The Interactive Relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Counterproductive Work Behavior: An Interpretation Based on an Integrated Emotion-Cognition Framework

Authors: Zhao Jun, Yan Miao, Xiao Sufang, Zhang Yongjun, Zhang Yongjun

Date: 2018-11-14T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

Traditional perspectives posit that organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior represent either opposite poles of a single continuum or negatively correlated independent two-dimensional structures. However, recent research suggests that the relationship between these two constructs is more nuanced, potentially exhibiting a moderate positive correlation under specific contextual conditions. First, this paper reviews the antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior, as well as the cognitive evolution of their relationship. Then, drawing upon an emotion-cognition integration framework, it employs Conservation of Resources theory and Moral Balance theory to examine the interactive relationship between these two behaviors. Finally, it outlines future research directions, including exploring the boundary mechanisms of their interactive relationship through empirical studies, validating this relationship using multiple research methodologies, investigating its dynamic changes via latent growth models, and elaborating on management practice strategies derived from this interactive relationship.

Full Text

The Mutual Relationship Between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Counterproductive Work Behavior: An Interpretation Based on an Integrated Emotion-Cognition Framework

ZHAO Jun[1], YAN Miao[1], XIAO Sufang[1], ZHANG Yongjun[2]
[1]School of Public Administration, Zhongnan University of Economics and Law,

Wuhan 430073, China
[2]School of Business Administration, Henan University, Kaifeng 475004, China

Abstract: Traditional perspectives have argued that organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and counterproductive work behavior (CWB) represent opposite poles of the same continuum or constitute a negatively correlated, independent two-dimensional structure. However, recent research suggests that their relationship is more complex than previously assumed, and that they may exhibit a modest positive correlation under certain circumstances. This paper first reviews the antecedents of OCB and CWB as well as the cognitive evolution of their relationship. It then explores the mutual mechanisms between OCB and CWB through the lenses of Conservation of Resource Theory and Moral Balance Theory within an integrated emotion-cognition framework. Finally, future research directions are discussed, including exploring the boundary mechanisms of their mutual relationship through empirical studies, verifying this relationship using multiple research methods, analyzing dynamic changes based on latent growth models, and investigating management practice strategies for their interaction.

Keywords: organizational citizenship behavior; counterproductive work behavior; emotion; cognition
Classification: B849: C93

1. Introduction

Work performance has long been a central topic in organizational behavior and human resource management research. In recent years, however, scholarly attention has gradually shifted from task performance to spontaneous behaviors beyond formal job requirements, giving rise to two distinct yet related research domains: organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. Meta-analytic evidence (Dalal, 2005) indicates that OCB and CWB share numerous common correlates—such as job satisfaction, perceived organizational justice, and conscientiousness—but exhibit opposite relationships with these factors. Consequently, academics have widely regarded OCB and CWB as two fundamentally contrasting yet highly correlated spontaneous behaviors, typically described as either opposite ends of a single continuum or as negatively correlated independent dimensions (Bennett & Stamper, 2001; Sackett, Berry, & Laczo, 2006). Employees who engage in OCB are celebrated as "good soldiers" (Bateman & Organ, 1983), while those who perpetrate CWB are labeled "bad apples" (Dunlop & Lee, 2004; Felps, Mitchell, & Byington, 2006).

Real-world observations, however, reveal more nuanced patterns. Some individuals demonstrate exceptional diligence yet habitually take advantage of organizational resources, perhaps feeling that their personal sacrifices go unrecognized. Others, after making costly mistakes that harm organizational interests, subsequently engage in exemplary prosocial acts to compensate for their prior transgressions. Research by Dalal, Lam, Weiss, Welch, and Hulin (2009)

demonstrated that coworker-directed OCB and organization-directed CWB can be positively correlated, suggesting that individuals may simultaneously engage in behaviors beneficial to colleagues yet harmful to the organization. Yam, Klotz, He, and Reynolds (2017) found that employees compelled to perform OCB may develop a sense of psychological entitlement, which subsequently licenses various unethical behaviors. When employees' OCB goes unrewarded, they may respond with anger by 转向 engaging in CWB; conversely, employees may experience shame after harming their organization and subsequently display OCB (Spector & Fox, 2010a, 2010b). As research has progressed, scholars have increasingly recognized that OCB and CWB may exhibit a positive interactive relationship—simultaneously independent and positively associated (Dalal, 2005; Ilies, Peng, Savani, & Dimotakis, 2013). Nevertheless, whether such an interactive relationship truly exists and whether contextual factors produce more complex boundary effects remain questions requiring deeper investigation.

Previous studies have typically interpreted the emergence of OCB and CWB from singular theoretical perspectives (Colquitt, 2001; Spector & Fox, 2002). Given the crucial roles played by both emotion and cognition in these processes (Dalal, 2005; O' Boyle, Humphrey, Pollack, Hawver, & Story, 2011), most research has examined the triggering mechanisms of OCB and CWB from either an emotional or cognitive viewpoint, inevitably yielding partial and limited insights. Lee and Allen (2002) and Clark and Fiske (1982), however, argue that only by integrating both emotional and cognitive perspectives can we accurately comprehend the essence of OCB and CWB. In light of these practical realities and research gaps, this study employs an integrated emotion-cognition perspective to explain the interactive relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior.

2. Research Status and Developments

2.1 Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Counterproductive Work Behavior

Early research on OCB and CWB developed as separate fields, with investigations of their antecedents proceeding independently. As research advanced, however, scholars began to recognize connections between these behaviors, prompting increasingly systematic explorations that link the two constructs (Spector & Fox, 2010a; Klotz & Bolino, 2013). We therefore first summarize the antecedents of OCB and CWB before analyzing their similarities and differences. As shown in Table 1 , these antecedents can be broadly categorized into individual and situational levels. Individual-level factors primarily include personal characteristics (e.g., personality traits, emotional perception) and behavioral motives (e.g., impression management), while organizational/situational-level factors encompass organizational characteristics (e.g., ethical climate, organizational constraints), team characteristics (e.g., team psychological climate), and leadership styles (e.g., spiritual leadership, abusive supervision).

Table 1 Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Counterproductive Work Behavior

Category	Organizational Citizenship Behavior	Counterproductive Work Behavior
Demographic variables	(Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000)	(Lau, Au, & Ho, 2003)
Personality traits	Agreeableness, conscientiousness (Werner, 2006; Liu, Jing, Li, & Tang, 2014)	Self-esteem (Marcus & Schuler, 2004; Shen et al., 2009)
Emotions	Positive (negative) emotions (Spector & Fox, 2002; Dalal, 2005; Dalal et al., 2009)	(negatively correlated) (positively correlated)
Job satisfaction	(Dalal, 2005; Zhao, Liao, & Zhang, 2014)	
Organizational justice	(Colquitt, 2001; Dalal, 2005)	
Perceived organizational support	(Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998; Guo, Yang, & Fu, 2015)	
Self-control	(Marcus & Schuler, 2004)	
Impression management	(Bolino, Klotz, Turnley, & Harvey, 2013)	
Organizational ethical climate	(Shin, 2012; Liu et al., 2014)	
Organizational constraints	(Miles, Borman, Spector, & Fox, 2002; Spector & Fox, 2010a)	
Interpersonal conflict, workload	(Miles et al., 2002)	
Leader-member exchange	(Harris, Li, & Kirkman, 2014; Peng, Liang, & Zhao, 2011)	
Team psychological climate	(Law, Dollard, Tuckey, & Dormann, 2011; Tang, 2005)	
Spiritual leadership	(Wang, Ding, & Liu, 2018; Chawla, 2014)	

Category	Organizational Citizenship Behavior	Counterproductive Work Behavior
Abusive supervision	(Xu, Huang, Lam, & Miao, 2012; Martinko, Harvey, Sikora, Brees, & Mackey, 2013)	

As Table 1 reveals, the antecedents of OCB and CWB are interconnected yet distinct. These factors can be classified into three categories: First, **different antecedents**. For instance, demographic variables such as gender and age show significant correlations with CWB (Lau et al., 2003) but not with OCB (Podsakoff et al., 2000); self-control and self-esteem are negatively correlated with CWB (Marcus & Schuler, 2004), but their relationship with OCB remains unclear. Second, **common antecedents with opposite relationships**. Variables including agreeableness, conscientiousness, positive/negative emotions, organizational justice, ethical climate, and abusive supervision show opposite relationships with OCB and CWB (Liu et al., 2014; Dalal, 2005; Dalal et al., 2009; Shin, 2012; Martinko et al., 2013). Third, **common antecedents with consistent relationships**. Miles et al. (2002) found that organizational constraints, interpersonal conflict, and workload positively influence both OCB and CWB.

2.2 Cognitive Evolution of the Relationship Between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Counterproductive Work Behavior

The relationship between OCB and CWB involves intricate internal connections, and academic understanding of this relationship has evolved from viewing them as opposite poles of a single continuum, to recognizing them as negatively correlated independent dimensions, and finally to acknowledging a moderately positive correlation under specific circumstances.

2.2.1 Opposite Poles of the Same Continuum Since both OCB and CWB can be categorized as organization-directed or interpersonal-directed, each dimension should theoretically be negatively correlated. Bennett and Stamper (2001) confirmed this view through multidimensional scaling analysis. Furthermore, because these behaviors share many antecedents with opposite effects (Dalal, 2005), OCB and CWB were considered opposite ends of a single continuum. Heckert and Heckert (2002) proposed that this continuum is anchored by conforming behavior at its center, with norm-violating behavior (organization-directed CWB) at one end and exceeding-expectations behavior (organization-directed OCB) at the other. The opposite-poles perspective implicitly assumes that OCB and CWB function in completely opposing ways—that individuals who engage in OCB would not perpetrate CWB, and vice versa. Clearly, numerous real-world exceptions contradict this view, rendering the continuum perspective overly simplistic and inadequate.

2.2.2 Negatively Correlated Independent Two-Dimensional Structure
Because OCB and CWB encompass different performance dimensions, their behavioral orientations should constitute independent structures. Sackett et al. (2006) confirmed the dimensional distinctiveness of OCB and CWB through factor analysis, concluding that they represent moderately negatively correlated independent dimensions. O' Brien and Allen (2008) examined how different rating sources affect the structural relationship between OCB and CWB and their relative importance, finding through factor analysis that a four-factor structure—organization-directed OCB, interpersonal-directed OCB, organization-directed CWB, and interpersonal-directed CWB—was superior to one-, two-, or three-factor structures. Dalal' s (2005) meta-analysis of 16,721 samples also revealed a moderate negative correlation between OCB and CWB with an asymmetric relationship pattern. Most current research supports this negatively correlated independent structure, yet it cannot explain why the same individual might simultaneously engage in both OCB and CWB toward the same target.

2.2.3 Moderately Positive Correlation Under Specific Circumstances
As research has deepened, the negative correlation between OCB and CWB has proven less robust than initially thought, sometimes showing no relationship or even a modest positive correlation. Dalal' s (2005) meta-analysis demonstrated that the OCB-CWB relationship is influenced by measurement content, rating methods, and rating sources; when using non-semantically-opposite items, frequency response scales, and self-report methods, the correlation coefficient becomes substantially smaller and may even show a weak positive relationship (Spector & Fox, 2010a; Fox, Spector, Goh, Bruursema, & Kessler, 2012). Duffy, Ganster, and Pagon (2002) also noted that social support and social undermining are not necessarily opposites—in fact, the same individual may simultaneously engage in both social support and social undermining behaviors—a view subsequently supported by Spector and Fox (2010a) and Klotz and Bolino (2013). Therefore, the perspective of moderate positive correlation under specific circumstances provides a valuable supplement to traditional views, enabling a more comprehensive and dynamic understanding of the OCB-CWB relationship.

3. An Interaction Framework for Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Counterproductive Work Behavior

While mainstream research has traditionally viewed OCB and CWB as negatively correlated (Lee & Allen, 2002; Judge, Scott, & Ilies, 2006), substantial practical experience and some studies suggest they may also be positively related (Ilies et al., 2013; Reynolds et al., 2015), with measurement artifacts potentially distorting this relationship (Dalal, 2005). Research by Ilies, Scott, and Judge (2006) and Judge et al. (2006) found that this positive association can exist at the within-person level—individuals can be "good soldiers" and "bad apples" simultaneously within short timeframes—a phenomenon confirmed in both

work (Dalal et al., 2009) and non-work contexts (Venkataramani & Dalal, 2007). Thus, the OCB-CWB relationship appears quite complex, influenced by both research perspectives and measurement methods. Fox et al. (2012) have called for increased attention to positive OCB-CWB relationships and the identification of boundary conditions at individual and organizational levels. Moreover, while numerous studies have highlighted the importance of emotion and cognition in OCB and CWB research (Colquitt, 2001; Spector & Fox, 2002; Dalal, 2005), systematic investigations integrating both perspectives remain scarce. Examining behavioral mechanisms through an integrated emotion-cognition framework can demonstrate theoretical parity while more completely describing causal logic at the individual level (O' Boyle et al., 2011) and provide deeper insight into the roles of emotion and cognition in triggering behaviors (Lee & Allen, 2002). Therefore, this study constructs an integrated emotion-cognition framework to explain the interactive relationship between OCB and CWB (see Figure 1 [Figure 1: see original paper]).

For the emotional perspective, we employ Conservation of Resource Theory, which posits that individuals strive to maintain, protect, and acquire valued resources (Hobfoll, 1989), with emotion itself being one such resource (Hobfoll, 2001). When facing resource loss or threat, psychological pressure drives individuals toward ethical darkness (Hobfoll, 2001), whereas resource gain and surplus generate happiness (Rappaport, 1981; Cohen & Wills, 1985), leading to corresponding ethical behavioral decisions based on emotional resource balance. For the cognitive perspective, we utilize Moral Balance Theory, which proposes that individuals possess fundamental cognitions about moral self-approval and moral equilibrium. A morally relevant behavior causes moral self-approval to fluctuate, while moral equilibrium remains relatively static. When facing moral decisions, individuals consider the relationship between their current moral self-approval and moral equilibrium, making decisions that reduce this gap—this is moral balancing (Nisan & Horenczyk, 1990; Zhong, Ku, Lount, & Murnighan, 2010). We contend that with solid theoretical foundations, controlled boundary conditions, and appropriate research methods, a positive interactive relationship between OCB and CWB does exist.

3.1 The Influence Mechanism of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Counterproductive Work Behavior

Previous research has speculatively explored the internal logic of how OCB influences CWB (Spector & Fox, 2010a; Klotz & Bolino, 2013; Reynolds et al., 2015), but only one empirical study has confirmed this logic from a cognitive perspective (Yam et al., 2017). To more clearly delineate this influence mechanism, we provide an explanation based on the integrated emotion-cognition framework. At the emotional level, Conservation of Resource Theory explains OCB' s effect on CWB through the mediating role of negative emotion and the moderating role of situational judgment effectiveness. Engaging in OCB consumes limited resources (Bolino, Turnley, Gilstrap, & Suazo, 2010), breeding negative

emotions, which subsequently motivates individuals to restore resource balance through CWB. Situational judgment effectiveness represents a rational capacity to navigate complex environments (Chan, 2006), enabling individuals to correctly identify motivations for OCB, thereby mitigating resource depletion and its negative consequences. At the cognitive level, Moral Balance Theory explains this relationship through the mediating role of moral self-concept and the moderating role of joint reward systems. OCB represents cooperative behavior not required by formal roles; engaging in such behavior inflates moral self-concept (Aquino & Reed, 2002), subsequently licensing individuals to engage in CWB. A joint reward system is an incentive mechanism that encourages cross-functional collaboration (Gupta, Raj, & Wilemon, 1986); under high joint reward systems, individuals receive feedback for OCB engagement, weakening moral self-concept and constraining CWB. The conceptual model is illustrated in Figure 2 [Figure 2: see original paper].

3.1.1 Emotional Perspective Conservation of Resource Theory posits that individuals are motivated to obtain, conserve, and maintain resources (Hobfoll, 2001). When resources are threatened, lost, or investments fail, individuals experience psychological pressure (Hobfoll, 2001). The primary method for alleviating this pressure involves preventing further resource loss or increasing opportunities to acquire other resources. Resource loss affects not only material quality of life and psychological security but also inhibits individuals' sense of value existence.

According to Conservation of Resource Theory, individuals possess limited resource stores; engaging in OCB depletes available resources and may even affect normal work operations and career development (Bolino et al., 2010; Bolino, Harvey, & Bachrach, 2012; Bergeron, Shipp, Rosen, & Furst, 2013), thereby generating negative emotions. Bolino and Turnley (2005) also found that individual initiative leads to role overload, job stress, and work-family conflict. Under such pressure, individuals resort to CWB to restore resource conservation. On one hand, CWB can serve as a symbolic means to regain psychological control over resources; on the other hand, it helps individuals overcome performance obstacles. For instance, Nordan and Penney (2013) found that employees high in conscientiousness but low in agreeableness could facilitate shared tasks in low-performing teams through abrasive supervision (i.e., rude shouting), suggesting that CWB can help individuals manage resource threats. Therefore, we propose that Conservation of Resource Theory can explain why individuals engage in CWB after performing OCB from an emotional perspective, with negative emotion mediating the OCB-CWB relationship.

Additionally, we examine the moderating effect of situational judgment effectiveness—a trait reflecting individuals' general capacity to make effective judgments and respond to situations (Chan, 2006). This ability helps individuals make correct decisions amid situational opportunities and external constraints, yielding positive work outcomes (McDaniel, Morgeson, Finnegan, Campion, & Braver-

man, 2001; Chan & Schmitt, 2002). However, without proper judgment of real demands and situational constraints, good intentions may produce negative consequences. Chan (2006) found that when situational judgment effectiveness is low, proactive personality traits correlate positively with negative individual outcomes, such as reduced job satisfaction, performance, perceived supervisor support, social integration, and procedural justice. Individuals with low situational judgment effectiveness cannot effectively identify and respond to external situations; consequently, OCB engagement may generate unrealistic expectations and demands. When these expectations are unmet by the organization, psychological resources plummet, negative emotions emerge, and individuals resort to CWB to restore resource balance. Conversely, individuals with high situational judgment effectiveness view OCB as a long-term investment, preventing short-term negative emotions and unethical behavior. Thus, we propose that the effect of OCB on CWB is moderated by situational judgment effectiveness.

3.1.2 Cognitive Perspective Moral Balance Theory suggests that individuals strive to keep moral self-approval as close as possible to their moral equilibrium, balancing ethical behavioral decisions in this manner, with current behaviors nested within prior behaviors. If previous ethical behavior elevated moral self-approval beyond equilibrium levels, individuals feel licensed to engage in unethical behavior, thereby reducing moral self-approval back to equilibrium (Zhong et al., 2010; Klotz & Bolino, 2013)—this is the licensing effect of moral equilibrium.

OCB is inherently positive, but becomes more commendable when it is spontaneous, unexpected, oriented toward others' needs, and performed without expectation of reward or recognition (Krebs, 1970; Bar-tal, Raviv, & Leiser, 1980). Engaging in such morally noble behavior inflates individuals' cognition of their moral state, known as moral self-concept (Aquino & Reed, 2002). According to the licensing effect, individuals with inflated moral self-concept relax behavioral constraints, even self-licensing morally questionable behaviors such as tardiness, work slowdowns, or misappropriating organizational resources. Existing research supports this view, showing that credit accumulated from past moral behavior can license subsequent unethical behavior (Mazar & Zhong, 2010; Kouchaki, 2011; Cascio & Plant, 2015). Therefore, we propose that the licensing effect of Moral Balance Theory can explain why individuals engage in CWB after performing OCB, with moral self-concept mediating this relationship.

We also examine the moderating effect of joint reward systems—organizational incentive mechanisms designed to reward employees' cross-functional collaboration and effort (Gupta et al., 1986), manifested through verbal praise, training opportunities, promotion prospects, etc. Research confirms that joint reward systems facilitate interpersonal communication (Chimhanzi, 2004), reduce person-organization goal misalignment (Xie, Song, & Stringfellow, 2003), and alleviate organizational conflicts (Gupta et al., 1986; Chimhanzi, 2004). Generally, OCB is not incorporated into formal compensation and promotion systems,

making its benefits uncertain. However, this very public-spirited nature makes OCB performers more susceptible to moral labeling. Without joint reward system support, OCB engagement may more strongly activate moral self-concept, as unrewarded good deeds enhance moral self-approval, licensing greater CWB. Conversely, when OCB performers receive corresponding returns from joint reward systems, moral credit accumulation may be weakened, making OCB less likely to trigger moral self-concept and resulting in stronger self-constraint against CWB. Thus, we propose that the effect of OCB on CWB is moderated by joint reward systems.

3.2 The Influence Mechanism of Counterproductive Work Behavior on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

While previous research has speculatively discussed how CWB influences OCB (Spector & Fox, 2010b; Reynolds et al., 2015), and some empirical studies provide supporting evidence, direct empirical research revealing their logical relationship remains extremely limited (Ilies et al., 2013). To more systematically analyze how CWB affects OCB, we elaborate from the integrated emotion-cognition perspective. At the emotional level, Conservation of Resource Theory explains CWB' s effect on OCB through the mediating role of positive emotion and the moderating role of supervisor' s forgiveness. Engaging in CWB helps restore emotional resources (Krischer, Penney, & Hunter, 2010), improves positive emotions, and thereby stimulates more OCB. Supervisor's forgiveness represents organizational tolerance and understanding, which facilitates the accumulation and enhancement of positive emotions after CWB engagement, prompting OCB performance. At the cognitive level, Moral Balance Theory explains this relationship through the mediating role of guilt and the moderating role of attribution style. CWB violates fundamental ethical principles, and participation induces guilt; to restore moral balance, individuals subsequently engage in OCB as compensation (Tangney, Stuewig, & Mashek, 2007). Internal attribution leads individuals to ascribe CWB engagement to personal causes, triggering stronger guilt and motivating more OCB compensation. The conceptual model is illustrated in Figure 3 [Figure 3: see original paper].

3.2.1 Emotional Perspective Conservation of Resource Theory posits that to defend against potential future resource loss, individuals strive to acquire resources to create resource surplus (Hobfoll, 2001), which generates positive well-being perceptions (Rappaport, 1981; Cohen & Wills, 1985). Resource-rich individuals also invest resources, which requires mobilizing available resources or obtaining new resources from external systems to achieve resource exchange balance within larger social systems.

The harm of CWB to organizations is undeniable (Rotundo & Xie, 2008; Hershcovis & Barling, 2010), yet it is not entirely without function. CWB can serve as resistance to express dissatisfaction or attempt to resolve injustice, thereby venting negative emotions, protecting legitimate interests, and enhancing self-

confidence and self-esteem. According to Conservation of Resource Theory, engaging in CWB helps alleviate emotional exhaustion, restore work interest, and achieve emotional resource recovery (Krischer et al., 2010). Additionally, venting anger facilitates positive psychological improvement, and aggressive behavior can purify deep-seated hostility (Bushman & Baumeister, 2001). Bushman, Baumeister, and Stack (1999) confirmed that after attacking others or viewing violent scenes, individuals experience some recovery of positive emotions. We therefore infer that CWB engagement can improve and enhance positive emotions. The positive effect of positive emotions on OCB has been well-documented (Williams & Shiaw, 1999; Lee & Allen, 2002; Dalal, 2005). Thus, we propose that Conservation of Resource Theory can explain why individuals engage in OCB after perpetrating CWB from an emotional perspective, with positive emotion mediating the CWB-OCB relationship.

We also examine the moderating effect of supervisor' s forgiveness. Rooted in Western religious culture, forgiveness refers to the process by which offended parties intentionally choose to alleviate negative emotions and suppress retaliatory desires (Aquino, Grover, Goldman, & Folger, 2003). This study focuses on supervisors' forgiveness directed toward employees. Wallace, Exline, and Baumeister (2008) found that victims' forgiveness leads to offenders' self-forgiveness, which promotes positive emotions and prosocial responses. Fisher and Exline (2006) confirmed positive relationships between self-forgiveness and prosocial responses such as self-reflection and humility. Woodyatt and Wenzel (2013) also found that genuine self-forgiveness benefits both offenders and victims. For individuals, supervisor's forgiveness is perceived as organizational 包容 and understanding of their CWB engagement, which helps alleviate negative consequences, facilitates emotional resource accumulation and positive emotion enhancement, and prompts prosocial responses like OCB. Conversely, when supervisors withhold forgiveness, it may intensify subordinate-supervisor conflicts and even trigger a "devil-may-care" attitude, leading to tit-for-tat strategies. Therefore, we propose that the effect of CWB on OCB is moderated by supervisor' s forgiveness.

3.2.2 Cognitive Perspective Moral Balance Theory suggests that unethical behavior reduces moral self-approval; to regain self-worth and restore moral balance, individuals are more likely to engage in behaviors that demonstrate their core values to repair the damage caused by ethical violations—this is the compensation effect of moral balance (Tetlock, Kristel, Elson, Green, & Lerner, 2000). Zhong and Liljenquist (2006) found that individuals who experienced threats to their moral self-image (e.g., through lying) 倾向于 engaging in physical cleansing behaviors to achieve psychological purification.

The core characteristic of CWB is harming organizational interests, which violates fundamental workplace ethical principles (Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Generally unacceptable in mainstream work environments, CWB engagement places individuals in moral dilemmas, reduces moral self-approval, and generates guilt. Guilt represents a generalized expectation of

self-regulation and self-punishment (Mosher, 1965; Tangney, 1990). According to the compensation effect, to restore moral balance, individuals actively adopt compensatory behaviors such as OCB (Tangney et al., 2007; Silfver, 2007; Leng, Wang, Gao, & Li, 2015). Flynn and Schaumberg (2012) confirmed that guilt enhances organizational attachment, motivating greater affective commitment and work effort. Ilies et al. (2013) constructed a dynamic restoration model to explain compensatory behavior resulting from guilt. Therefore, we propose that the compensation effect of Moral Balance Theory can explain why individuals engage in OCB after perpetrating CWB, with guilt mediating the CWB-OCB relationship.

We also examine the moderating effect of attribution style—individuals' habitual tendencies to explain the causes of events, which can be categorized as internal or external attribution (Heider, 1958). Internally attributing individuals believe they are the cause of their behavioral outcomes, regardless of success or failure; externally attributing individuals believe outcomes result from factors beyond their control. Research has confirmed that CWB antecedents are diverse, including active and passive, internal and external, and controllable and uncontrollable factors (Spector & Fox, 2010b). Perrewé and Zellars (1999) explained how attributions affect emotions and behaviors, noting that internal, controllable attributions trigger guilt. According to the compensation effect, when individuals attribute CWB engagement to internal, controllable factors, the resulting guilt cognition is stronger, and guilt precisely motivates positive compensatory behavior (i.e., OCB). Conversely, when individuals attribute CWB to external, uncontrollable factors, they experience less guilt and are less likely to engage in compensatory behavior. Thus, we propose that the effect of CWB on OCB is moderated by attribution style.

4. Conclusion and Future Directions

Over the past three decades, OCB and CWB have received sustained academic attention (Bolino, Hsiung, Harvey, & LePine, 2015; Reynolds et al., 2015). Due to evolving research perspectives and measurement methods, their relationship has transformed from opposite poles of a continuum, to independent negative correlation, to moderate positive correlation under specific circumstances, demonstrating considerable complexity. Moreover, direct empirical research remains extremely scarce (Yam et al., 2017), allowing us only glimpses of their relationship from related studies without achieving comprehensive understanding. In response, this study constructs an integrated emotion-cognition framework based on Conservation of Resource Theory and Moral Balance Theory to systematically explain the interactive mechanisms between OCB and CWB. Our propositions further reveal their internal associations, providing theoretical foundations for effective intervention strategies. We suggest future research proceed along four avenues:

First, explore boundary mechanisms of their interactive relationship through empirical research. "Good soldiers" may rot into "bad apples,"

while "bad apples" may transform into "good soldiers," suggesting a positive interactive relationship between OCB and CWB (Spector & Fox, 2010a; Klotz & Bolino, 2013). Why do some individuals correct their mistakes while others persist in wrongdoing? Perhaps boundary conditions render their interactive relationship more complex. This study constructed an interactive mechanism model based on an emotion-cognition integration framework and speculatively discussed boundary conditions, but this is insufficient. Understanding the OCB-CWB relationship solely through emotional and cognitive perspectives may still be too narrow. Moreover, the boundary effects of variables discussed herein require empirical verification.

Second, verify their interactive relationship using multiple research methods. Evidence suggests that most previous studies failed to exclude measurement artifacts, potentially leading to misconceptions about the OCB-CWB relationship (Dalal, 2005; Fox et al., 2012). Future research could employ three methods: (1) use scales with non-semantically-opposite items (Spector et al., 2006) and conduct self-report surveys across multiple time periods; (2) adopt experience sampling methods from a within-person perspective to capture variables' true existence and interrelationships in complex contexts (Sun, Yan, & Chu, 2014); and (3) use experimental methods with situational controls to collect participants' emotional and behavioral responses at different time points, thereby verifying their interactive relationship.

Third, examine dynamic changes in their relationship using Latent Growth Models. Human psychology and behavior are dynamic processes that continuously change over time, a perspective repeatedly validated in organizational socialization research (Ashforth & Saks, 1996). We speculate that the OCB-CWB relationship may also exhibit such dynamic changes. Latent Growth Models can evaluate changes across variable levels while simultaneously estimating group and individual variation in developmental processes (Meredith & Tisak, 1990). By collecting actual measurements of OCB and CWB at different time points, we can estimate the latent structure' s initial level and slope, then model the relationship between these change parameters. Applying Latent Growth Models to examine dynamic OCB-CWB changes represents an important future research direction.

Fourth, explore management practice strategies for their interactive relationship. For management practice, this study aims to illuminate how to prevent "good soldiers" from corrupting into "bad apples" while promoting the transformation of "bad apples" into "good soldiers" —a pressing practical issue. We speculatively explained the moderating roles of situational judgment effectiveness, joint reward systems, supervisor' s forgiveness, and attribution style. Future research could explore management practice strategies along these lines, such as conducting situational judgment effectiveness training, optimizing joint reward systems, implementing forgiveness management, and guiding proper attribution styles. Of course, positive management interventions extend beyond these; we might also consider corporate culture building and performance feed-

back management (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996; O' Regan & Ghobadian, 2005), all of which could help prevent "good soldier" corruption or promote "bad apple" transformation.

References

Guo, W., Yang, J., & Fu, J. (2015). The impact of perceived organizational support and organizational justice on counterproductive work behavior: The mediating role of organizational cynicism. *Chinese Journal of Management*, 12(4), 530–537.

Leng, B., Wang, X., Gao, H., & Li, F. (2015). The cognitive and emotional activities of guilt and their brain regulation. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 23(12), 2126–2134.

Liu, W., Jing, R., Li, G., & Tang, J. (2014). Employees' Big Five personality traits, organizational ethical climate and counterproductive work behavior: A cross-level examination. *Management Review*, 26(11), 141–151.

Peng, Z., Liang, D., & Zhao, H. (2011). Leader-member exchange and knowledge workers' counterproductive work behavior: The moderating role of Chinese traditionality. *Journal of Intelligence*, 30(4), 196–200.

Shen, Y., Yuan, D., Zhang, H., Yang, D., Zhang, J., & Zhang, Q. (2009). The effects of two types of social exchange on organizational citizenship behavior: The different roles of organizational identification and self-esteem needs. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 41(12), 1215–1227.

Sun, X., Yan, M., & Chu, X. (2014). Bad mood and work behavior: The cross-level moderating role of Zhongyong thinking. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 59(11), 1704–1718.

Tang, Y. (2005). Team psychological safety, organizational citizenship behavior, and team innovation: An empirical analysis of a mediated transmission model. *Nankai Business Review*, 8(6), 24–29.

Wang, H., Ding, Z., & Liu, W. (2018). The impact of spiritual leadership on knowledge sharing: The mediating role of perceived insider status. *Luojia Management Review*, 12(3), 115–129.

Wang, Z., Sun, J., & Zhang, R. (2012). The effect of managers' core self-evaluation on subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior: The roles of ethical leadership and collectivism orientation. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 57(9), 1231–1243.

Zhao, J., Liao, J., & Zhang, Y. (2014). The impact of evaluative performance appraisal on workplace deviance: Examining the roles of job satisfaction and Machiavellianism. *Economic Management*, 36(3), 63–76.

Aquino, K., Grover, S.L., Goldman, B., & Folger, R. (2003). When push doesn' t come to shove: Interpersonal forgiveness in workplace relationships. *Journal*

of Management Inquiry, 12(3), 209–216.

Aquino, K., & Reed, A. (2002). The self-importance of moral identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(6), 1423–1440.

Ashforth, B.K., & Saks, A.M. (1996). Socialization tactics: Longitudinal effects on newcomer adjustment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(1), 149–178.

Bar-tal, D., Raviv, A., & Leiser, T. (1980). The development of altruistic behavior: Empirical evidence. *Developmental Psychology*, 16(5), 516–524.

Bateman, T.S., & Organ, D.W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 587–595.

Bennett, R.J., & Stamper, C. L. (2001). Corporate citizenship and deviancy: A study of work behavior. In C. Galbraith, & M. Ryan (Eds.), *International research in the business disciplines: Strategies and organizations in transition* (pp. 265–284). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.

Bennett, R.J., & Robinson, S.L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 349–360.

Bergeron, D.M., Shipp, A.J., Rosen, B., & Furst, S.A. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior and career outcomes: The cost of being a good citizen. *Journal of Management*, 39(4), 958–984.

Bolino, M.C., Klotz, A.C., Turnley, W.H., & Harvey, J. (2013). Exploring the dark side of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(4), 542–559.

Bolino, M.C., Harvey, J., & Bachrach, D.G. (2012). A self-regulation approach to understanding citizenship behavior in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 119(1), 126–139.

Bolino, M.C., Hsiung, H.H., Harvey, J., & LePine, J.A. (2015). "Well, i' m tired of tryin!" organizational citizenship behavior and citizenship fatigue. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(1), 56–74.

Bolino, M.C., & Turnley, W.H. (2005). The personal costs of citizenship behavior: The relationship between individual initiative and role overload, job stress, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(4), 740–748.

Bolino, M.C., Turnley, W.H., Gilstrap, J.B., & Suazo, M.M. (2010). Citizenship under pressure: What' s a "good soldier" to do? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(6), 835–855.

Borman, W.C., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 99–109.

Bushman, B.J., & Baumeister, R.F. (2001). Do people aggress to improve their mood? Catharsis beliefs, affect regulation opportunity, and aggressive

responding. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 81(1), 17–32.

Bushman, B.J., Baumeister, R.F., & Stack, A.D. (1999). Catharsis, aggression, and persuasive influence: Self-fulfilling or self-defeating prophecies? *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 76(3), 367–376.

Cascio, J., & Plant, E.A. (2015). Prospective moral licensing: Does anticipating doing good later allow you to be bad now? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 56(1), 110–116.

Chan, D. (2006). Interactive effects of situational judgment effectiveness and proactive personality on work perceptions and work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(2), 475–481.

Chan, D., & Schmitt, N. (2002). Situational judgment and job performance. *Human Performance*, 15(3), 233–254.

Chawla, V. (2014). The effect of workplace spirituality on salespeople' s organizational deviant behaviors: Research propositions and practical implications. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 29(3), 199–208.

Chimhanzi, J. (2004). The impact of integration mechanisms on marketing/HR dynamics. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 20(7–8), 713–740.

Clark, M.S., & Fiske, S.T. (1982). *Affect and cognition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cohen, S., & Wills, T.A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98(2), 310–357.

Colquitt, J.A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386–400.

Dalal, R.S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1241–1255.

Dalal, R.S., Lam, H., Weiss, H.M., Welch, E.R., & Hulin, C.L. (2009). A within-person approach to work behavior and performance: Concurrent and lagged citizenship-counterproductivity associations, and dynamic relationships with affect and overall job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(5), 1051–1066.

Duffy, M.K., Ganster, D.C., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(2), 331–352.

Dunlop, P.D., & Lee, K. (2004). Workplace deviance, organizational citizenship behavior, and business unit performance: The bad apples do spoil the whole barrel. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(1), 67–80.

Felps, W., Mitchell, T.R., & Byington, E. (2006). How, when, and why bad apples spoil the barrel: Negative group members and dysfunctional groups. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 27(6), 175–222.

Fisher, M.L., & Exline, J.J. (2006). Self-forgiveness versus excusing: The roles of remorse, effort, and acceptance of responsibility. *Self & Identity*, 5(2), 127–146.

Flynn, F.J., & Schaumberg, R.L. (2012). When feeling bad leads to feeling good: Guilt-proneness and affective organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(1), 124–133.

Fox, S. Spector, P.E., Goh, A., Bruursema, K., & Kessler, S.R. (2012). The deviant citizen: Measuring potential positive relations between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 85(1), 199–220.

Gupta, A.K., Raj, S.P., & Wilemon, D. (1986). A model for studying R&D-marketing interface in the product innovation process. *Journal of Marketing*, 50(2), 7–17.

Harper, D. (1990). Spotlight abuse-save profits. *Industrial Distribution*, 79(3), 47–51.

Harris, T.B., Li, N., & Kirkman, B.L. (2014). Leader-member exchange (LMX) in context: How LMX differentiation and LMX relational separation attenuate LMX' s influence on OCB and turnover intention. *Leadership Quarterly*, 25(2), 314–328.

Heckert, A., & Heckert, D.M. (2002). A new typology of deviance: Integrating normative and reactivist definitions of deviance. *Deviant Behavior*, 23(5), 449–479.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley.

Hershcovis, M.S., & Barling, J. (2010). Towards a multi-foci approach to workplace aggression: A meta-analytic review of outcomes from different perpetrators. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(1), 24–44.

Hobfoll, S.E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513–524.

Hobfoll, S.E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50(3), 337–421.

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

Ilies, R., Scott, B.A., & Judge, T.A. (2006). The interactive effects of personal traits and experienced states on intraindividual patterns of citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(3), 561–575.

Judge, T.A. Scott, B.A., & Ilies, R. (2006). Hostility, job attitudes, and workplace deviance: Test of a multilevel model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1),

126–138.

Klotz, A.C., & Bolino, M.C. (2013). Citizenship and counterproductive work behavior: A moral licensing view. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(2), 292–306.

Kluger, A.N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119(2), 254–284.

Kouchaki, M. (2011). Vicarious moral licensing: The influence of others' past moral actions on moral behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(4), 702–715.

Krebs, D.L. (1970). Altruism: An examination of the concept and a review of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 3(4), 258–302.

Krischer, M.M., Penney, L.M., & Hunter, E.M. (2010). Can counterproductive work behaviors be productive? CWB as emotion-focused coping. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(2), 154–166.

Lau, V.C.S., Au, W.T., & Ho, J.M.C. (2003). A qualitative and quantitative review of antecedents of counterproductive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 18(1), 73–99.

Law, R., Dollard, M.F., Tuckey, M.R., & Dormann, C. (2011). Psychosocial safety climate as a lead indicator of workplace bullying and harassment, job resources, psychological health and employee engagement. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 43(5), 1782–1793.

Lee, K., & Allen, N.J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 131–142.

Marcus, B., & Schuler, H. (2004). Antecedents of counterproductive behavior at work: A general perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(4), 647–660.

Martinko, M.J., Harvey, P., Sikora, D., Brees, J.R., & Mackey, J. (2013). A review of abusive supervision research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(S1), 120–137.

Mazar, N., & Zhong, C.B. (2010). Do green products make us better people? *Psychological Science*, 21(4), 494–498.

McDaniel, M.A., Morgeson, F.P., Finnegan, E.B., Campion, M.A., & Braverman, E.P. (2001). Use of situational judgment tests to predict job performance: A clarification of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(4), 730–740.

Meredith, W., & Tisak, J. (1990). Latent curve analysis. *Psychometrika*, 55(1), 107–122.

Miles, D.E., Borman, W.E., Spector, P.E., & Fox, S. (2002). Building an integrative model of extra role work behaviors: A comparison of counterproductive

work behavior with organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment*, 10(1&2), 51–57.

Moorman, R.H., Blakely, G.L., & Niehoff, B.P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior? *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(3), 351–357.

Mosher, D.L. (1965). Interaction of fear and guilty in inhibiting unacceptable behavior. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 29(2), 161.

Nisan, M., & Horenczyk, G. (1990). Moral balance: The effect of prior behavior on decision in moral conflict. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 29(1), 29–42.

Nordan, A., & Penney, L.M. (2013, August). Nice guys finish last: CWB and the pursuit of performance goals. In M.K. Shoss, & L.M. Penney (Chairs), *Understanding motives for counterproductive work behaviors*. Symposium presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Orlando, FL.

O' Boyle, E.H., Humphrey, R.H., Pollack, J.M., Hawver, T.H., & Story. P.A. (2011). The relation between emotional intelligence and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(5), 788–818.

O' Brien, K.E., & Allen, T.D. (2007). The relative importance of correlates of organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior using multiple sources of data. *Human Performance*, 21(1), 62–88.

O' Regan, N., & Ghobadian, A. (2005). Innovation in SMEs: The impacts of strategic orientation and environmental perceptions. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 54(2), 81–97.

Organ, D.W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It' s construct clean-up time. *Human performance*, 2(10), 85–97.

Perrewé, P.L., & Zellars, K.L. (1999). An examination of attributions and emotions in the transactional approach to the organizational stress process. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(5), 739–752.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B., & Bachrach, D.G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513–563.

Rappaport, J. (1981). In praise of paradox: A social policy of empowerment over prevention. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 9(1), 1–25.

Reynolds, C.A., Shoss, M.K., & Jundt, D.K. (2015). In the eye the beholder: A multi-stakeholder perspective of organizational citizenship and counterproductive work behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 25(1), 80–93.

Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant work-place behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555–572.

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

Rotundo, M, & Xie, J.L. (2008). Understanding the domain of counterproductive work behavior in china. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(5), 856–877.

Sachdeva, S., Iliev, R., & Medin, D.L. (2009). Sinning saints and saintly sinners the paradox of moral self-regulation. *Psychological Science*, 20(4), 523–528.

Sackett, P.R., Berry, C.M., & Laczo, R.M. (2006). Citizenship and counterproductive behavior: Clarifying relations between the two domains. *Human Performance*, 19(4), 441–464.

Shin, Y. (2012). CEO ethical leadership, ethical climate, climate strength, and collective organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 108(3), 299–312.

Silfver, M. (2007). Coping with guilt and shame: A narrative approach. *Journal of Moral Education*, 36(2), 169–183.

Spector, P.E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(2), 269–292.

Spector, P.E., & Fox, S. (2010a). Counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: Are they opposite forms of active behavior? *Applied Psychology*, 59(1), 21–39.

Spector, P.E., & Fox, S. (2010b). Theorizing about the deviant citizen: An attributional explanation of the interplay of organizational citizenship and counterproductive work behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20(2), 132–143.

Spector, P.E., Fox, S., Penney, L.M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(3), 446–460.

Tangney, J.P. (1990). Assessing individual differences in proneness to shame and guilt: Development of the self-conscious affect and attribution inventory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(1), 102–111.

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

Tetlock, P.E., Kristel, O.V., Elson, S.B., Green, M.C., & Lerner, J.S. (2000). The psychology of the unthinkable: Taboo trade-offs, forbidden base rates, and heretical counterfactuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(5), 853–870.

Venkataramani, V., & Dalal, R.S. (2007). Who helps and harms whom? Relational antecedents of interpersonal helping and harming in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 952–966.

Wallace, H.M., Exline, J.J., & Baumeister, R.F. (2008). Interpersonal consequences of forgiveness: Does forgiveness deter or encourage repeat offenses? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44(2), 453–460.

Werner, J.M. (2006). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences. *Personnel Psychology*, 59(2), 484–487.

Williams, S., & Shiaw, W.T. (1999). Mood and organizational citizenship behavior: The effects of positive affect on employee organizational citizenship behavior intentions. *Journal of Psychology*, 133(6), 656–668.

Woodyatt, L., & Wenzel, M. (2013). Self-forgiveness and restoration of an offender following an interpersonal transgression. *Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology*, 32(2), 225–239.

Xie, J., Song, M., & Stringfellow, A. (2003). Antecedents and consequences of goal incongruity on new product development in five countries: A marketing view. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 20(3), 233–250.

Xu, E., Huang, X., Lam, C.K., & Miao, Q. (2012). Abusive supervision and work behaviors: The mediating role of LMX. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(4), 531–543.

Yam, K.C., Klotz, A., He, W., & Reynolds, S.J. (2017). From good soldiers to psychologically entitled: Examining when and why citizenship behavior leads to deviance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(1), 373–396.

Zhong, C.B., Ku, G., Lount, R.B., & Murnighan, J.K. (2010). Compensatory ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 92(3), 323–339.

Zhong, C.B., & Liljenquist, K. (2006). Washing away your sins: Threatened morality and physical cleansing. *Science*, 313(5792), 1451–1452.

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.