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Abstract:
Although numerous empirical studies have indicated perceived organizational justice associate with satisfaction, this study aims at extending extant contemporary organizational research studies and investigates whether benevolence and revenge relate with procedural justice, workplace satisfaction and intention to leave. After performing a literature review, the relationships amongst the five constructs were proposed and their related measurement items were taken to prepare the questionnaire for collecting data. Structural equation modeling was adopted to test the hypotheses with data of 239 part-time students. The findings supported most of the hypotheses, except the relationships between revenge and intention to leave, and between benevolence and intention to leave. The results indicate that procedural justice relates to revenge and benevolence, and these three constructs link with workplace satisfaction. Workplace satisfaction relates to intention to leave but revenge and benevolence do not associate with intention to leave. This research may be the first study to investigate the five constructs together in one research. It strengthens theoretical implications of organizational studies and the findings show the importance and implications of revenge and benevolence for forgiveness in the workplace. Particularly, encouraging forgiveness with fair procedural policy is recommended as employees would work more satisfactorily and have higher willingness to retain. But this does not mean forcing employees to forgive as employees may adopt revenge, particularly when they perceive working under unfair system.
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1. Introduction
In recent years, several researchers have examined the positive impacts of forgiveness and have treated it as one of the desirable ways to tackle interpersonal conflicts. For example, some studies have illustrated the notion that forgiveness helps maintain congruous and productive working environment, obtains more supportive networks and enhances job performance as well as morale (e.g., Cameron et al., 2004; Kurzynski, 1998; McCullough et al., 2000; Worthington & Drirkard, 2000). Forgiveness is then regarded as a kind of civic virtue in an organization (Kurzynski, 1998). Furthermore, forgiveness is affected by organizational characteristics (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Several researchers (e.g., Karremans et al., 2005; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997) have indicated that organizational justice is one of these organizational factors. Fair formal procedure assists to promote forgiveness in the workplace (Karremans et al., 2005).

However, forgiveness may encourage repeated offenses in some corporations without fair and formal procedures (e.g., sexual harassment). Some scholars consider forgiveness as a sign of weakness. Nietzsche (1887/1956) was the key proponent of this perspective and he deemed people who forgive others as weaklings and unhealthy. A few researchers indicate revenge is a good approach. Especially when persons face repeated interpersonal mistreatment, they may not choose forgiveness which may bring more moral and psychological
burdens (e.g., Subkoviak et al., 1995). They may then take revenge to protect their dignity and prevent further transgressions (e.g., Bradfield & Aquino, 1999; Kearns & Fincham, 2005; Aquino et al., 2006). Some psychologists (e.g., Exline et al., 2003) have also argued that forgiving distrustful offender is risky to a forgiver as this motivates offenders to exploit further. Therefore, revenge may assist people to restore status and tackle troublesome colleagues (Bies et al., 1997).

Forgiveness may not be a suitable strategy to tackle workplace bullying and abuse in some circumstances.

Forgiveness is a controversial research issue. It should be treated as an important topic for organizational research. However, investigation of forgiveness has been scant, compared with other facets of organizational behavior (Cox et al., 2012; McCullough et al., 2006). The concept of forgiveness has been neglected in previous organizational research studies and its practical implications for management have not been fully explored (Bradfield & Aquino, 1999; Madsen et al., 2009; Metts et al., 2006). There is a need to understand forgiveness in-depth, particularly its impact on different working attitudes.

This study aims at extending contemporary investigations of forgiveness, along with revenge and exploring their impacts on an employee’s working attitudes, i.e., workplace satisfaction and intention to leave. The aim is to enhance the understanding of forgiveness in the workplace in numerous ways. First, in previous studies, many researchers have examined the reasons, processes, benefits and problems involved in forgiving others. Studies of the relationships between organizational justice and forgiveness, and forgiveness’ effects on work related attitudes remain inadequately explored (Exline et al., 2003; Karremans & Van Lange, 2005; Madsen et al., 2009). Any research for clarifying the role of forgiveness is a worthwhile investigation. The findings are also expected to be valuable for widening the examination of forgiveness in the domain of organizational studies. Second, numerous managerial implications are provided for assisting managers to formulate policies for conflict management and training, and to maintain harmonious as well as cooperative workplace.

2. Literature review

When people forgive transgressors, benevolence dominates, and revenge is suppressed (McCullough et al., 1998). Benevolence is defined as the motivation for conciliation and goodwill, which is important for building awareness of forgiveness (Ismail et al., 2009). Desire for revenge is a strong motivation or desire to cause harm or inflict discomfort, injury or punishment on a transgressor (Bies & Tripp, 1996; Stuckless & Goranson, 1992). They affect people’s emotions, cognitions and behaviors.

Benevolence. Positive benevolence motivates forgiveness, tightens co-workers’ relationships and builds trustful networks (Struthers et al., 2005; Worthington & Drinkard, 2000). People decide to take benevolent attitudes toward offenders as they may believe conflicts enhance interactions, promote greater cooperation and develop more of mutual understanding with others (Cox et al., 2012; Komorita et al., 1991; McCullough et al., 1998). Kickul et al. (2005) explained that benevolent persons always find satisfaction because they are givers and are generally content with their existing situations. Specifically, they treat relationships as the most important issue in the workplace and they want to sustain their established ties. But benevolence mostly takes root only with high level of organizational support (Eisenberger et al., 1986).
Otherwise, benevolent desires may be suppressed.

**Revenge.** People have different reasons to adopt revenge in the workplace. For example, Aquino and co-workers argue that when one has conflict with another who has lower work status, revenge is the most common coping strategy. This is the way to show the power of being superior. Aquino *et al.* (2001) supported this view with a sample of 141 government agency employees. In addition, Aquino *et al.* (2006) used data of 129 public utility employees to illustrate that those in relatively lower hierarchical status have stronger desire to take revenge, particularly in corporations without fair and formal corporate procedures. Therefore, revenge assists people to restore status and even improve work performance, and to tackle their troublesome colleagues (Bies *et al.*, 1997). However, several researchers have reported different findings. For instance, Baumeister *et al.* (1996) stated that superiors may not consider revenge because of ego threats. They have higher commitment towards their companies and also need to work as examples to their inferiors. In addition, revenge is not a proper approach to confront conflicts as it intensifies the conflicts and leads to retaliations (Kim & Smith, 1993).

3. **Hypotheses**

3.1 **Procedural Justice, Benevolence and Revenge**

Numerous organizational researchers have illustrated that procedural justice relates with revenge and benevolence differently. For example, in the study of Aquino *et al.* (2006), the researchers performed one field study with 129 public utility employees and an experimental study with 148 MBA students. They found that when the perceived procedural justice climate is low, revenge is encouraged, especially those staff with lower status. The situation is different when the procedural justice climate is high, forgiveness is enhanced. In addition, Jones (2009) provided more explanation towards the relationships between different kinds of justice and revenge. With 424 employed students as the participants, the research result illustrated that formal procedural justice perceptions affect desire for revenge. Stelan *et al.* (2008) added that people are more likely to increase benevolence and minimize revenge under fair organizational context. Hence, this study attempts to extend their research and investigate further the relationships between procedural justice and forgiveness/revenge. The following hypotheses are proposed:

*H1:* Procedural justice positively relates to benevolence.

*H2:* Procedural justice negatively relates to revenge.

3.2 **Procedural Justice, Workplace Satisfaction and Intention to Leave**

In this study, workplace satisfaction and intention to leave are the two major working attitudes that would be investigated. Workplace satisfaction is one of the important theoretical constructs in organizational studies. It refers to a kind of positive or negative attitude and a favorable or unfavorable evaluative judgment towards one’s workplace or working situation (Brief, 1998; Motowidlo, 1996). Intention to leave refers to the intensity of a person’s willingness to stay with or leave the workplace (Elangovan, 2001).

The relationships between procedural justice and satisfaction, and between satisfaction and intention to leave, have been examined extensively. Numerous researchers have indicated the importance of correlation of satisfaction with
procedural justice (e.g., Masterson et al., 2000) and propensity to leave (e.g., Tett & Meyer, 1993). Some scholars suggest that lower level of satisfaction leads to higher intention to leave (e.g., Blau, 2007; Porter & Steers, 1973; Tett & Meyer, 1993). Hence, in this study, procedural justice and workplace satisfaction associate positively, whereas workplace satisfaction and intention to leave are negatively related:

$H_3$: Procedural justice positively relates to workplace satisfaction.

$H_4$: Workplace satisfaction negatively relates to intention to leave.

### 3.3 Benevolence, Revenge, Workplace Satisfaction and Intention to Leave

Forgiveness is deemed as the way to restore damaged working relationships and promote satisfying environment. For examining the relationships between organizational characteristics and forgiveness, and between willingness to forgive and satisfaction, Cox (2011) used 429 items of data from teachers and illustrated these constructs are positively associated with each other. She indicated that employees’ willingness to forgive is affected by organizational forgiveness climate and it influences individual and organizational outcome variables. Interestingly, she found that willingness to forgive is significantly and negatively related to organizational performance. The finding shows that too much forgiveness may not be good for employees’ job performance. This illustrates that forgiveness has certain effects on organizational behaviors.

Furthermore, Cote and Morgan (2002) explained the relationships between pleasant and unpleasant emotions, satisfaction and intention to quit. They performed a longitudinal study with 111 workers and reported two significant findings: (a) the suppression of unpleasant emotions decreases satisfaction and increases intentions to quit; and (b) the amplification of pleasant emotions increases satisfaction. Their research illustrates the importance of mediation role of satisfaction and the impacts of negative and positive emotions on satisfaction and intention to quit.

Based on these two studies, benevolence and revenge are examined in this research so as to illustrate their relationships with workplace satisfaction and intention to leave. People have high level of satisfaction because they value working relationships more and perceive working conditions as favorable (Crede et al., 2007), thereby forgiving others easily. Benevolence is thus one of the ways to restore forgiveness, sustain satisfaction and willingness to continue to work in organizations. On the other hand, if employees have negative emotions, like revenge, they may develop high dissatisfaction and even think of other ways to solve the problems, e.g., withdrawal (Crede et al., 2007). Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed:

$H_5$: Benevolence positively relates to workplace satisfaction.

$H_6$: Revenge negatively relates to workplace satisfaction.

$H_7$: Benevolence negatively relates to intention to leave.

$H_8$: Revenge positively relates to intention to leave.

### 4. Method

#### 4.1 Procedure and Samples

In this study, 257 part-time students from five evening classes at three renowned Hong Kong universities were invited to participate. At the end, 243 questionnaires were returned of which four were not completed to the extent of more than 50% and, therefore, they were not used, leaving 239 sets for further analyses. All participants were Chinese.
Amongst them, 62% were females whereas males were 38%. They were mostly within the age groups of “25 or below” (60%) and “26-35” (28%). Most of them had tertiary/university education level (94%). In addition, the majority were holding non-managerial positions (73%).

Before the survey, the researcher prepared a questionnaire. Since most of the statements in the questionnaire were originally in English, they were translated into Chinese and another scholar was invited to translate the Chinese version back into English. During the survey, the participants received the questionnaires in the classes. They were not offered any gifts or extra credit marks for participation.

4.2 Measures
Most of the measurement items were based on the related literature studies. Procedural justice was measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) and the other measures were adopted a 5-point Likert-type scale: from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Procedural justice. The items were based on the studies of Moorman (1991) and Niehoff and Moorman (1993). Six items were for procedural justice to measure the extent of executing certain mechanisms for job decisions. The sample item was: “Job decisions are made by the manager in an unbiased manner.”

Benevolence and revenge. They were based on the “Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations Inventory” (TRIM) propounded by McCullough and his co-workers (2001, 2003, 2006) for measuring general approaches of tackling conflicts. Five items were for motivation to seek revenge and the sample item was: “I’ll make him/her pay”. Six items were for benevolence motive and the sample statement was: “Even though his/her actions hurt me, I have goodwill for him/her.”

Workplace satisfaction. Kim and his co-wokers (1996) refined “The Index of Job Satisfaction” (IJS) (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951) to six items for measuring the general level of satisfaction towards own workplace. The sample item was: “I am fairly well satisfied with my workplace.”

Intention to leave. The measurement of intention to leave was based on the study of Mitchell and his colleagues (2001). Three items were for assessing a person’s tendency and likelihood to leave. The sample item was: “Do you intend to leave the organization in the next 12 months?”

5. Results
Table 1 summarizes mean, standard deviation, inter-correlations and the coefficient alphas amongst the research variables. The mean scores varied from 2.66 to 4.44 in the five constructs. No item was near the minimum and maximum points (Argyrous, 2000). The standard deviation was from .83 to 1.20. All the five constructs were significantly correlated with each other, ranging from -.36 to .43 (p < .01).

-- INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE --
A two-step approach suggested by Anderson and Gerbing (1988) was adopted with AMOS (version 16). First, a measurement model was assessed with a total of 26 items in five constructs. The global fit indexes were acceptable ($\chi^2$/df = 1.44, $p < .001$; GFI = .92; NFI = .91; IFI = .97; TLI = .97; CFI = .97; RMSEA = .04). All the path coefficients indicated well hypothesized factor structure: procedural justice (between .76 and .83), revenge (between .73 and .85), benevolence (between .75 and .82), workplace satisfaction (between .81 and .84) and intention to leave (between .80 and .86). In addition, the reliability statistics were between .84 and .87. The average variance
extracted (AVE) values of the research items ranged from .51 to .76, reaching the recommended level and supporting the validity of the items (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Anderson & Gerbing, 1988).

Another step was to assess the proposed structural model. The goodness-of-fit indexes were mostly above the acceptable levels ($\chi^2$/df = 3.67, $p < .05$; GFI = .94; NFI = .92; IFI = .94; TLI = .92; CFI = .94; RMSEA = .11), except $\chi^2$/df and RMSEA. The standardized parameter estimates amongst the research constructs are shown in Figure 1 and Table 2. Six of the eight hypotheses (H1-H6) were supported, based on the standardized parameter estimates and $t$ values for the hypothesized relationships. The paths between procedural justice and benevolence (H1), between procedural justice and revenge (H2), between procedural justice and workplace satisfaction (H3), between workplace satisfaction and intention to leave (H4), between benevolence and workplace satisfaction (H5), and between revenge and workplace satisfaction (H6) were all supported.

However, there were two unsupported hypotheses which were related to the paths between benevolence and intention to leave (H7), and between revenge and intention to leave (H8). Therefore, an amended model was performed without these two paths. The goodness-of-fit indexes were improved and all above the acceptable levels ($\chi^2$/df = 2.01, $p < .001$; GFI = .98; NFI = .97; IFI = .98; TLI = .96; CFI = .98; RMSEA = .06).

6. Discussion
This study demonstrates the relationships between procedural justice and benevolence/revenge, and between benevolence/revenge and workplace satisfaction. Further, workplace satisfaction is an important factor that affects the relationships between benevolence/revenge and intention to leave. This research may be the first to investigate these constructs simultaneously and to examine their relationships with each other in one study. Many previous studies (e.g., Aquino et al., 2003) have investigated how forgiveness restores relationships but have seldom examined how benevolence and revenge affect individual working attitude. In addition, a lot of scholars believe forgiveness enhances positive attitude but the related empirical support for its impacts has been insufficient in organizational research. This study strengthens this theoretical implication and examines benevolence and revenge with workplace satisfaction and intention to leave.

Moreover, the research findings of this study illustrate that procedural justice is an important organizational characteristic which affects benevolence, revenge and workplace satisfaction. These results are consistent with previous studies (e.g., Aquino et al., 2006; Jones, 2009; Skarlicki et al., 1999; Strelan et al., 2008). Their relationships illustrate that employees value fair procedures much in the workplace, for instance, the ways to collect their responses or appeal unfair treatment. Under fair policies, employees tend to give up revenge, and restore benevolent attitude. But if they perceive company procedures as unfair, the possible outcome(s) may be that employees become more vengeful and/or less benevolent.

In addition, workplace satisfaction is a major factor which links benevolence and revenge with intention to leave. If employees have higher benevolence to forgive others, they may have greater workplace
satisfaction and want to stay. This research shows that benevolence is the key aspect of forgiveness which helps restore positive psychological state and positive working relationships. It is also the important factor in the whole forgiving process that helps suppress negative facets. Bradfield and Aquino (1999) explain this with the theory of cognitive consistency that certain cognitions lead to further actions. Cote and Morgan (2002) justify that pleasant emotions increase satisfaction and dilute intention to quit. Therefore, if people have stronger feelings of benevolence, they are happier at work and have better relationships with colleagues. But the more people think about revenge, the more likely they act upon this thought. They finally may not satisfy to work in their workplaces as they may need to solve conflicts by themselves; finally this thought leads them to leave.

In terms of practical implications, this research illustrates the importance of strengthening benevolence and understanding revenge in an organization. Particularly, they relate with procedural justice and workplace satisfaction. Several managerial implications are provided here. First, top management should allow employees to learn from mistakes and not waste time in snitching on comrades. They should show more benevolence and act as an example first in the workplace. Second, management should have positive attitude towards conflicts and encourage staff to act positively in facing interpersonal conflicts. Compelling subordinates to forgive others or keep silent is not a desirable practice (Cox et al., 2012). Even though some may take revenge, management should not blame them and should understand the reasons. As Jernigan et al. (2002) indicated, “if managers do not know what causes an attitude to take on a particular form, they cannot accurately predict what behavior might follow” (p. 564). Therefore, suppressing revenge and forcing benevolence are not good approaches. Management should know and explain why employees adopt them. Particularly, greater understanding of causes of revenge may help improve the existing staff complaint system and reveal problems in the internal arrangement. Formal and systematic policies may help employees adopt benevolent approaches, for example, indicating clearly what kinds of behaviors are not allowed and what reporting systems should be followed.

Another practical implication of this study is the need to stress the importance of staff training with implications for forgiveness, meaning of conflict, self-emotional control technique and conflict management skills. Actually, employees should understand that forgiveness does not mean tolerating any unfair and malicious treatment and it is not a reflection of weakness (Kerns, 2009). Forgiveness refers to embracement of a positive attitude when settling conflicts through direct confrontations, discussions and communications. An additional focus is to change the perception of conflicts, clarifying that they are not totally negative experiences and they provide valuable lessons for learning and improving one’s own conflict management skills (Kurzynski, 1998). These may be some of the reasons why benevolence may be adopted in handling particular conflicts.

7. Limitations and future directions

There are several limitations this study faced. First, as this research is of cross-sectional design, the relationships and effects amongst the constructs may not be the same in a longitudinal study. Second, data used in this study are self-rated which may
have led to certain desirable responses and common method variance. Several approaches were adopted in this study. When preparing the questionnaire, all construct items were not named and were not grouped together (Lages & Jap, 2003). Some pilot tests were performed before the survey. All responses were anonymous and confidentiality of the returned questionnaires was guaranteed (Singh, 2000; Lages & Lages, 2004). After collection of the data, different statistical analyses were conducted in the preliminary examination for ensuring the extent of responses. Indeed, observational or experimental research is strongly recommended. Third, since this study uses convenience sampling, this might lead to certain systemic biases and limitations in generalization. Therefore, random samples are recommended to be taken from different organizations and countries. Lastly, numerous factors may affect forgiveness, like organization climate, relational and offending characteristics. More antecedents should be examined in future studies to understand the impacts of forgiveness in the workplace better.

In conclusion, forgiveness is one of the indispensable factors in one’s life, especially in the workplace. Should employers want their employees to have higher workplace satisfaction and stronger willingness to continue working in their organizations, forgiveness (i.e., benevolence) should be promoted. Certainly, this is not an easy task as top management should have such virtue and their employees need to learn how to get conciliation and goodwill, how to tackle conflicts and what benefits they may obtain from proper conflict management.
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Table 1: Mean, standard deviation, correlations and reliabilities of major variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Procedural justice</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>[.86]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Benevolence</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>[.86]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Revenge</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>[.87]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Workplace satisfaction</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-35**</td>
<td>[.84]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Intention to leave</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-36**</td>
<td>[.87]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Reliabilities are reported along the diagonal. Scale correlations are below the diagonal. ** p<.01 (two-tailed)

Table 2: Proposed and amended structural model fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall model fit indexes</th>
<th>Proposed model</th>
<th>Amended model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \chi^2/df )</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Standardized parameter estimate</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Hypothesis supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: Procedural justice → benevolence</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: Procedural justice → revenge</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: Procedural justice → workplace satisfaction</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: Workplace satisfaction → intention to leave</td>
<td>-.49***</td>
<td>-5.43</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: Benevolence → workplace satisfaction</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6: Revenge → workplace satisfaction</td>
<td>-.76***</td>
<td>-21.40</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7: Benevolence → Intention to leave</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8: Revenge → Intention to leave</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05 ; **p < .01 ; ***p < .001
Figure 1: Proposed structural model

Note: Dashed grey lines indicate nonsignificant relationships at $p < .10$. 
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