

Revanchist Behaviors in an Academic Style: A Qualitative Study to Analyze Academics' Revenge

Oktay Koç¹, Abdullah Kıray^{2*}, Serkan Özdemir³

1. Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Kocaeli University, Kocaeli, Turkey
2. Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Political Sciences, Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Canakkale, Turkey
3. Department of Business Administration, Biga Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Canakkale, Turkey

(Received: September 18, 2019; Revised: February 25, 2020; Accepted: March 5, 2020)

Abstract

This study focuses on examining the counterproductive behaviors of academics, who have a lesser likelihood to show revanchist acts on account of the characteristics of their professional group, defining the purposes, means, and reasons of revenge, and determining the results of revanchist behaviors. To this end, we conducted a qualitative study on the academics who were working at Turkish state universities. In the end, the reasons, purposes, and means of revenge have been defined, and the results of revanchist behaviors have been determined through processing and analyzing interpretively collected data. Accordingly, there are numerous rationales for revenge among academics as they define it personally and closely related to their personal character on one hand, and on the other hand, they tend to use various tools during revenge process, mostly a combination of semi-legal and legal ones since there are some obstacles (i.e. administrative sanction mechanisms) to use illegal tools. In addition, they aim to re-balance the situation and look for justice after any harmful action or activity stemmed from other parties. As a different result, revenge is defined as a tool for protecting self and self-interest(s).

Keywords

Workplace, Counterproductive behaviors, Revenge, Revanchist behaviors, Academic personnel.

* Corresponding Author, Email: abdullahkiray@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Despite their enigmatic nature (Crombag, Rassin, & Horselenber, 2003) revanchist behaviors are often defined as counterproductive behaviors in the workplaces (Collins & Griffin, 1998; Robinson, 2008). A more detailed view, furthermore, shows that revenge is an unstoppable and common or a pervasive and inevitable (Schumann & Ross, 2010) response to injustice, and it is instigated in order to restore justice (Bradfield & Aquino, 1999), even though these behaviors are costly (Jones, 2009). Conceptually revenge can be defined as a punitive and damaging responsive behavior to a perceived wrongdoing (Stuckless & Goranson, 1992). The perceived wrongdoing or offense is critical in the context of revanchist behavior. In contrast to aggressive dark and harmful workplace actions that can be caused by a variety of factors, revenge is a reaction triggered by offense or wrongdoing. But the lesser forms of mistreatment, which can also be called discourteous behaviors in organizations without any intention of harm, are regarded as abusive and should be distinguished from the concept of revenge (Anderson & Pearson, 1999). In fact, revenge is usually viewed as counterproductive, and counterproductive work behaviors are against the legitimate interest of any organization (Jones, 2009). Additionally, revenge and revanchist behaviors may also be defined as useful and advantageous to the organizations in some situations (Bies & Tripp, 2004). In some cases, revanchist behavior can correct injustice and be useful to the organization, improve employee morale and increase productivity. The possibility of revenge may also provide some opportunities for authorities to deter abuse of power (Bradfield & Aquino, 1999). But the critical point in gaining an advantage through managing revanchist behaviors thoroughly is to define rightly its causes, and predict its likely results.

In this context, several studies have been conducted to determine and define the causes, types and results of revanchist behaviors in the workplace (Beugre, 2005; Bies & Tripp 2004; Nayir, 2015; Tatarlar & Çangarlı, 2014), mostly by focusing on private sector organizations and often taking blue collar workers as sample set in their nature. Surprisingly, there are no plentiful studies focusing on revanchist behaviors in the public sector. Furthermore, there are rare studies focused on to analyzing revanchist behaviors among academics

working at public universities (e.g. Şener & Erdem 2014). Accordingly, there is still room to improve our understanding and to clarify the nature of revenge in different sectors, particularly the public sector. Along with this, further examination of these behaviors within organizational context will also contribute to defining and determining what is empirically consistent with revanchist behaviors, and how administrators can manage the major direct and side effects and consequences of revanchist behaviors thoroughly, and then other relationships in the scope of revanchist behaviors to improve organizational performance, since the desire for revenge not only disrupts individuals' mental well-being, it also disrupts interpersonal relationships due to its aggressive and violent nature (Staub, Pearlman, Gubin, & Hagengimana, 2005).

A detailed review of current body of knowledge on revanchist behaviors in organizations indicates clearly that the organizational climate and the perception of justice are both the most important factors that cause revanchist behaviors (Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2006; Jones, 2009), notwithstanding the lack of empirical studies on other organizational factors that might influence revenge (Aquino et al., 2006). Osif's study (2005), from a different perspective, defines individuals' personality as a critical element in affecting organizational climate. Like this, Thompson, Carlson, Hunter, and Whitten (2016) also define personality as a factor in seeking equity and – naturally – revenge. In this context, academic workplaces, which may be expected to have productive and peaceful climates, should be examined to determine whether they correspond to these hypothetical claims or, in other words, whether the personality of academics may cause revanchist behaviors on one hand, and on the other hand, whether revenge is also pervasive in academic organizations and among academics. Hence, the likely findings of this study may also reveal whether revanchist propensities among academics are pervasive or not. If yes, the administrators of academic institutions may use these findings to overcome the worst scenarios and to improve performance since it also seems a critical problem for public organizations (Hildebrand, 2007; Rangone & Paolone, 2017). This can be achieved by analyzing counterproductive behaviors such as revanchist conduct in interpersonal relationships and by

determining whether academics exhibit revanchist behaviors (Hu, Hung, & Ching, 2016). Moreover, academics are known as individuals who are well educated and possess high levels of intellectual capabilities. In this sense, it is not, perhaps, expected to observe negative behaviors in the meaning of revenge or counterproductive behaviors within this community and among community's members. Crossley (2009) also notes that the stage of moral development is associated with educational level and according to him education is the highest demographic characteristic when taking academics as a sample. Examining the relationship between personal characteristics and the desire for revenge, Satici, Can, and Akin (2015) claim that psychoticism and "neuroticism", which is one of the five-factor personal characteristics, are strongly related to vengeful feelings. Even if there are no abundant studies on academics' personal characteristics (Jaiswal et al., 2011), we can easily claim that academics should possess higher qualifications, and be less neurotic or psychotic by taking into consideration their educational and intellectual background.

However, when considering practice, various cases imply that in the academic community, and naturally among this community's members, revanchist behaviors are pervasive in public institutions, although revenge seems also as a counterproductive activity for academics (Crombag et al., 2003). Revanchist behaviors in the conduct of academics need to be scrutinized since most of the studies did not speak of this issue, particularly in public universities. In this context, by taking into consideration the lack of studies in this field, we claim that there is still room for research projects regarding revanchist behaviors of academics in the workplace, the causes of giving up revenge, the goals of revanchist behaviors, their means and strategies, and the results of revanchist behaviors. These aspects, certainly, might be useful to manage micro- and meso-level effects and consequences of the revanchist behaviors and other relationships if they can be illuminated properly using the data gathered from the field.

From this point of view, the research question of this study can be stated as: "What are the causes of possible revanchist behaviors among academics, how do they exhibit revanchist behaviors, why do academics give up revenge, and what are the consequences of

revanchist behaviors?” Thus, the aim of this study is to define the purpose, means, and reasons of revenge and to determine the results of academics’ revanchist behaviors. To this end, we use qualitative research methods in the collection and analysis of the data. Overall, the results show that while all the participants know how to take revenge, most of them exhibit revanchist behaviors or intend to take revenge more than 5 times, and in most cases the subject of revanchist behaviors are superiors. According to the results, the causes of revanchist behaviors are categorized as “protection against harm, rebalancing status, personal satisfaction/self-proving, the lack of trust towards formal mechanisms/search for justice, beating other party down to size, and gaining social recognition (responding to social expectations). It is also found that sometimes the revenge is given up because of “believing in divine retribution/leaving punishment to God and cursing (malediction), disbelief in accomplishing a result with revanchist behavior, living it down, disdaining revanchist behaviors/discrepancy with personal values, refraining (shying away/fear), taking pity/having scruples, not liking disproportionate use of force, not being able to find the means or opportunity, and the desire to keep the last move”. Also the results reveal that legal, semi-legal and illegal means are used for revenge and the consequences of revanchist behaviors are “personal satisfaction, the increase in the tension between the parties, the decrease in job satisfaction and job commitment, the instigation of negative mood/disappointment or humiliation to the other party, making other party see his/ her own mistake, being justified by peers, and the intervention of higher authorities”. Besides, we also found that revenge may be perceived as “a game with no winners”.

2. The Process of Revenge

Revenge in workplaces is considered by scholars to be unique (e.g. Tripp & Bies, 2015) since it includes a specific motive: to get even. Thus, revenge is concerned with reactions to perceived workplace injustices (Bradfield & Aquino, 1999; Tripp & Bies, 2015). According to their comprehensive model, Tripp, Bies, and Aquino (2007, p.13) put forth that:

There is a sequence in the attempts of revenge: (a) revenge is triggered by an event; (b) the victim blames the offender responsible for the trigger; (c) the victim becomes motivated to seek revenge; and (d) the victim copes with the motivation/desires to seek revenge by choosing to actually get revenge, avoid the offender, forgive the offender and/or reconcile with offender.

Although revenge is taken as a part of the social fabric (Tripp & Bies, 2009), it can also be a joint function of the automaticity of trait forgiveness and relevant attributions (Wang, Bowling, Tian, Alarcon, & Kwan, 2016). Yet revenge feels so visceral and universal that it surely seems to have been a core part of human nature (Jackson, Choi, & Gelfand, 2019). In this direction, the causes of revenge may depend on the recognition of the offense, which is perceived as harmful or wrong, and revanchist behaviors are also driven by an offense in the workplace. Another incentive for revenge is to attribute blame to another party (Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2001). In this context it can be said that an important cause of revenge is the severity of the offense. Research claims that up to 75 percent of employees engage in misbehaviors such as theft, sabotage, unexcused absenteeism and vandalism (Jones, 2009). This claim shows that there is a high probability of offense which can induce revanchist behaviors in the workplace as a result of misbehaviors. In line with this process (offense and revenge), it should be stressed that in this study it is important to distinguish between the revanchist behavior and the incivility. Revanchist behaviors are driven only by a perceived offense; however, incivility can be motivated by a multitude of factors such as competitiveness, sadistic impulses, or inattentiveness, which are not the motivators of revenge (Bies & Tripp, 2004; Tripp & Bies, 2015). Looking for reasons of seeking revenge, Jackson et al. (2019) make a summary by reviewing literature from a wider perspective. According to their findings, people take revenge for several reasons, including (a) because they feel angry over a perceived norm violation, (b) because they see revenge as a means of restoring reputation, (c) because they believe revenge will make them feel better, and (d) because cultural norms license vengeance.

Furthermore, Bies and Tripp (2004) also summarize their findings pertaining to revenge, such as:

- revenge is provoked,
- emotions are figural elements,
- revenge has rationality and morality,
- The emotions of revenge are shaped by social-cognitive dynamics,
- revenge can take many forms.

It is obvious, in this context, that revenge is not only a rational but also an emotional response to an offense. They categorize the provocation sources as:

- goal obstruction,
- violation of rules, norms and promises,
- status and power derogation.

In understanding the process of revenge, the phenomenon of honor is also suggested as a key concept. Asserting one's honor is an aspect of a deep-rooted urge to be superior to others. In the society, the urge to prove oneself superior to others, especially in the academic field where there is always competition, should be considered an important factor in determining revanchist behavior (Elster, 1990; Jackson et al., 2019). In addition, Aquino et al. (2006) examined the previous studies in this regard and put forth some factors which affect responses to workplace offense. Accordingly, blame attributions, social-cognitive dynamics, personality, emotions, and the sophistication of an individual's moral reasoning are also found to be effective in deciding revenge-like behaviors in organizations. To put it briefly, although there are various causes or motives for revenge, all of these can be categorized into two common classes: cultural and biological (Jackson et al., 2019). Nonetheless, Wang et al. (2016) claim that researchers will never fully understand the dynamics of revenge without taking into account the automatic processing of trigger events.

3. Choices after the Offense or Wrongdoing

Some scholars (e.g. Thompson et al., 2016) mention that not every person in the work place has wrong desires or seeks revenge. Wronged or offended people sometimes choose to give up revenge or

don't feel the urge to take revenge at all (Aquino et al., 2006), maybe due to the fear of subsequent revenge (Tripp & Bies, 2009). Although revenge is an impulse and it is the primary cause of aggressiveness, after experiencing an offense, people may choose to let go of the negative effect (Bradfield & Aquino, 1999). In these cases, the "forgiver" may choose to make an effort for reconciliation, forgive conditionally, or directly forgive without reconciliation at all (Bradfield & Aquino, 1999). Perceptions about the offender, the greed of the offender, and the perceptions about the underlying motives and malice of the offender are important when it comes to the perceptions about the severity of the offense and the subsequent anger (Crossley, 2009). In this context, it can easily be claimed that the motives and characteristics of the offender can play a part in giving up revenge. As it was mentioned before, education is associated with moral development and moral development also plays a part in revanchist behaviors (Crossley, 2009). Research also shows that the likableness of the offender increases the chance of forgiveness and causes the victim to give up revenge (Bradfield & Aquino, 1999). On the other hand, it should be noted that giving up revenge may have negative outcomes. Believing that exhibiting revanchist behaviors directly and openly is dangerous may also lead people to give up revenge; however, consciously or unconsciously they may reduce their commitment and contribution to the organization (Sievers & Mesky, 2006). While Tripp et al. (2007) clearly define victim's choice of coping response as dependent upon situational factors and on personality traits. Tripp and Bies (2009), on the other hand, categorize three classes of moderators that may determine the choice of revenge seeker: the victim's power in the organization, the procedural justice climate of the organization, and the victim's personality traits.

Along these, there are different choices for revenge seeker to use as means or tools to get revenge. For example, Thompson et al. (2016) categorize two different sets of means for revenge, namely overt and covert. According to them, overt means contain gossip or escalated forms of workplace deviance while covert means include indirect aggression, displacement on the organization, or withdrawal. Actually, the possibility of using various means for revenge depends upon the possibility of having this kind of means. In a different saying, the

more means one has, the more likely one will use one of those means (Tripp et al., 2007).

4. Methodology

The main questions of the research are formulated as “What may be the causes of revanchist behaviors that also appear among academics? And, in regard to these causes, how and by what sort(s) of tools are revanchist behaviors realized, why do people give up revenge in some cases, and what are the consequences of revanchist behaviors?” In the context of these questions, this study aims primarily at describing academics’ perceptions of revenge and revanchist behaviors (Tajeddini, 2009) in detail. To this end, qualitative methods have been preferred to use with respect to the propositions such as “Using qualitative methods is mostly proper when there is little known about the phenomenon” (Eisenhardt, 1989, pp.548; Yin 2009, pp.18). Even though there are quantitative studies focusing on vengeance and revenge (Stuckless & Goranson, 1992; Carraher & Michael, 1999) to some extent, there is still room for detailed research focused on illuminating the process, tools and strategies of revenge (and revanchist behaviors), and the results of revanchist behaviors. Additionally, the construct of revenge has clearly not been defined in Turkish working culture to date. Thus, the current study paves the way for the detailed analysis of revenge and revanchist behavior, and in turn, sheds lights on academics’ perceptions on revenge in academic institutions.

To this end, we used phenomenological analysis, which is a qualitative method, since it provides an opportunity to directly convey data and requires lower levels of interpretation. In addition to this, phenomenological analysis is also a useful method for defining a phenomenon which is less understood and gives researcher an opportunity to present some quotes from collected data (Giorgi, 2012; Vaismoradi, Turunen, & Bondas, 2013). Revenge as a phenomenon is defined by us prior to the data collection process through using a conceptual framework or template formed based on a comprehensive literature review. Accordingly, we prepared (and used) some questions to discern whether a behavior (or intention) is related to revenge such as:

- Is the revanchist behavior connected to a perceived wrong?

- Is the revanchist behavior exhibited against a perceived injustice?
- Is the revanchist behavior caused by the desire to attain justice?
- Is the revanchist behavior a punitive or harmful reaction?

To gather data, we created a semi-structured interview form by reviewing the literature. The semi-structured interviews were conducted face-to-face with a sample of 15 academics employed in a state university in Turkey. Most of the participants were actually senior lecturers and for some cases they were research assistants. In the presentation of the processed data, we took into account ethical considerations, and depended on consents of the participants. Hence, instead of the real names of the participants, we assigned numbers for each participant. A detailed table is provided below on the characteristics of the participants.

Table1. Information about interviewees and interviews

No:	Title	Department	Age	Gender	Duration	Previous Revanchist Behaviors	Knowledge about how to take revenge	Revanchist Behavior or Intent Frequency	Other party of the Revanchist Behavior
1	Research Assistant	Political Sciences and Public Administration	28	Male	30 Mins.	No behaviors exhibited but intended.	Yes	More than once	Superior
2	Research Assistant	Political Sciences and Public Administration	31	Male	15 Mins.	No behaviors exhibited but intended.	Yes	More than once	Superior / Subordinate
3	Research Assistant	Political Sciences and Public Administration	35	Female	30 Mins.	No behaviors exhibited but intended.	Yes	More than once	Superior
4	Assistant Professor Dr.	Political Sciences and Public Administration	38	Male	30 Mins.	Exhibited revanchist behaviors	Yes	More than 10 times	Superior
5	Assistant Professor Dr.	Political Sciences and Public Administration	35	Male	25 Mins.	No behaviors exhibited but intended.	Yes	More than once	Superior

Table1. Information about interviewees and interviews

No:	Title	Department	Age	Gender	Duration	Previous Revanchist Behaviors	Knowledge about how to take revenge	Revanchist Behavior or Intent Frequency	Other party of the Revanchist Behavior
6	Assistant Professor Dr.	Political Sciences and Public Administration	36	Female	15 Mins.	No behaviors exhibited but intended	Yes	More than 5 times	Superior
7	Assistant Professor Dr.	Economics	32	Female	20 Mins.	Exhibited revanchist behaviors	Yes	More than once	Peer
8	Associate Professor Dr.	Business Administration	42	Male	25 Mins.	No behaviors exhibited but intended.	Yes	More than 5 times	Superior
9	Associate Professor Dr.	Political Sciences and Public Administration	43	Female	30 Mins.	Exhibited revanchist behaviors	Yes	More than 10 times	Superior / Subordinate (Rarely)
10	Associate Professor Dr.	Business Administration	39	Male	15 Mins.	No behaviors exhibited but intended.	Yes	More than once	Superior/ Peer
11	Associate Professor Dr.	Business Administration	52	Female	25 Mins.	Exhibited revanchist behaviors	Yes	More than 5	Superior/ Peer/ Subordinate
12	Professor Dr.	Industrial Relations	50	Female	30 Mins.	Someone else exhibited revanchist behavior	Yes	More than 10 times	Superior / Subordinate (Rarely)
13	Professor Dr.	Business Administration	52	Male	15 Mins.	Exhibited revanchist behaviors	Yes	More than 5 times	Superior / Subordinate (Rarely)
14	Professor Dr.	Economics	48	Female	15 Mins.	No behaviors exhibited but intended.	Yes	More than once	Peer
15	Professor Dr.	Business Administration	55	Male	30 Mins	Exhibited revanchist behaviors	Yes	More than 10 times	Superior / Subordinate/ Peer

Eight of the participants were male and seven were female. One of them was between 20-30 years old, seven were between 31-40 years old, four were between 41-50 years old, and three were more than 51 years old. Three of the participants who exhibited revanchist behavior were male and three were female. Both groups were equal in frequency. Moreover, two of them were between the ages of 30-40, one of them was between the ages of 41-50 and three of them were 51 and over.

For data analysis, we applied some qualitative data analysis procedures (e.g. Tajeddini & Trueman, 2008). In this regard, we transcribed all conversations as texts, and then used these texts in processing data. We read and re-read these texts and analyzed them line by line using open coding procedures following Charmaz's suggestions (1998). After processing collected data using these techniques, we found some meaningful patterns (units) that helped us with clearly defining academics' perceptions on revenge and, in turn, finding proper answers for our research questions (Giorgi, 2012; Tajeddini & Trueman, 2008). Here we provide these patterns under general titles as a whole, and relevant passages or short quotes from our interviews as evidence for our findings.

5. Findings and Discussion

When the findings are examined, it is clearly seen that the concept of revenge and how to take it are both known by all the participants. On the other hand, it is also understood that there was an intent or action to take revenge at least once, and in some cases revanchist behaviors were exhibited more than 10 times. Most of the participants stated the ones (the other party) who are exposed to revenge as their superiors and they note that subordinates are also rarely subjected to revanchist behaviors. The findings also reveal that all the participants had intentions to take revenge and six of them took action in the form of revanchist behaviors. Another finding is that only a single participant stated that someone else exhibited revanchist behaviors for the injustice he/she suffered. Along with these, these academics didn't intend to make first move since they wait for the other party's excuse.

5. 1. Causes of Revanchist Behaviors

In the scope of the gathered and processed data, we have observed that academics generally involve in revanchist behaviors by depending upon or aiming at achieving at least one of the following objectives, and they at the same time take all of these as rationales to protect themselves physically and/or emotionally. Thus they try:

- to protect themselves from harm

“If I didn’t do anything he would have tried to defeat me personally. I felt to save myself from him and his attacks.” (13)

- to rebalance their status,

“I was actually in a situation within which I felt myself as foolish and piteous. I decided naturally to seek equilibrium.” (9)

- for personal satisfaction/to prove or establish themselves,

“Why should I have stopped myself? Indeed, through this way I tried to protect myself on the one hand, and on the other hand, concomitantly to test my power within this institution.” (12)

- to beat other party down to size,

“Actually at that time, I swore to give her a lesson on how to be a real female.” (4)

- to gain social recognition (responding to social expectations),

“If I cannot do anything, I cannot look in the mirror and at other people’s face once again as a Professor since everyone saw his (verbal) attacks on me.” (13)

-to personally react due to the lack of trust towards formal mechanisms (vigilantism) and/or search for justice,

“Actually there are no real mechanisms by which we can save ourselves from mobbing for example. Depending on this mostly we try to use our own hands.” (1), (2), (4), (13)

These seem basic but not total causes that lead academics to intend or exhibit revanchist behaviors. To put it briefly, academics as revenge-seekers tend mostly to use revanchist attempts in securing their very existence from external challenges and threats instead of fantasy or common good. Actually, they at the same time believe that

there are some mechanisms which are ostensibly designed for solving personal problems legally rather than functionally.

5. 2. Means used in the Scope of Revanchist Behaviors

Participants put forth that they used or intended to use some means for revenge. These must actually be legal at first sight but it is obvious that sometimes academics might be in a situation to use semi-legal means when legal or formal tools are not looked useful. Here, some themes produced via processing the gathered data about means, mostly used by revenge-seeker academics, are provided:

- formal mechanisms such as petitions, complaints and objections to higher-ups,

“After her attack I tried to write a petition for complaint. Unfortunately, our superiors were her close friends. I guess because of this they didn’t want to do anything notwithstanding my formal appeal.” (3)

- social processes such as organizing peers against other party, implementing social pressure, spreading gossip for revenge.

“Actually we organized a declaration against him and his authority. But it was just within organization and I believe that it was not sufficient.” (5)

Along with these, they sometimes intend to use semi-legal means such as humiliation, using formal authority to abuse rights or prevent rights, complaints to peers/prevention of titles and projects. Additionally, participants who used semi-legal means stated that they think legal means in revenge are non-functional and useless. Because of this they tend to use semi-legal tools or means to avoid punishment.

As it is understood from processed data, academics cannot often courageously tend to use illegal means for their aims since in case of using those tools, formal investigation and/or punishment might also be required. As a result, they hesitate to apply these means directly. But at a final point, some of them try to use illegal methods to deal with in-house problems via venturing punishment.

5. 3. Causes of Giving up Revenge

Participants mostly stated that sometimes they refrain from revanchist intentions and behaviors because of the following reasons. These are all personal attitudes and approaches determined by contingencies.

- belief in divine retribution/leaving punishment to God and cursing (malediction/wishing ill),
“Whenever I confront any wrong-doing, I mostly tend to forget it and leave the rest to God. It’s totally proper to my religious beliefs.” (6)
- disbelief in accomplishing a result with revanchist behaviors,
“Actually I’m aware of the fact that there is no easy success with revenge. Because of this I often tend to use other strategies which don’t contain revanchist behaviors. I’m a peaceful human-being.” (5)
- living it down,
“I believe the idea that revenge is a dish best served cold.” (12)
- they disdain revanchist behaviors/revanchist behaviors conflict with their personal values,
“Revenge indeed is not my business. I’m an academic. Nevertheless I have to confess that sometimes I have strong feelings for revenge as a normal person. But I think that it would be shameful for me to take revenge.” (6)
- refraining (shying away/fear),
“There is an easy way to overcome revenge: Totally forgetting it. You also have to try it. Believe me! It is also a way to take revenge.” (8)
- they take pity on the other party/they have scruples exhibiting revanchist behaviors,
“I’m a merciful person. Because of this, I prefer to forgive any evil-doer rather than taking revenge.” (2), (3)
- they don’t want to abuse their authority and use disproportionate force,
“I’m also the head of the department and I have the authority to do anything, and this may include revenge against my inferiors. But as a manager I cannot do that. It would be an abusive behavior for my situation.” (8)
- they are not able to find any means or opportunities,
“Look at me! I’m a research assistant. There is only one way for me: To obey. Do you know this popular saying: Obey and be comfortable?” (1)

- they want to keep the last move in their hands.

“I mostly try to keep the last move to myself. You can take this as a tactic to handle personal things. In the end, I always find a solution for transforming the situation for my favor.” (5)

Academics tend to give up revanchist behaviors mostly due to personal reasons. In addition to this, sometimes they cannot seize any opportunities to attempt revenge. That is, “to desist” might also be a way against evil under some circumstances.

5. 4. Results of Revanchist Behaviors

Participants expressed that as a consequence of revanchist behaviors, they obtain personal gains to some extent. But these gains are not directly related to tangible assets; rather, they are intangible. The following consequences are produced by processing the gathered data:

- personal satisfaction,
 - “I don’t want you to think that I’m psychopath. But it may be possible for me to take revenge in some cases.” (13)
- the increase in tension between the parties,
 - “Naturally the tension between us increased at that time. Isn’t it normal, simply saying, [because] we are all human beings?” (9)
- the decrease in job satisfaction and job commitment,
 - “And my commitment to this organization went rapidly down. I still don’t want to be part of this organization. But there is no other choice.” (2), (3)
- causing a negative mood/disappointment or humiliation to the other party,
 - “Believe me, she got embarrassed totally. But she pretended to be cool!” (12)
- evoking other party’s awareness to see their mistake/other party coming to their senses,
 - “In the end, he was aware of his failure. But it was too late for a second chance. In fact, I was there for his success, too. He cannot understand that.” (9)
- being justified by peers,

“My colleagues told me that: You are totally right in your battle and we strongly support you! In fact this support provides me a smooth mood.” (9)

- the intervention of superiors

“I tried to warn our directors through this way. Finally, I did it, and they were aware of our situation. After that, they summoned both of us and listened to our story as a whole. This was my main purpose, indeed. I didn’t want to look for another solution.” (13)

It is understood that academics often tend to apply revanchist behaviors not just for pecuniary outcomes but also for intangible results. Additionally, when findings related to the consequences of revanchist behaviors analyzed deeply, it can easily be concluded that these consequences might be harmful for social relationships within work place, whether public or private.

Conclusion

The findings of this study reveal that revanchist behaviors and revenge in a basic meaning are pervasive in academic community and among academics. These behaviors, furthermore, may affect individual and organizational performance negatively. But in some cases, academics tend to hesitate to try revanchist behaviors due to some legal obstacles. Depending on this, they try to choose and use semi-legal tools or means for revenge on the one hand, and on the other hand, they use various legal tools and strategies for revenge. Moreover, even though there isn’t a prejudice against revanchist behaviors, and everyone - at some point - may have the intention to exhibit suchlike behaviors, when it comes to act in the direction of the feeling of revenge, it can be claimed that most of the academics consider personal values. Furthermore, they take it personally and/or a personal battle which needs to be won. In fact, it closely depends upon their personal characteristics. From a different point of view, the general social routines may also affect the decisions of the revenge looked for by the academics. As a result, it can be said up to a certain extent that revanchist individuals will get results in protecting their personal interests or re-possessing them by means of revanchist behaviors and will harm the party which is to the target of the

revanchist behaviors. However, there is also a critical and different finding here that revenge is seen as a “game with no winners” by some academics.

In the end, it is obvious that academics may, more or less, either exhibit revanchist behavior or at least intend to do so. Considering the mission and characteristics of academic organizations, this situation will create a counterproductive environment and this will adversely affect scientific activities and productivity. In order to prevent this negative effect, the existing system and legislative infrastructure should be revised and a more transparent, positive and trustworthy climate should be provided. In addition to these, the administrators of academic organizations should be more sensitive to revanchist behaviors and their causes and they should also try to prevent and/or manage both causes and vengeful behaviors properly and functionally in order to eliminate the likely negative effects of such behaviors.

To put it briefly, the reasons of and means for revenge may differ from organization to organization, individual to individual, or case to case. Furthermore, revenge may have a ubiquitous character in organizational fields and naturally also in academic organizations.

Finally, there are some limitations in this research that might be used to suggest an agenda for future research. In future studies, using eclectic research models can provide benefits with regard to the validity and reliability of the data. This study suggests the managerial practitioners to manage revanchist behaviors as positively as possible instead of taking them as “counterproductive” behaviors.

References

- Anderson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy Of Management Review*, 24(3), 452-471.
- Aquino, K., Tripp, T., & Bies, R. (2001). How employees respond to personal offense: The effects of blame attribution, victim status, and offender status on revenge and reconciliation in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 52-59.
- Aquino, K., Tripp T., & Bies, R. (2006). Getting even or moving on? Power, procedural justice, and types of offense as predictors of revenge, forgiveness, reconciliation and avoidance in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(3), 653-668.
- Beugre, D. C. (2005). Reacting aggressively to injustice at work: A cognitive stage model. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 20(2), 291-301.
- Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (2004). The study of revenge in the workplace: Conceptual, ideological, and empirical issues. In S. Fox & P. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive workplace behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 65–81). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Bradfield, M., & Aquino, K. (1999). The effects of blame attributions and offender likableness on forgiveness and revenge in the workplace. *Journal of Management*, 25(5), 207-631.
- Charmaz, K. (1998). Grounded theory. In J. A. Smith, Harre, R., & Langenhove, L.V (Eds.), *Rethinking methods in psychology* (pp. 27-50). London: Sage
- Carraher, M., & Michael, K. W. (1999). An examination of the dimensionality of the vengeance scale in an entrepreneurial multinational organization. *Psychological Reports*, 85(2), 687-688.
- Collins, J. M., & Griffin, R. W. (1998) Dysfunctional behavior in organizations: Violent and deviant behavior. In R. W. Griffin, A. O'Leary-Kelly, & J. M. Collins (Eds.), *Dysfunctional behavior in organizations* (pp.xix-xxiii). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Crombag, H., Rassin, E., & Horselenber R. (2003). On vengeance. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 9(4), 333-344.

- Crossley, C. D. (2009). Emotional and behavioral reactions to social undermining: A closer look at perceived offender motives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108(1), 14-24.
- Eisenhardt, M. K. (1989). Building theories from case study research". *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532-550.
- Elster, J. (1990). Norms of revenge. *Ethics*, 100(4), pp. 862-885.
- Giorgi, A. (2012). The descriptive phenomenological psychological method. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, 43(1), 3-12.
- Hildebrand, R. (2007). Measuring and managing performance in local government: A literature review. *University of Victoria-School of Public Administration*, Local Government Institute Working Paper Series.
- Hu Y. L., Hung, C. H., & Ching, G. S. (2016). The impact of monitoring and sanctioning and perceived loafing towards revenge motive and tendency to commit counterproductive work behaviors within the academic workplace. *International Journal of research Studies in Management*, 5(2), 79-95.
- Jackson, C. J., Choi, K. V., & Gelfand, J. M. (2019). Revenge: A multilevel review and synthesis. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 70(3), 319-345.
- Jaiswal, G., Sahu, P., Bhadoria, Y., Singh, S., Dubey, S., Gupta, S., Singh, D. P. (2011). Personality types and emotional intelligence: A study of academicians. In S. S. Bhakar and S. Mehta (Eds.), *A systematic guide to write a research paper* (pp. 235-247). New Delhi: Excel Books.
- Jones, D. A. (2009). Getting even with one's supervisor and one's organization: Relationships among the types of injustice, desires for revenge, and counterproductive work behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(4), 525-542.
- Nayir, F. K. (2015). Öğretmen adaylarının öç alma davranışına ilişkin görüşleri [Opinions regarding revenge behaviour of candidate teachers]. *Turkish Studies*, 10(11), 1205-1216.
- Osif, B. A. (2005). Manager's bookshelf: Personality and the workplace-difficult employees. *Library Leadership & Management*, 19(4), 212-217.

- Rangone, A., & Paolone F. (2017). Managing local government performance in Italy: Issues, assesment criteria and perspectives. *International Journal of Advances in Management and Economics*, 6(6), 1-11
- Robinson, S. (2008). Dysfunctional workplace behavior. In J. Barling & L. C. Cooper (Eds.), *The sage handbook of organizational behavior* (pp.141-159). London: Sage.
- Rowley, J. (2002). Using case studies in research. *Management Research News*, 25(1), 16-27.
- Satıcı, S. A., Can, G., & Akın, A. (2015). İntikam ölçeği: Türkçe'ye uyarlama çalışması [The vengeance scale: Turkish adaptation study]. *Anatolian Journal of Psychiatry*, 16 (Special Issue 1), 36-43.
- Schumann, K., & Ross, M. (2010). The benefits, costs, and paradox of revenge. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4(12), 55–67.
- Sievers, B., & Mesky, R. R. (2006). The economy of vengeance: Some considerations on the aetiology and meaning of the business of revenge. *Human Relations*, 59(2), 241-259.
- Staub, E., Pearlman, L. A., Gubin, A., & Hagengimana, A. (2005). Healing, reconciliation, forgiving and the prevention of violence after genocide or mass killing: An intervention and its experimental evaluation in Rwanda. *Journal of Social and Clinic Psychology*, 24(3), 297-334.
- Stuckless, N., & Goranson, R. (1992). The vengeance scale: Development of a measure of attitudes toward revenge. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 7(1), 25–42.
- Şener, E., & Erdem, R. (2014). Akademik örgütlerde intikamın şekil ve belirleyicilerine ilişkin nitel bir araştırma [A qualitative research on the forms and determinants of revenge in academic organizations]. In *22nd National Management ve Organization Congress, 22-24 May 2014* (pp. 281-290). Konya, Turkey: Selcuk University
- Tajeddini, K., & Trueman, M. (2008). The potential for innovativeness: A tale of the Swiss watch industry. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 24(1-2), 169-184.

- Tajeddini, K. (2009). Perceptions of learning among Swiss watch managers. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 21(7), 525-537.
- Tatarlar, C. & Çangarlı, B. G. (2014). Madalyonun iki yüzü: örgütsel intikam davranışlarında yöneten ve yönetilen [Two sides of the coin: Managers and workers in organizational revanchist behavior]. In *22nd National Management ve Organization Congress, 22-24 May 2014* (pp. 281-290). Konya, Turkey: Selcuk University
- Thompson, H., Carlson, D., Hunter, E., & Whitten D. (2016). We all seek revenge: The role of honesty-humility in reactions to incivility. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 17(1), 50-65
- Tripp, M. T., Bies, J. R., & Aquino, K. (2007). A vigilante model of injustice: Revenge, reconciliation, forgiveness, and avoidance. *Social Justice Research*, 20(1), 10-34.
- Tripp, M. T., & Bies, J. R. (2009). "Righteous" anger and revenge in the workplace: The fantasies, the feuds, the forgiveness. In M. Potegal, , G. Stemmler, & C. Spielberger, (Eds.) *International handbook of anger: Constituent and concomitant biological, psychological, and social processes* (pp. 413-431). New York: Springer.
- Tripp, M. T., & Bies J. R. (2015). "Doing justice": The role of motives for revenge in the workplace. In S. R. Cropanzano & L. M. Ambrose (Eds.) *The Oxford handbook of justice in the workplace*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vaismoradi, M., Turunen, H., & Bondas, T. (2013). Content analysis and thematic analysis: Implications for conducting a qualitative descriptive study. *Nursing and Health Sciences*, 15(3), 398-405.
- Wang, Q., Bowling, A. N., Tian, Q., Alarcon, M. G., & Kwan K. H. (2016). Workplace harassment intensity and revenge: Mediation and moderation effects. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 151(1), 213-234.
- Yin, K. R. (2009), *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.