

Conceptual Challenge to Understand Envy: A Review

Sangeeta Malik

Abstract

Envy is a universal aspect of everyday life. We only reluctantly acknowledge the inhibiting and destructive aspects of this emotion in the workplace. The author has examined the conceptual challenges associated with studying envy. This conceptual paper attempts to clarify the concept of envy for business research from a situational perspective. Thereto, it integrates research on envy from various scientific disciplines i.e., from philosophy, anthropology, evolutionary and social psychology to political thought and introduces a novel, conceptually distinction in the four notions of envy, proper, benign envy, spite, and jealousy. Considering the power and ubiquity of envy, envy implies hostility, we generally view it as a dangerous emotion, capable of disrupting interpersonal relations and triggering hostility, Thereby, it lays the groundwork for further analysis of the phenomenon of envy in business research.

Key words: Envy, Jealousy, Conceptualization.

INTRODUCTION

Envy is an unpleasant, often painful emotion characterizes by feelings of inferiority, hostility, and resentment produced by an awareness of another person or group of persons who enjoy a desired possession (object, social position, attribute, or quality of being; e.g. Parrott, 1991; Parrott & Smith, 1993). Envy, however, creates a drive in people to try and outdo their peers. Envy derives from a mix of emotional insecurity competitiveness, resentment and dissatisfaction with a situation. The resentment comes from a belief that others have something that we ourselves think we should have or are capable of attaining. Without the resentment, envy would just be desire. Our desires can certainly cause us to feel discontentment, without necessarily stirring up envy inside of us, so the crucial component of envy is the resentment factor.

Envy has long been a subject of debate in various disciplines of philosophy such as (see for example D'Arms & Kerr, 2008; Gillmann, 1996 or Schoeck, 1966 for an overview),

Dr. Sangeeta Malik

Professor

MAIMS, GGISPU, Delhi

sangeetamalik.maims@gmail.com

Anthropology (see for example Lindholm, 2008), and evolutionary (Hill & Buss, 2008) and social psychology (Smith & Kim, 2007) to political thought (Russell, 1930; Schoeck, 1966) and Economics (Zizzo, 2008; Kolm, 1995). However, it has not received significant attention in the management literature (Mishra, 2009), as have emotions in general (see Delgado-Garcia & De La Fuente-Sabte, 2010 for the review of the extant empirical work). This is despite the fact that envy can have important influences on many topics relevant to management research. These topics include individual workplace behavior (Vecchio, 2000; Duffy, Shaw & Schaubroeck, 2008; Mishra, 2009) to managerial decision making (Lister, 2001; Goel & Thakor, 2005; Moran & Schweitzer, 2008), consumer behavior (Young & Rubicam EMEA; Belk, 2008) and even the theory of the firm (Nickerson & Zenzer, 2008).

The literature on envy is relatively sparse. Important thought limited psychoanalytic contributions began in the early 1920's with the work of Abraham (1921), Eisler (1921), and Klein (1928, 1932). Joan Riviere (1932, 1952) in London discussed envy, Jealousy, and the negative therapeutic reaction, the paradoxical impasse arising in some analytic situations. Sigmund Freud's principal contribution was his idea of penis envy as part of female psychological development (1908, 1914a, 1925, 1933a, 1937). The psychological literature over the last decade and a half has generated some important work on envy.

The few researchers who have studied envy at workplace, have taken diverse theoretical perspectives (Vidaillet, 2007). Stein (2000, 2005) and Vidaillet (2007) have taken a psychoanalytic perspective that emphasizes the unconscious aspect of the emotion; this perspective describes the internal workings of the minds of the envious, and argues that the emotion develops very early in childhood through dependency on the mother's breast. American psychologists have recently consolidated the few studies made during the last two decades, and produced a remarkable collection reviewing findings from a broad range of disciplines. In these valuable studies, the more conscious aspects of envy is

discussed. Patient, Lawrence, and Maitlis (2003) attempted to understand workplace envy from a social constructionist perspective through the analysis of a narrative fiction – Richard Russo's novel, *Straight Man*. Schaubroeck and Lam (2004) and Vecchio (1997, 2000, 2005) have adopted the social psychology perspective and studied envy using self-report questionnaires. Vecchio – with his multiple publications on the subject – is the management scholar who has published the most on envy. He defines envy not just as an emotion, but as a "pattern of thoughts, emotions, and behaviors." The conceptualization of envy as an amalgamation of emotions, thoughts, and behaviors has serious limitations, the biggest being the danger of relationships in a nomological network to become tautological (Popper, 1959, 1963).

Envy is considered as a dangerous emotion that may drive to dramatic issues such as violent acts, aggressions or even crimes (Glick, 2002; Schoeck, 1969). In addition, envy is considered as a negative emotion (e.g. the Bible considers envy as one of the Seven Sins) and thus socially condemned and highly refrained in almost all societies. Envy is a complex and puzzling emotion. It is very commonly charged with being (either typically or universally) unreasonable, irrational, imprudent, vicious, or wrong to feel. With very few exceptions, the ample philosophical literature defending the rationality and evaluative importance of emotions explicitly excludes envy and a few other nasty emotions as irredeemable. Most philosophers who have sought to define envy agree in identifying it as a form of distress felt by the subject at the thought that he does not possess the good and the rival does. Indeed, some authors who are prepared to defend even jealousy insist that envy is beyond the pale. Yet there is considerable controversy over what precisely envy is, and the cogency of various specific criticisms of envy depends on what view of that subject is adopted. In addition to its centrality to discussions in the philosophy of emotions, envy has sparked controversies in political philosophy. Perhaps best known among these is the claim that egalitarian views of justice are motivated by envy. It also receives substantial treatment from John Rawls, who

takes pains to argue that envy does not pose a threat to his theory of justice. Although the religious teachings also aim at preventing the enmity & aggression believed to be associated with envy (Aquaro, 2004; Foster, 1972)

Envy is wrong and dangerous in religious terms because it is in essence a statement of secularism. Only by denying God's divine system of distribution may mere mortal dare to desire someone else's good fortune. The feeling rely on belief in secular system by which good fortune should be distributed among people. Because justice is an important secular system of distribution, expressing one's desire for another party's fortune in terms of injustice serves to add psychological and moral force to one's claim (Mikula, 1993; Miller, 2001; Lind & Tyler 1988).

The Philosophical debate of Envy emphasizes the importance of social comparisons in generating several major emotions (e.g. emulation, pity). Aristotle presents social comparisons as the core of envy: without comparisons no envy can arise. Several philosophers picture envy as a destructive emotion insisting on its ugly side (D'Arms, 2002; D'Arms and Kerr, 2008; Kant, 1986; Thomas Aquinas, 1981). In spite of the ubiquity of envy in social systems, it has until recently been virtually ignored in the social sciences outside of psychology (Kets de Vries 1992; Stein 2000).

Workplace envy, in particular, has generally received little scholarly attention (Ashforth and Humphrey 1995). This is despite the fact that envy is present in the workplace and a natural result of the assignment of limited organizational resources (Bedeian 1995; Cohen-Charash 2000) and the frequent opportunities individuals have of comparing themselves unfavorably to their peers. One reason that workplace envy may have been overlooked, is that, it is often less visible than other strong emotions, perhaps because envy, and the feelings of inferiority and resentment associated with it, are seen as socially disgraceful. Because of its typically covert nature, envy may go unaddressed in organizations. This is in spite of the fact that it can significantly undermine individual and group performance, potentially

leading to job dissatisfaction, supervisor dissatisfaction, and a tendency to quit (Duffy and Shaw 2000). Reviewing the literature about envy in general, and envy in the workplace in particular, reveals that the topic of envy is gaining increasing recognition and importance, and attracts higher levels of attention in comparison to where we were several years ago.

It seems that one of the problems of management research on envy is that different research projects use different terms and conceptualizations of envy, be they explicit or only implicit. Some researchers are generally skeptical whether a unanimously accepted definition of what envy constitutes exactly will ever emerge (Harris & Salovey, 2008). However, the problem is not so much whether everyone will agree to the same meaning of the term "envy", but rather everyone making explicit their understanding of the term. This limits the comparability of existing research and hinders the aggregation of findings. To facilitate this, this paper attempts to conceptualize envy and related phenomena for management research.

NATURE OF ENVY

Envy, the unpleasant emotion that can arise when people compare unfavorably with others, is a common experience for most people regardless of culture (e.g. Foster, 1972; Schoeck, 1969; Teitelbaum, 1976; Walcot, 1978). One reason that envy is important to understand is that it appears to be a hostile emotion that often prompts aggressive behaviors. Its antagonistic nature is exemplified by the many publicized crimes (e.g. Schoeck, 1969; Thernstrom, 1998) and intergroup conflicts (e.g. Beck, 1999; Glick, 2002) attributed to it; the countless literary tales of assassination, murder, and sabotage provoked by it (e.g. De la Mora, 1987; Schoeck, 1969). Envy derives from a mix of emotional insecurity competitiveness, resentment and dissatisfaction with a situation. In psychological literature, envy defined as an unpleasant emotion that is experienced when a person compares oneself with another person or group of persons who enjoy a desired possession, social position, attribute, or quality of being (Parrott, 1991; Parrott & Smith, 1993; Smith & Kim, 2007).

SITUATION CONCEPTUALIZATION OF ENVY

Three different ways of interpreting envy are conceivable, a dispositional, a phenomenological or a situational approach (Salovey, 1991). The dispositional approach understands envy as a person's sensitivity to envy-provoking situations and their tendency to harbor envious feelings. The phenomenological approach focuses on the specific feelings that people encounter when experiencing envy. The situational approach, in contrast, center on the question which kinds of situations can arouse envy in individuals and what their desires in such situations are.

When one disentangles the different ideas of envy that can be found in the literature, principally four different situations and corresponding terms describing them emerge. These are envy proper, benign envy, spite, and jealousy.

First, there is what is being referred to as "envy Proper" (Smith & Kim, 2007, p.47), "Malicious envy" (Parrott, 1991, pp. 9-12), or "destructive" or "Black envy" (Grolleau, Mzoughi & Sutan, 2006, p. 5). It describes the phenomenon that a person who made a disadvantageous comparison to another person has a desire to move his or her relative disadvantage by making the comparison person worse off to overcome his or her feelings of inferiority. Malicious envy employs a very different system of thought: if someone you've deemed junior to you suddenly gets an object you want, you wish to prove your superiority by degrading their new possession. Malicious envy occurs if the other person is thought to be undeserving; it evokes a desire to "pull down" the other person. Maliciously envious people feel frustrated and try to level the difference with the superior others by pulling those others down. Elster says that such envy comes in two forms, namely weak and strong envy. Weak envy, on the one hand, implies that the disadvantaged person enjoys seeing the other person's welfare diminished but is not willing to incur a cost for this to happen. Strong envy, on the other hand, implies that a person is

willing to incur a personal cost in order to have the other's welfare reduced (Elster, 1991). The latter constitutes the more common case and represents a trade-off between absolute and relative standing. An example of strong envy proper would be a company owner who exits a joint venture even though it was profitable for him only because the joint venture partner made even greater gains.

The second is called the "benign envy" (Smith & Kim, 2008, p. 3, Smith & Kim, 2007, p. 47), "non-malicious envy" (Parrott, 1991, pp. 9-12), "Competitive" or "white envy" (Grolleau et al., 2006, p. 5), or "emulation" (Elster, 1991, p. 49; Miceli & Castelfranchi, 2007, p. 473). This concept refers to the reaction of a person that realizes his or her inferiority as compared to another person and develops the desire to eliminate this discrepancy by improving his or her own position with regard to the dimension of comparison. Benign envy exists if the advantage of the other person is deserved, and motivates people to attain a coveted good or position for themselves. This more motivating type of envy makes people pay an envy premium for those products that elicited envy. Benignly envious people also feel frustrated, but they try to level the difference by moving themselves up. It is important to note here that both types of envy are not associated with a motivation to be like the other, but rather they motivate behavior to solve the inequality by increasing one's own (benign envy) or decreasing the other's relative standing (malicious envy). it's destructive; it can both make people unhappy in themselves and it can drive them to destroy the object of their envy. Some scholars, however, argue that this phenomenon does not really represent envy, as true envy does require some form of ill will directed towards the envied person (Smith & Kim, 2007, p. 47; D'Arms & Kerr, 2008, pp. 45-48).

Third, there is the phenomenon of "Spite" (Elster, 1991, p. 54), sometime also referred to as "nastiness" (Abbink & Sadrieh, 2009, p. 306). Spite is the desire of one person to make another person worse off not to regain parity, but to gain superiority. While envy wants to eliminate

another's superiority, spite wishes for his or her inferiority. Normally, envy tends to bring spite with it (Elster, 1991). Similar to envy, spite can also be weak and strong, depending on whether the one person is willing to incur a cost to see the another person be made inferior (Elster, 1991). An example for weak spite would be a situation in which a manager is happy to see another colleague being demoted, while at the same time not being willing to incur a personal cost to make it happen.

A similar distinction is made when the terms "general envy" and "particular envy" are used (Rawls, 1999, p. 466). Whenever the object of envy that causes the discrepancy in standing between the two persons comparing is unique, envy and spite naturally coincide. Such an object can for example be a position in a ranking. If the person ranked second envies the person ranked first, the desire to gain first place naturally requires the other person to lose first place.

Another definitional challenge concerns how envy differs from jealousy (Bedeian, 1995; Foster, 1972; Guerrero & Andersen, 1998; Neu, 1980; Parrott, 1991; Parrott & Smith, 1993; Russell, 1930; Salovey & Rodin, 1986; Schoeck, 1969; Silver & Sabini, 1978; R.H. Smith et al., 1988). Although the word is oftentimes used synonymously with envy in colloquial language, it refers to a genuinely distinct concept (Foster, 1972; Salovey & Rothman, 1991, Smith & Kim, 2007; Salovey & Rothman, 1991). While envy relates to the desire to remove someone's superiority, jealousy refers to the fear of losing one's superiority to somebody else (Miceli & Caetelfranchi, 2007; Smith & Kim, 2007). The two phenomena are interlinked in that when one person realizes that he or she might become jealous for that very reason. Jealousy is always the fear that the object of jealousy is being transferred from the jealous person to another, not merely being lost by one person. Like envy, jealousy is also an unpleasant emotion; however, it is experienced only when there is threat of a loss of an important relationship with another person (called the "partner") to a rival (Parrott, 1991; Parrott & Smith, 1993; Salovey & Rothman, 1991). Envy and jealousy result from different

situations, generate distinct appraisals, and produce distinct emotional experiences.

Most people may readily acknowledge their feelings of pride, shame, and guilt rather than discussing about jealousy that they possessed, even though the feeling is considered normal & experienced by every person (Bedeian, 1995). This is because envy and jealousy have been always been portrayed as a feeling related to hostility and aggression. Both emotions are viewed as dangerous, capable to disrupt interpersonal relations and trigger violence.

LOCUS OF ENVY

Why is it that another people's advantage can make people feel this painful, socially abhorrent feeling? Perhaps the most telling answer to why we envy is that the advantages enjoyed by other people often have potent consequences for the self, as a long tradition of empirical work shows (e.g. Buunk & Gibbons, 1997; Festinger, 1954; Mussweiler, 2003; Smith, Diener, & Wedell, 1989; Suls & Miller, 1977; Suls & Wheeler, 2000). Relative standing usually contributes much to deciding who gains the prized things in life. Social comparisons also help form the foundations for inferences about the self (Festinger, 1954). The usual potent consequences of social comparisons for tangible outcomes and for self-evaluation, noticing another person's relative advantage, logically, should lead to some sort of negative feelings (Smith, 2000). Empirical research found strong support for this claim regarding Envy (Bers & Rodin, 1984; Salovey & Rodin, 1984, 1991; Tesser & Smith, 1980). For example, Bers & Rodin found younger children, who do not distinguished between important & non-important situations becomes envious in all situation in which another child was better than they were in a domain that was important to them. With adult Salovey and Rodin (1991) found that males are envious more of wealth & females of attractiveness these gender differences are consistent with the idea that people envy what is important to them. From an evolutionary viewpoint wealth is important for males to be selected for sexual

reproduction while attractiveness is more important for women (Hill & Buss, 2008).

OBJECTS OF ENVY

People can envy all others who are better than them in an important domain, research has shown that we mainly do so for people similar to us (Salovey & Rodin, 1984; Schaubroeck & Lam, 2004; Tesser, 1991; Tesser & Smith, 1980). Early philosophers already had similar ideas: Aristotle (1954) thought that we would envy those close in time, place, age, or reputation. Bacon (1597) and Kant (1780/1997) considered this likely to be because people only tend to compare themselves with similar others. We seek out to attend, and are affected by social comparison with people who share comparison related attributes, such as gender, age and social class (Goethals & Darley, 1977), Without such similarities, social comparisons can seem irrelevant and our reactions may be indifferent and detached.

Sharing comparison related similarities with the advantaged person is important for envy to arise, but research also shows that the domain of comparison in which the envied person enjoys an advantage should be self-relevant (e.g. Salovey & Rodin, 1984, 1991; Silver & Sabini, 1978; Tesser, 1991) one core part of one's self-worth must be linked to doing well on the domain of comparison. Unless doing well matters, it is unlikely for a social comparison to create an emotion of any kind, as emotion in general arise because they are linked to a person's important goals, a point that most emotion researchers stress (e.g. Lazarus, 1991; Ortony, Clore, & Collins, 1988). As many theorists claim (e.g. James, 1890/1950; Pyszczynski, Greenberg, Solomon, Arndt, & Schmiel, 2004; Tesser, 1991), most people are motivated to maintain a positive self concept. Most people's self-worth will be invested in doing well in certain areas more than in others (e.g. James, 1950; Tesser, 1991). Schaubroeck and Lam (2004) found the reason about why participants felt envious towards the promote was that being promoted was important and self-relevant to them.

Study by Salovey and Rodin (1984) provides strong evidence for the importance of both similarity and self-relevance in envy. Envy occurred only when participants, having received negative feedback, compared themselves with the student who had done better on a career domain relevant to them.

HOSTILITY & ENVY

There are a variety of studies suggesting that envy is a hostile emotion. Whether it emerges as dislike, as various negative outcomes in the workplace or in group settings, as the willingness to give up one's own highest outcome so that another person's advantage can be lessened, or as pleasure when an envied person suffers a misfortune, even if it is undeserved one, the hostile nature of envy manifests itself.

The frustration inherent in invidious comparisons may also contribute to hostility in envy. As envy is argued to arise from a frustrated desire for an attribute enjoyed by another person, such frustration might therefore lead to hostility and aggression. Empirical work shows that undeserved frustration is more likely to produce aggression than deserved frustration (e.g. Kulik & Brown, 1979; Pastore, 1952; Rule, Dyck & Nesdale, 1978). If a sense of injustice characterizes the envious response, then anger and hostility should be all the more likely as well (e.g. Brown, 1985; Smith et al., 1994).

Another possible explanation for the hostile nature of envy follows from the connection between envy and shame. Shame is the painful feeling of having lost the respect of others because of the improper behavior, incompetence, etc ., of oneself (Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language, 1982, p. 1302) shame appears similar to envy in the sense that it also involves a sense of inferiority (e.g. Cheung, Gilbert, & Irons, 2004; Gilbert, 1998; Kaufman, 1989). However, envy is caused by an actual unflattering social comparison, whereas shame may be caused by feelings of inferiority in a more generalized sense. Shame may also be different from envy

in that it involves a more constant focus on a defective, inferior aspect of the self (e.g. Lewis, 1971; Tangney, 1995; Tangney & Dearing, 2002). Whereas envy, arguably, has a dual focus on both inferiority and hostility directed at the disadvantaged person (Smith, 2000). Research indicates that people feeling shame will tend to lash out at others (e.g. Tangney & Dearing, 2002; Tangney & Salovey, 1999).

If shame is a typical response to having a devalued self, then it follows that any case of envy, which by definition involves a sense of inferiority, can create shame as well. By this logic, a component of envious hostility is shame based. What may make envy the best label for the emotion is when the cause of the sense of inferiority results from an explicit social comparison. In sum, the hostile nature of envy may seem puzzling at first. However, there are reasons to expect an unflattering social comparison to produce more than depressive feelings. Invidious hospitality can be understood as a self assertive, immediate response to inferiority, a natural result of frustration (especially perceived unfair frustration, however subjectively derived) and a likely product of how people cope with the shame associated with their envy-causing inferiority and with the additional shame linked to their shame.

PERCEIVED CONTROL

We generally envy others who enjoy an advantage in an area linked to similar self-worth. But there is another important feature of the comparison situation to consider. It is usually claimed that people feeling envy must believe that the desired attribute is beyond their power to obtain (e.g. Elster, 1998; Neu, 1980; Scheler, 1951/1961; Smith, 1991; Vecchio, 1997). Empirical evidence for the importance of perceived control in envy can be inferred from the more general research on social comparisons.

In terms of the self-evaluation, a set of studies by Lockwood and Kunda (1997) shows the perception of control also predicted whether a comparison with a superior person would

negatively affect self-views. Although the research on reactions to unflattering social comparisons appears to confirm that low perceived control should be an important factor in envy. If it is true that we are more likely to envy those who are similar in background characteristics, would not this similarity suggest the capacity to obtain the desired attribute as well. In general, emotional reactions are more intense if participants can more easily imagine alternatives to a particular emotion-inducing situation than if they cannot.

Research on relative deprivation (e.g. Crosby, 1976; Folger, 1987; Smith & Kessler, 2004) is also instructive with regard to the role of perceived control in envy. A pre condition for relative deprivation is that another person's advantage be perceived as undeserved, and so the feelings associated with relative deprivation largely entail varieties of resentment. As already noted, envy has complex connections with a sense of injustice, and, therefore, factors associated with relative deprivation have potential relevance for understanding envy as well. One of the important factors predicting relative deprivation concerns the feasibility of obtaining the outcomes enjoyed by the advantaged persons. It is interesting that some initial research (Crosby, 1976) suggests that relative deprivation is more likely if the desired outcome is feasible to be obtained, when, there is high perceived control. However, later research suggests it is the lack of feasibility that predicts relative deprivation (Folger, 1987; Walker, Wrong & Kretschmar, 2002). The inconsistency in these findings may suggest the general difficulty of capturing how the issue of control affects emotional reactions to another's advantage. Even when the outcomes enjoyed by the advantaged person seem undeserved, an extreme sense of low control may lead to depressive, helpless feelings. An extreme sense of high control may lead to indignation, anger, and corrective action. Conditions leading to envy may inhabit a territory in between these two extremes where a sense of control is low but where the desired outcome can be imagined and where the deservingness judgments are subjective rather than objective.

In sum, the role of perceived control in envy is complex. One of the reasons why envy is painful may be that similarity with the envied person creates a sense of possibility together with a realization that this possibility will be frustrated. There is a sense that the outcome or attributes enjoyed by the advantages person could be the things that one should also have by virtue of this similarity. In this sense, there is an expectation of that it could, even should, happen. This coming together of both expectation and frustration may help explain why unflattering comparisons with far superior others are not thought to create envy.

ENVY AT WORK PLACE

Envy is a natural instinct. We cannot ignore the workplace intricacies of envy and how managers and executives in the organizations fall in the prey of this deadly sin. Regard less of their economic viability and climate, people at all levels of a firm are vulnerable to envy. Envy damages relationships, disrupts teams, and undermine organizational performances. Envy is difficult to manage and measure, in part because it's hard to admit that we harbor such a socially unacceptable emotion. A discomfort, forces us to conceal and deny our feelings, and that makes things worse. Later repressed envy inevitably resurfaces, stronger than ever in many different forms. It sometime becomes so difficult for the manager to understand and manage the detrimental performances of the people at workplace. People become so fixated on their rival that they lose their focus on their own performances while doing over interactions and indulge in unnecessary organizational politics with their rivals, start comparing their rewards, unhappy when a close friend succeeds in a personally relevant domain than a stranger, and overanalyze the fleeting praise the boss bestowed on others. Truly, people want to learn more about the ideas that come from other companies than about ideas that originate with rivals in their own organization. This dislike of learning from inside rival has occurred high organizational price. Employees instead pursue external ideas that cost more than in time and in money.

Researches on workplace envy are very scanty. There is a need to take up this topic for the upcoming organizational excellencies and productivity and help the manager to replace their envy with more –productive habits of mind. A few simple techniques can help manager to deal with envy directed not only at workforce but as a manager himself. These are

- Envy reflex can be a useful source of information by recognizing the circumstances and qualities in others that trigger envy. Manager can accurately identify the things that set off a person before they turn into counterproductive responses. He may help a person to improve himself.
- Manager who share the glory with subordinates and promote others help both their teams and themselves.
- Sharing resources with other teams will also help tamp down envy in organization. Managers often believe that they can guarantee their survival by hoarding resources, but in reality they only isolate themselves and lose allies, and may even set in motion their own demise. Sharing resources, in contrast, lays the ground work for reciprocity and future collaboration.
- Enable enviers to mentally separate their roles and carve out separate domains can curtail invidious comparison.
- Use and promote the internal innovations and creative ideas a priority for the benefit of the organization .People are usually unhappy when a close friend succeeds in a personally relevant domain than when a stranger does.
- Manager can avoid unintentionally breeding envy by positive signaling, e.g; too much public praise for certain team members and overlooking the importance of collaborative followers.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION

Envy has been discussed by Philosophers like Aristotle, Francis Bacon, Kant, John Stuart Mill

and others; where it has been perceived as a cause of murder, vandalism, and other forms of crime. It has a numerous references from religious literature, fairy tales and mythologies of all culture; it makes an interesting topic in fictional literature, soaps and movies. Evidences for envy have been found in anthropological, sociological and psychological literature. Considering the power and ubiquity of envy, one would expect envy to have been studied extensively in organizational context but barring a few recent exceptions, envy has been largely ignored by management researchers. The perspective taken by the researchers have been diverse and there appear to be a few problems with respect to the conceptualization and operationalization of envy.

This paper was motivated by the fact that while the concept envy has been treated extensively

in various scientific disciplines, it has been comparably neglected in management research. Since this is likely to be partially due to a confusion regarding the specific concepts associated with the term 'envy'. This paper set out to develop situational conceptualizations of envy-related phenomena for management research. Therefore, the four distinct concepts of envy proper, benign envy, spite, and jealousy were identified through integration of literature from various scientific disciplines. This paper lays the groundwork for further analysis of the phenomenon of envy in business settings. Several opportunities for future research exists. This allows the identification of research gaps with regard to envy in business. Another avenue for further research could be further exploring the exact psychological mechanisms driving the phenomena addressed in this contribution.

REFERENCES

1. Abbink, K., & Sadrieh, A. (2009). The pleasure of being nasty. *Economics Letters*, 105 (3), 306-308.
2. Abraham, K (1921). Contributions to the theory of the anal character. In Stein, D.J, Stone, M. H. (Ed) (1997). *Essential papers on obsessive-compulsive disorders*. New York: New York University Press.
3. Ashforth, Blake e., and Ronald H. Humphery (1995) 'Emotions in the Workplace: A reappraisal'. *Human Relations* 48: 97-125.
4. Aquaro, G. R. A. (2004). *Death by envy: The evil eye and the envy in the Christian tradition*. Lincoln, NE: Universe.
5. Aristotle.(350BC/1954). *The rhetoric and the Poetics of Aristotle* (W.R.Roberts, Trans.). New York : Modern Library.
6. Bacon, F. (1597). Of envy. In *The Essays*.
7. Beck, A. (1999) *Prisoners of hate: the Cognitive basis of anger, hostility, and violence*. New York: Harper Collins.
8. Bedeian, A.G (1995) *Workplace envy*. *Organizational Dynamics*, 23, 49-56.
9. Belk, R.W. (2008). *Marketing and Envy*. In Smith, R.H. (Ed.), *series in Affective Science. Envy. Theory & Research*, 211-226. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. Bers, S., & Rodin, J. (1984). Social comparison jealousy: A developmental and motivational study. *Journal of social Psychology*, 47, 766-779.
11. Brown, R. (1985). *Social psychology* (2nd ed.). New York : Free Press.
12. Baunk, B.P., & Gibbons, F .X. (Ed.). (1997) *Health, coping and well being: Perspectives from social comparisons theory*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
13. Cheung, M.s.P., Gilbert, P., & Irons. C. (2004). An exploration of shame, social rank, and rumination in relation to depression. *Personality and Individual Difference*, 36, 1143-1153.
14. Cohen-Charash, Yochi (2000) 'Envy at Work: An exploratory examination of antecedents and outcomes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California. Berkeley.
15. Crosby, F. (1976). A Model of egoistic relative deprivation. *Psychological Review* , 83, 85-113.
16. D'Arms, J. (2002). Envy, in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, [http:// Plato.stanford.edu/entries/envy](http://Plato.stanford.edu/entries/envy).
17. D'Arms, J., & Kerr, A.D. (2008). *Envy in the Philosophical Tradition*. In Smith, R.H. (Ed.), *Series of Affective Science. Envy. Theory and Research*, 39-59. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

18. Duffy, M.K., Shaw, J.d., (2000). The salieri syndrome: Consequences on envy in groups. *Small Group Research*, 31, 3-23.
19. Duffy, M.K., Shaw, J.d., (2002). The Salieri syndrome : consequences of envy in groups. *Small Group Research*. 31, 3-23.
20. Duffy, M.K., Shaw, J.d., & Schaubroeck, J.M. (2008). Envy in organizational life. In Smith, R. H. (Ed.), *Series in Affective Sciences. Envy. Theory & Research*, 167-189. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
21. Delgado-Garcia, J.B., & De La Fuente-Sabate, J.M. (2010). How do CEO Emotions matter?: Impact of CEO affective traits on strategic and performance conformity in the Spanish banking industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31-(5), 562-574.
22. De la Mora, G. R. (1987). *Egalitarian envy : The Political foundation of social justice*, new York : Paragon House Publishers.
23. Elster, J. (1991). Envy in Social Life. In Zeckhauser, R. J. (Ed.), *Strategy and Choice*, 49-82. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
24. Elster, J. (1998). *Alchemies of the mind: Rationality and the emotions*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
25. Festinger, L. (1954). Theory of social Comparison processes. *Human Relations*, 7, 117. doi: 10.1177/001872675400700202.
26. Folger, R. (1987). Reformulating the preconditions of resentment: A referent cognitions model. In W.T. Smith & J.C. Masters (Eds.), *social comparison, social justice, and relative deprivation: Theoretical, empirical, and policy perspectives* (pp. 183-215). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
27. Foster, G. M. (1972). The anatomy of envy: A study in symbolic behavior. *Current Anthropology*, 13, (2) 165-186.
28. Foster, G. (1972). The anatomy of Envy, *Current Anthropology*. Vol. 13, pp. 165-202.
29. Freud, S. (1914). Remembering, Repeating and Working-Through (Further Recommendations on the Technique of Psycho-Analysis II). *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XII (1911-1913): The Case of Schreber, Papers on Technique and Other Works*, 145-156.
30. Freud, S. (1925). Negation. In J. Strachey, (Ed.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud (Vol. 19, pp. 235-239)*. London: Hogarth Press.
31. Freud, S. (1933a [1932]). New introductory lectures on psycho-analysis. *SE*, 22: 1-182.
32. Freud, Sigmund, (1908) *The Sexual Enlightenment of Children*. SE 9, 131-139.
33. Freud, Sigmund, (1937) *Analysis Terminable and Interminable*. SE 23, 211-253.
34. Gillmann, M.A (1996). *Envy as a Retarding Force in Science*. Aldershot: Avebury.
35. Schoeck, H. (1966). *Der Neid: eine theorie der Gesellschaft*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Verlag Karl Alber.
36. Gilbert, P. (1998). What is shame? Some core issues and controversies. In P. Gilbert & B. Andrews (Eds.), *Shame: Interpersonal Behaviour, psychopathology, and culture* (pp. 3-38). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
37. Glick, P. (2002). Sacrificial lambs dressed in wolves clothing: Envious prejudice, ideology, and the scapegoating of Jews, in L.S. Newmann & R. Erber (Eds.), *What social psychology can tell us about the holocaust*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 113-145.
38. Goel, A., & Thakor, A. (2005). Green with Envy: Implications for Corporate Investment Distortions. *Journal of Business*, 78 (6) 2255-2288.
39. Goethals, G.R., & Darley, J.M. (1977). Social comparison theory: An Attributional approach. In J.M. Suls & R.L. Miller (Eds.), *Social comparison Processes* (pp. 259-278). Washington, DC: Hemisphere.
40. Guerrero, L.K., & Anderson, P.A. (1998). The dark side of jealousy and Envy: Desire, Delusion, desperation, and destructive communication. In B.H. Spitzberg & W. R. Cupach (Eds.), *The dark side of close relationships* (pp. 33-70). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
41. Grolleau, G., Mzoughi, N., & Sutan, A. (2006). Competitive versus Destructive Envy: An Insightful Distinction? *Cahiers du CEREN*, 15, 4-10.
42. Harris, C. R., & Salovey, P. (2008). Reflections on Envy. In Smith, R. H. (Ed.), *Series in Affective Science. Envy. Theory and Research*, 335-356. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
43. Hill, S.E., & Buss, D.M. (2008) *The Evolutionary Psychology of Envy*. In Smith, R.H. (Ed), *Series in Effective Science. Envy. Theory and Research*, 60-70. Oxford University Press.
44. James, W. (1950). *The principles of psychology*. New York: Dover Publications. (original work published in 1890).
45. Kant, I. (1780/1997). *Lectures on ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

46. Kaufman,G. (1989).The Psychology of shame: theory and treatment of shame- based syndromes.New York: Springer.
47. Kulik, J.A., & Brown, R. (1979). Frustration, attribution of blame, and aggression. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 15, 183-194.
48. Kolm,S.C.(1995).The Economics of social Sentiments: The Case of envy.The *Japanese Economics Review*, 46 (1).63-87.
49. Kets De Vries,Manfred F.R.(1992) 'The motivating role of Envy:A Forgotton factor in management theory'. *Administration & Society* 24/1: 41-60.
50. Kant,E. (1986).*La Metaphysique des Moeurs*,French tradition by J.et O.Masson,Bibliotheque de la Pleiade (vol.III), Gallimard.
51. Lazarua, R.S. (1991) *Emotion and adaptation*. New York:Oxford University Press.
52. Lewis, H.B. (1971) . *Shame and guilt in nerosis*. New York : International Universities Press.
53. Lister, E.A. (2001).*Organizational Change: Tales of Intergenerational and sibling Rivalry*. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 14 (5), 468-479.
54. Lindholm, C.(2008).*Culture & Envy*.In smith,R.H (Ed.),*Series in Affective Science*.*Envy. Theory and Research*,227-244.Oxford:Oxford University Press.
55. Lind, E.A. & Tyler, T.R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. N.Y.: Plenum. Translated into Japanese. Tokyo: Tuttle-Mori Publishing.
56. Lockwood, P., & Kunda, Z. (1997).*Superstar & me: Predicting the impact of role models on the self*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, &3, 91-103.
57. Melaine, K. (1928) - "Envy and Gratitude", Volume 3, London: Hogarth Press.
58. Miceli, M., & Castelfranchi, C. (2007). The envious mind. *Cognition & Emotion*, 21 (3), 449-479.
59. Michael, J. E. (1921). A man's unconscious phantasy of pregnancy in the guise of traumcatic hysteria. A clinical contribution to anal erotism 255 H. von Hug-Hellmuth - On the technique of child-analysis 287 Owen Berkeley-Hill - The anal-erotic factor in the religion, philosophy and character of the Hindus 305 James S. The International Psycho-Analytical Press, London - Vienna - New York.
60. Mishra,P.(2009).*Green-eyed Monsters in the workplace: Antecedents And consequences of Envy* (Academy of Management Annual Meeting).Chicago, IL.
61. Mikula, G. (1993). On the experience of injustice. In W. Stroebe, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (Vol. 4, pp. 223-244). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
62. Miller, D. T. (2001). Disrespect and the experience of injustice. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 527-553.
63. Moran, S., & Schweitzer , M.E.(2008) *When better is Worse: Envy and the use of Deception*. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 1 (1), 3- 29.
64. Mussweiler, T. (2003). Comparison processes in social judgment: Mechanisms and consequences. *Psychological Review*, 110, 472-489.
65. Neu, J. (1980). Jealous thoughts. In R. Rorty (Ed.), *Explaining emotions* (pp. 425-463). Berkeley: University of California Press.
66. Nickerson, J.A., & Zenger, T.R.(2008).*Envy, Comparison Costs, and the Economic Theory of the Firm*. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29 (13), 1429-1449.
67. Ortony, A., Clore, G. L., & Collins, A. (1988). *The Cognitive Structure of Emotions*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
68. Parrott,W.G.(1991).*The emotional experiences of envy &Jealousy*.In Salovey,P(Ed.),*the psychology of jealousy and Envy*, 3-30,New York,NY:the Guilford Press.
69. Parrott, W.G., Smith, R.H.(1993).*Distinguishing the experiences of envy and jealousy*,*Journal ofPersonality and Social Psychology*, vol. 64, No. 6, p. 906-920.
70. Pastore, N. (1952). The role of arbitrariness in the frustration-aggression hypothesis. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 47, 728-731.
71. Patient, D. Lawrence, T. & Maitlis, S. (2003). Understanding workplace envy through narrative fiction. *Organization Studies*, 24, 1015-1044.
72. Popper, K. R. (1959), *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, Hutchinson, London. English translation, with new preface, footnotes and appendices of (Popper 1934).

73. Popper, K. R. (1963), *Conjectures and Refutations*, Routledge, London.
74. Pyszczynski, T., Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., Arndt, J., & Schimel, J. (2004). Why do people need self-esteem? A theoretical and empirical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 435-468.
75. Rawls, J. (1999). *A Theory of Justice* (Rev. ed.). Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
76. Riviere, J. (1932) 'Jealousy as a mechanism of defence'. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*. 13: 414-424.
77. Riviere, J.(1952) 'The unconscious phantasy of an inner world reflected in examples from literature'. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*. 33: 160-172.
78. Russell, B. (1930). *The Conquest of Happiness*. New York, NY: Liveright Publishing Corporation.
79. Rule, B. G., Dyck, R., & Nesdale, A. R. (1978). Arbitrariness of frustration: Inhibition or instigation effects on aggressions. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 8, 237-244.
80. Russell, B.(1930).*The Conquest of Happiness*.New York.NY: Liveright Publishing Corporation.
81. Salovey, P. (1991). Social Comparison Processes in Envy and Jealousy. In Suls, J., & Wills, T. A. (Eds.), *Social Comparison. Contemporary Theory and Research*, 261-285. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
82. Salovey, P., & Rodin, J. (1984). Some antecedents and consequences of social-comparison jealousy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 780-792.
83. Salovey, P., & Rodin, J. (1986). The differentiation of social-comparison jealousy and romantic jealousy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 1100-1112.
84. Salovey, P., & Rodin, J. (1991). Provoking jealousy and envy: Domain relevance and self-esteem threat. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 10, 395-413.
85. Salovey, P., & Rothman, A. J. (1991). Envy and jealousy: Self and society. In P. Salovey (Ed.), *The psychology of jealousy and envy* (pp. 271-286). New York: Guilford Press.
86. Scheler, M. (1961). *Ressentiment* (L. A. Coser, Ed., W. W. Holdheim, Trans.). Glencoe, IL: Free Press. (Original work published in 1915).
87. Schoeck, H. (1969). *Envy: A theory of social behavior*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.
88. Silver, M., & Sabini, J. (1978). The perception of envy. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 41, 105-117.
89. Smith, R. H., Kim, S. H. and Parrott, W. G. (1988). Envy and jealousy: semantic problems and experiential distinctions, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol.14, pp. 401-409.
90. Smith, R. H., Parrott, W. G., Ozer, D., & Moniz, A. (1994). Subjective injustice and inferiority as predictors of hostile and depressive feelings in envy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 705-711.
91. Smith, H. J., & Kessler, T. (2004). Group-based emotions and intergroup behavior: The case of relative deprivation. In L. Z. Tiedens & C. W.
92. Leach (Eds.), *The social life of emotions* (pp. 292-313). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
93. Smith, R. H. (1991). Envy and the sense of injustice. In P. Salovey (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on jealousy and envy* (pp. 79-99). New York: Guilford.
94. Smith, R. H. (2000). Assimilative and contrastive emotional reactions to upward and downward comparisons. In J. M. Suls & L. Wheeler (Eds.), *Handbook of social comparison: Theory and research* (pp. 173-200). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
95. Smith, R. H., Diener, E., & Wedell, D. H. (1989). Intrapersonal and social comparison determinants of happiness: A range-frequency analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 317-325.
96. Smith, R. H., & Kim, S. H. (2007). Comprehending Envy. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133 (1), 46-64.
97. Smith, R. H., & Kim, S. H. (2008). Introduction. In Smith, R. H. (Ed.), *Series in affective Science. Envy. theory & Research*, 3-14. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
98. Schoeck, H. (1969). *Envy: a theory of social behavior*, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
99. Schaubroeck, J., & Lam, S. K. (2004). Comparing lots before and after: Promotion rejectees' invidious reactions to promotees. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 94, 33-47.
100. Stein, Mark. (2000). 'After Eden: Envy and the defences against anxiety paradigm' *Human relations* 53/2: 193-211.

101. Stein, M. (2005) Young people leaving care: poverty across the life course, in *At Greatest Risk*, Child Poverty Action Group, London.
102. Suls, J.M., & Miller, R.L.,(Eds.).(1977) .Social comparison processes:Theoretical and empirical perspectives. Oxford. United Kingdom: Hemisphere.
103. Suls, J. M., & Wheeler, L. (Eds.). (2000).Handbook of social comparison: Theory and research. New York: Plenum Press.
104. Tangney, J. (1995). Shame and guilt in interpersonal relationships. In J. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-consciousness emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 114–139). New York: Guilford Press.
105. Tangney, J., & Dearing, R. L. (2002). *Shame and guilt*. New York: Guilford Press.
106. Tangney, J., & Salovey, P. (1999). Problematic social emotions: Shame, guilt, jealousy, and envy. In R. M. Kowalski & M. R. Leary (Eds.), *The social psychology of emotional and behavioral problems: Interfaces of social and clinical psychology* (pp. 167–195). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
107. Teitelbaum, (1976). Tunisia. The leer and the loom—Social controls on handloom weavers. In C. Moloney (Ed.), *The evil eye* (pp. 223–279). New York: Columbia University Press.
108. Tesser, a., & Smith, J.(1980). Some effects of task relevance and friendship on helping: You donot always help the one you like. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 16, 582-590.
109. Tesser, A. (1991). Emotion in social comparison and reflection processes. In J. M. Suls & T. A. Wills (Eds.), *Social comparison: Contemporary theory and research* (pp. 115–145). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
110. Thernstrom, M. (1998). *Half way heaven: Diary of a Harvard murder*. New York: Doubleday. (1948), *The Summa theologiae*, Ave maria Press.
111. Thomas.A (1981). *Summa Theologiae*, trans. English Dominican Fathers. New York: Christian Classics.
112. Young & Rubicam EMEA. All You Need Is Envy. London. Retrieved October 26 , (2009), from [http:// emea.yr.com/ envy.pdf](http://emea.yr.com/envy.pdf).
113. Vecchio, R. P. 1997. Categorizing coping responses for envy: A multidimensional analysis of workplace perceptions. *Psychological Reports*, 81: 137-138.
114. Vecchio, R. P. 2000. Negative emotion in the workplace: Employee jealousy and envy. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 7(3): 161-179.
115. Vecchio, R. P. 2005. Explorations in employee envy: Feeling envious and feeling envied. *Cognition & Emotion*, 19(1): 69-81.
116. Vidaillet, B. A.(2007). Lacanian theory’s contribution to the study of workplace envy: a case study, *Human Relations* 60(11): 1669-1700.
117. Walcot, P. (1978). *Envy and the Greeks*. Warminster, United Kingdom: Aris & Phillips.
118. Walker, I, Wong, N. K., & Kretschmar, K. (2002). Relative deprivation and attribution: From grievance to action. In I. Walker (Ed.), *Relative deprivation: Specification, development and integration* (pp. 288–312). New York: Cambridge University Press.
119. Webster’s New World Dictionary of the American Language. (1982). New York: Simon & Schuster.
120. Zizzo, D.J. (2008).The Cognitive and Behavioural Economics of Envy. In Smith,R.H.(Ed.), *Series in Affective Science. Envy. Theory and Research*, 190-210. Oxford: Oxford University Press.