook of Social Psychology*, ed. DT Gilbert, ST Fiske, G Lindzey, pp. 591–632. Boston: McGraw-Hill

Zohar D. 1999. When things go wrong: the effect of daily work hassles on effort, exertion and negative mood. *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.* 72(3):265–83