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Abstract
Entitativity is an important group construct that has received little attention in the organizational psychology literature. The current study based on 343 employed individuals explores the potential role of entitativity perceptions of organizations on the relationship between justice perceptions and employees’ emotional and behavioral reactions. Results of a three-wave survey study suggest that entitativity perceptions are positively associated with employees’ experienced gratitude toward organizations but has no relationship with employees experienced anger toward organizations. In addition, this study provides evidence that positive emotions can mediate the effect of justice perceptions on positive behavioral outcomes, and negative emotions can mediate the effect of injustice perceptions on negative behavioral outcomes. The implications of these findings and limitations of the current study are discussed.
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Chapter I

Introduction
We interact with people on a daily base. Sometimes we see those who interact with us as individuals representing themselves, such as a friend, a random person who asks for directions on the street, etc., but sometimes we see them as members of certain groups, such as one of the police officers, one of my coworkers, etc. We ourselves are members of numerous groups too. Although we perceive and interact with groups in everyday life, we do not see these groups the same, and we do not treat all groups the exact same way. For example, we might consider a certain group as a collective of people, such as a line of people waiting outside of a restaurant, while others as a highly united group, such as a sport team. Such differences in group perceptions are captured by the concept of entitativity, defined as the degree of group-ness an individual perceived toward social units (Campbell, 1958; Lickel et al., 2000). It is the fundamental step people engage in when conceptualizing social units and an important construct for the study of groups (Campbell, 1958; Hamilton, Sherman, & Lickel, 1998).

Early entitativity researchers developed various ways to manipulate and measure this construct, which makes it hard to generalize across studies (Blanchard, Caudill, & Walker, 2018; Hamilton, Sherman, & Castelli, 2002). Most of these manipulations and measurements confounded entitativity with related concepts, such as essentialism (e.g., Haslam, 1998), interactivity (e.g., Gaertner & Schopler, 1998), and similarity (e.g., Yzerbyt, Rogier, & Fiske, 1998). The lack of a widely accepted, valid entitativity measure can be seen as weakening theoretical conclusions and empirical findings. Until recently, few researchers addressed the importance of having a standard, psychometrically validated measure of entitativity that can differentiate the construct from other related concepts. Blanchard et al. (2018) filled this need by developing a valid and reliable entitativity scale that can be applied to multiple target groups. They established convergent and divergent validity evidence among three different types of
groups, including small work groups, by showing that the construct is related but distinct from its antecedents, such as similarity, interactivity, goals, and outcomes, such as group cohesion and identification. Organizations, as large dynamic groups, may share similar group characteristics with small work groups, such that they both are more goal-oriented and have less permeable boundaries than other social groups. But, it is worth noticing that organizations also have some characteristics that differentiate them from other social units, such that organizations have the power to determine membership and make decision about rewards, promotions, and sanctions of its members (King, Felin, & Whetten, 2010). Even though this newly developed scale was tested in small work groups, its utility in measuring entitativity perceptions of organizations is unknown. Therefore, the first goal of the current study is to explore whether employees can see their organizations as entities using the construct of entitativity and explore its relationship with antecedents in organizational context with the new entitativity scale developed by Blanchard and her colleagues.

Despite the inconsistency in measuring entitativity, the construct has been shown to vary across groups. People generally perceive social categories (e.g., gender, nationality, and ethnicity) as having low entitativity and interacting groups such as a family, a work team, or a sports team as having high entitativity (Brewer, 2015; Lickel et al., 2000; Yzerbyt, Corneille, & Estrada, 2001). The perception of entitativity influences people’s attribution processes about the group (Crawford, Sherman, & Hamilton, 2002; Morewedge, Chandler, Smith, Schwarz, & Schooler, 2013). According to Waytz and Young (2012), people tend to consider members of a group with high entitativity alike to each other in terms of both mental states and behaviors. Members of a high entitativity group are seen as more responsible for group actions than members of a group with low entitativity. Moreover, people believe that the attitudes and
behaviors of a group member can represent the whole group if he/she belongs to a cohesive, united group. Smith, Faro, and Burson (2013) found in a series of experiments that people donated more to a target group if it is perceived as highly entitative. They further illustrated that perceived entitativity can result in more extreme judgments toward a target group and its members by showing that target groups with high entitativity received more donations when paired with positive traits and less donations when paired with negative traits than the low entitativity counterparts. Therefore, it is clear that people’s attitudes and judgments of a group and its members are influenced by their perceived entitativity of the group.

Previous researchers mostly examined the effect of entitativity among social groups. Organizations as one important type of interacting groups, on the other hand, received little attention in entitativity research. Employees as group members of organizations interact with coworkers, supervisors, and other parties in the organization on a daily base. How full-time employees see their work organization, supervisors and coworkers could have an impact on the way they treat and interact with others at work. Perceived organizational entitativity could potentially affect organizational outcomes the same way as it influences group outcomes in other dynamic groups because organizations are dynamic in nature. It is also possible that the relationship pattern between organizational entitativity perceptions and outcome variables in organizations is different from such in small work groups or other dynamic groups because organizations have unique properties, such as sovereign powers (King et al., 2010). It is possible that theoretical and empirical findings about entitativity in social groups cannot be generalized to organizations. Therefore, exploring how perceived entitativity of organizations influence employees’ emotional reactions, attitudes, and behavior outcomes would help solve the puzzle and expand our knowledge of entitativity in organizations. Thus, the second goal of the study is
to examine the role of entitativity and its relationship with important outcomes in organizational settings.

Entitativity may have implications for the process for how organizational justice perceptions relate to employee attitudes and behavior. Organizational justice is a concept that has been widely studied in organizational research and has been linked to many important organizational outcomes such as affective reactions, organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB), and counterproductive work behaviors (CWB, e.g., Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). According to Social Exchange Theory (SET), employees work hard to complete job tasks and engage in extra role activities in exchange for multiple kinds of resources from another party. The quality of the relationship between employees and the other party will either be enhanced or diminished based on the quality of the exchange process (Cropanzano & Byrne, 2000). In order for the exchange to be tenable, there must be at least one more party engaged in the process besides employees. Previous researchers often studied the exchange relationships between employees and their supervisors, coworkers, or the organization itself (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005), and one of the fundamental assumptions of these exchange relationships is that employees view their organization as an independent entity in the exchange relationship. This is because we can only explain why being treated well by organizations can result in higher organizational commitment, higher perceived organizational support, and more organizational citizenship behaviors among employees with Social Exchange Theory when employees see their organization as an independent entity. Entitativity could be the key construct to test this assumption and deepen our understanding of the current SET theory.

In a social exchange context, justice is considered to be a symbolic resource that supervisors and organizations can offer (Cropanzano & Byrne, 2000). Employees, as members of
organizations, generate positive emotions and organizational citizenship behaviors toward the
target parties in exchange for justice (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015). Researchers studying justice
perceptions implicitly assume that organizations can be seen as an equivalent focus of justice as
other entities in the organization such as supervisors and coworkers (e.g. Colquitt et al., 2013;
Colquitt & Zipay, 2015), without examining the degree to what extent employees perceive
organizations as an united entity. Perhaps the level of perceived organizational entitativity might
play a role in the exchange process and influence how justice as a resource is perceived by
employees and, further, how employees behave in return. Perceptions of entitativity may be an
important piece in the justice – reaction relationship.

In the past organizational justice researchers mainly operationalized justice perceptions
into four dimensions (Colquitt, 2001) and linked these justice perceptions with varies
organizational outcomes (e.g., Colquitt, Long, Rodell, & Halvorsen-Ganepola, 2015;
Cropanzano & Rupp, 2008). Rupp, Shao, Jones, and Liao (2014) argued that these justice
dimensions are not the actual perceptions of justice but rather part of the justice perception
formation process. That is, employees evaluate whether normative rules have been violated when
making justice judgments, and these four dimensions of justice represent four related normative
rules. They further pointed out that a responsible party for the actions is required for employees
to form justice perceptions and that each justice dimension can be attributed to different
accountable parties in organizations (e.g., supervisor, coworker, organization as a whole). In their
meta-analytical review, they adopted a multifoci approach to examine whether specifying the
source of the justice perception relate to outcomes directed at matched sources better than
dimension-based justice perceptions. The results not only supported their hypothesis but further
indicated that multifoci justice perceptions more strongly related to target similar outcomes than
target dissimilar outcomes. They also found evidence for cross-foci effects suggesting that justice perceptions of one source are related to outcomes directed at another source. However, it is unclear how the accountability process differs across justice sources and whether it is related to employees’ attribution process. It is possible that the employees’ perception of the extent to which an organization is high in entitativity affects the attribution process and results in the cross-foci effects that Rupp et al. (2014) found. Thus, the third goal of the study is to investigate whether employees perceived organizational entitativity is involved in the justice accountability process and relates to cross-foci effects of justice perceptions.

Furthermore, Colquitt et al. (2015) clarified that the perception of injustice is more than the absence of justice but also a violation of normative rules. They further pointed out that employees react to justice and injustice differently in terms of both affect and behaviors and found that injustice perceptions are a stronger predictor of counterproductive workplace behaviors than justice perceptions, but justice perceptions perform better at predicting task performance and organizational citizenship behaviors. Unlike justice perceptions, which are associated with positive emotions like joy or optimism, injustice perceptions are found to be related to sense of anger directed at certain targets (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015). It is possible that entitativity perceptions could affect the relationship between injustice perception and negative emotions and behaviors. Moreover, whether the influence of entitativity on emotions and behaviors is similar under justice and injustice situations remains unclear. Therefore, to better understand the role of entitativity perception in organization setting, it is important to examine the full spectrum of multifoci justice perceptions by investigating both justice and injustice perceptions.

According to Affective Events Theory, emotions can either influence behaviors by
affecting cognition (affect cognition-driven behavior) or impact behaviors directly (affect-driven behavior, Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). The latter path represents the direct function of affect experienced by employees but not necessarily a change in relevant attitudes. For example, a spontaneous assault of a coworker can be triggered by anger experienced by employees. Studies have established the link between negative emotions and counterproductive behaviors (e.g. Judge, Scott, & Ilies, 2006), but it is unclear whether these behaviors are the result of the affect cognition-driven mechanism or affect-driven mechanism. It is possible that if the unjust situation induces anger, the behaviors toward the accountable party are triggered directly. Thus, unlike justice perceptions, entitativity perceptions might not be involved in the injustice – outcome relationship if the affect-driven behavior pathway is activated. Therefore, the last goal of the study is to explore the function of entitativity on the relationship between injustice and both emotional and behavior outcomes under a multifoci framework.

In summary, the overall purpose of the study is to contribute to the literature by investigating how entitativity affects the relationship between both employees’ justice and injustice perceptions and their emotional and behavioral reactions using a multifoci approach. Examining the function of entitativity in organizations addresses the deficit in the entitativity literature by exploring the fundamental assumption of Social Exchange Theory to explain why organizational justice perceptions relate to positive employee behaviors and attitudes: the organization as an exchange partner. Empirically investigating this relationship will help deepen our understanding of the relationship between employees and organizations. Using the multifoci approach to investigate the relationships enables researchers and practitioners to locate the target of employees’ emotional and behavior reactions in response to organizational justice and injustice perceptions and develop corresponding interventions. To summarize, this study aims to
make the following contributions to the literature: (1) explore whether employees are able to see their organizations as entities using the construct of entitativity and explore its relationship with antecedents in organizational context (2) examine the role of entitativity in organizational settings and explore its effect on organizational outcomes such as emotions and citizenship behaviors, (3) investigate whether employees’ perceived organizational entitativity may be involved in the justice accountability process and relates to cross-foci effects of justice perceptions, and (4) explore the relationships between injustice and emotional and behavior outcomes using the multifoci approach and examine whether perceived organizational entitativity affects these relationships.
Chapter II

Review of Literature
The review of the literature covers two relevant areas of research, entitativity, including research on entitativity antecedents and consequences, and organizational justice research, with a focus on Social Exchange Theory. First, academic literature on entitativity is reviewed. A description of entitativity as well as a discussion of the variety of ways the term has been defined and measured in research are provided. Next, a discussion of antecedents and consequences of entitativity follows, with an emphasis on the impact of ingroup entitativity on emotional and behavioral outcomes. I will then discuss the limited research around entitativity in organizational settings. Second, the organizational justice literature is reviewed within a social exchange framework. Perceptions of justice and injustice are differentiated, and different typologies of justice are introduced, followed by a description of multi-foci approach of justice. In addition, conceptual arguments are presented as to how entitativity could influence the relationship between justice perceptions and important organizational outcomes.

**Entitativity**

We human beings are social animals. We tend to form groups and interact with each other within these groups every day. We see these groups differently and treat them and their members in different ways. One way we can differentiate these groups is to what extent we see these “aggregations of people” as “true groups” (Brewer & Harasty, 1996). In other word, we use the perceived degree of groupness of these groups as one criterion to distinguish between groups. The degree of group-ness an individual perceives a social units to possess is defined as entitativity (Campbell, 1958). The definition has been widely cited, but the way people manipulate and measure it varies across studies.

**Definition of Entitativity**

Early group researchers related entitativity to the concept of essentialism and suggested
that highly entitative or essential groups are perceived to be homogeneous, exclusive, and richly informative (Haslam, 1998). These perceptions are mostly based on inherent properties rather than characteristics that can be acquired or developed. Essentialism and entitativity are closely related to each other but today it is also clear that these two are conceptually distinct constructs (Blanchard et al., 2018; Hamilton, Sherman, & Rodgers, 2004). Essentialism focuses on the core characteristics of social units and is thought to be a fundamental component of social categories with inherent properties (e.g., gender, ethnicity; McGarty, 1999). Entitativity, on the other hand, is believed to be more important to interacting groups (e.g., sport team, family) than social categories (Hamilton et al., 1998; Rutchick, Hamilton, & Sack, 2008). Another important difference between essentialism and entitativity is that not only group properties influence entitativity, but interactions among group members also affect perceptions of entitativity in interacting groups (Gaertner, Iuzzini, Witt, & Oriña, 2006).

Moreover, Blanchard and colleagues (2018) pointed out that early entitativity researchers defined and measured entitativity by its antecedents, such as similarity and interactivity. Some researchers emphasized the perceived consistency and the variability across group members in behavior, attitudes, and personality characteristics when defining entitativity (Brewer, Weber, & Carini, 1995; McGarty, Haslam, Hutchinson, & Grace, 1995). These researchers often approached group concepts from a category perspective and differentiated groups in terms of relative similarity among collections of people (Gaertner & Schopler, 1998). In addition to the category perspective, group researchers have also studied perceptions of entitativity from a dynamic perspective (Wilder & Simon, 1998).

The dynamic perspective suggested that the interconnection among people is crucial to group formation (Cartwright & Zander, 1968). Following this perspective, Gaertner and Schopler
(1998) argued that using similarity to define entitativity only captures the category perspective of the concept but fails to consider the dynamic nature of group. They reformulated entitativity as interactivity of group members and suggested that such operationalization could incorporate the dynamic perspective, which has often been ignored in previous entitativity research.

Despite the strong correlation between the perception of group entitativity and group properties such as similarity and interactivity among a group’s members (Lickel et al., 2000; Rutchick et al., 2008), entitativity cannot be equated with either similarity or interactivity or assessed by either similarity or interactivity. Rutchick et al. (2008) provided evidence for the distinction among the constructs by showing that items measuring entitativity loaded on both factor similarity and factor interactivity in an exploratory factor analysis.

The inconsistency in defining and measuring entitativity makes it difficult to generalize across studies. Despite this difficulty, the construct is considered to be a starting place to study group process and dynamics (Rutchick et al., 2008). Therefore, more recent researchers stress the importance of having a unified and clear way of defining and measuring entitativity (Blanchard et al., 2018; Hamilton et al., 2002; Lickel et al., 2000). Indeed, a neutral and generic definition of entitativity can help identify the unique and essential features of entitativity that differentiate it from other related constructs. Recently, Blanchard and colleagues (2018) suggested that researchers should focus on the core component of the entitativity construct and individuals’ subjective assessment of it. They defined entitativity as the continual cognitive assessment of the unit as being somewhere from “not a group” to “very much a group” and created a new scale of entitativity that can distinguish the construct from its antecedents and outcomes.

**Antecedents of Entitativity**

Entitativity varies among groups. In the original definition, Campbell (1958) identified
four objective characteristics, similarity, proximity, common fate, and pregnancy, and suggested that people tend to perceive groups that have members who are similar to each other (similarity), or have close intragroup relationships (proximity), or are moving toward the same direction (common fate), or have an observable pattern among members (pregnancy) as having a high degree of entitativity. To investigate whether these characteristics are associated with entitativity, Lickel, and colleagues (2000) asked participants to rate 40 target groups on different group properties and perceived entitativity in a series of studies. They found that properties like similarity among group members, interaction among group members, and group importance to its members all strongly correlated with entitativity ratings. Similar results were reported in Gaertner et al. (2006) and Rutchick et al. (2008) suggesting that similarity and interactivity are important antecedents of entitativity, such that higher within group interactivity and similarity will lead to higher perceived entitativity.

However, these antecedents do not always affect perceived group entitativity in the same way across different groups. This idea was tested by Lickel and colleagues (2000). They constructed profiles using ratings of different group properties and identified four types of groups based on the profiles: intimacy groups, task groups, social categories, and loose associations. They further found that these types differed significantly in the degree of perceived entitativity.

According to Lickel et al. (2000), intimacy groups are small groups with high interactivity such as family and close friends. These types of groups usually have long history and changing membership is rare. Intimacy groups also have the highest perceived entitativity among all types of groups. Task groups are highly interactive but less centrally important to members; changing membership is common. Members of such groups usually share common goals and outcomes. Task groups, such as committees, sports team, and work units, are also high
in perceived entitativity. Social categories (e.g., women, Americans) are usually large groups with impermeable boundaries and low interactivity level among members. Loose associations, such as students in the same school or people who share the same interests, are large in size but have very low interaction level and short history. Social categories have lower entitativity than task groups, and loose associations have the lowest entitativity level among all types of groups. The social categories and task groups have received the most attention in entitativity research (Blanchard et al., 2018).

Wilder and Simon (1998) proposed a different approach to distinguish between groups and argued that groups differ by specific criteria for membership. They suggested that there are two distinct social units, categorical groups and dynamic groups. The criterion for membership in categorical groups is similarity, and the criterion for membership in dynamic groups is interaction. Members of a categorical group tend to possess the group’s defining characteristics and their group memberships are more stable across time whereas members of a dynamic groups are more likely possess synergetic properties that are the result of the interaction among group members. More recent research by Ip, Chiu, and Wan (2006) followed Wilder and Simon’s (1998) distinction, and these author further proposed that there are two different paths to entitativity corresponding to categorical and dynamic groups. In a series of studies, they manipulated groups’ physical and behavioral similarity and found that physical similarity predicts entitativity through perceptions of common traits, and synchronous movement predicts entitativity through common goals. Spencer-Rodgers, Hamilton, and Sherman (2007) reported similar findings using real-world group exemplars of categorical and dynamic groups. Specifically, they mapped categorical groups and dynamic groups onto social categories and task groups as defined by Lickel et al. (2000) and reported that homogeneity and essence were related
to categorical groups’ entitativity and role differentiation and agency were related to dynamic groups’ entitativity. Thus, different cues were associated with entitativity in different type of groups. Rutitchick et al. (2008) argued that this difference in antecedents of entitativity between categorical and dynamic groups is related to the way people construe the target group. They tested their hypotheses using the same target group with different manipulation instructions so that participants would be primed to construe the target group either as categorical or dynamic. Results of their studies mapped onto previous research findings to show that participants pay more attention to similarity cues and relied on these cues when judging the target group’s entitativity in a categorical construal situation, and participants utilized interaction cues more to make judgments of entitativity when construing the group dynamically. In conclusion, antecedents of perceived entitativity depend on whether the group is perceived to be categorical or dynamic.

Although the researchers previously mentioned had studied antecedents of entitativity among many different groups, very few of them examined those relationship on the organizational level from employees’ viewpoints. According to Lickel et al., (2000), people often consider organizations as dynamic groups (task groups). This might not only because of the amount of interactivity people usually observe among its employees but also because of the heavy emphasize on group-specific goals. On the other hand, an organization is different from simple task group in group duration, group size, complexity, and boundary permeability (Blanchard et al., 2018), which makes it a special case of dynamic groups. Currently, little research has focused on this special case and how it differs in respect of antecedents and outcomes compared to other dynamic groups.
Consequences of Entitativity

Entitativity affects people’s impression formation process such that with higher perceived entitativity of the group, information about its members will be processed in a similar way as that regarding a single target (Brewer & Harasty, 1996; Campbell, 1958; Hamilton & Sherman, 1996). As a consequence, members of high entitativity groups lose part of their individuality and become confounded with the group impression when perceived by other people (Crawford et al., 2002; Waytz & Young, 2012). Therefore, individual member’s behavior will be seen as more responsible for group’s collective actions in a high entitativity group.

Moreover, people will tend to perceive individual members to be less responsible for their personal actions if they belong to a group with high entitativity (Waytz & Young, 2012). In comparing groups with high entitativity with groups that are low entitativity on impression formation processes, three major characteristics were found to differentiate the groups: on-line versus memory-based judgment, category-based versus individuating process, and prototypic versus exemplar (Brewer & Harasty, 1996; McConnell, Sherman, & Hamilton, 1994, 1997).

On-line judgment implies that people process information about the target and form impressions towards it simultaneously, whereas in a memory-based judgment situation, perceivers do not form impressions when processing information about the target; judgments can only be made after the information is processed and retrieved from memory (McConnell et al., 1994). Researchers have found high entitativity groups are associated with on-line judgment and low entitativity groups are characterized by memory-based judgment (McConnell et al., 1997). Because consistency and cohesion are expected from high entitativity groups as oppose to low entitativity groups, perceivers will be more likely to orient cognitive resources into forming an integrated impression of the group perceived to be highly entitative. As a result of such
processes, the impression formed of highly entitative groups will be less likely to change when incidents or behaviors are encountered that are contradictory to the impression. On the other hand, evaluations of groups will be more likely to be influenced by these inconsistent behaviors for groups who have low entitativity when memory-based judgments occur.

In the dual-process model proposed by Brewer (1988), a distinction is made between category-based and individuating processes. The former implies that information about a group member is subsumed under group impressions and linked to all the members of the group because people tend to organize information around coherent units. In contrast, information about a group member is solely associate with that person if an individuating process is used. Evidence suggests that impressions of each member is formed following category-based process when they are members of group with high perceived entitativity, whereas impressions of members from low entitativity groups are formed in an individuating manner (Crawford et al., 2002).

As previously discussed, when developing a representation or impression of a group, individuals engage in either the prototypic processing or exemplar processing (Brewer & Harasty, 1996). Perceived entitativity is found to be positively related to the extent to which groups are mentally represented as prototypes and negatively related to the extent to which they are mentally represented as exemplars because high entitativity leads perceivers to form simple abstract representations of the group and generalize such representation to members (Crawford et al., 2002; Yzerbyt, Rocher, & Schadron, 1997). This means that when interacting with members of highly entitative groups, people will tend to compare the target they encountered to a general abstract prototype of the group they have in mind and reach their conclusion relatively fast without carefully examining the target. If the target with whom they interact is a member of a
group with low entitativity, people will engage in exemplar processing and thoroughly compare the target with the exemplars of the group before making judgments of the target. In addition, the judgment made of a highly entitative target will be stronger and more extreme with magnified attributional inferences compared to judgments of a target with low entitativity (Dasgupta, Banaji, & Abelson, 1999). When interacting with members of a highly entitativity group, people are also more likely to believe that members’ attitudes and behaviors represent the group’s collective attitudes and actions but not individual members’ opinions, and attribute more responsibility to the group and its individual members for collective actions (Waytz & Young, 2012).

The differences in impression formation process between highly entitativity groups and lower entitativity groups can contribute to differences in group outcomes, such as group cohesion, group identification, and satisfaction (e.g. Castano, Yzerbyt, & Bourguignon, 2003; Gaertner et al., 2006; Hogg, Sherman, Dierselhuis, Maitner, & Moffitt, 2007) such that with higher perceived entitativity, individuals will experience stronger group cohesion, have stronger group identification and satisfaction. For example, Blanchard et al. (2018) tested the relationship between perceived entitativity of the target group and various group outcomes in several different dynamic groups. They found that perceived entitativity positively correlated with group identification in sport teams, with job satisfaction in small work groups and social groups, and with group cohesion among online virtual groups. Not only may the correlations between entitativity and positive outcomes be stronger for highly entitativity groups, the correlation between entitativity and negative outcome variables may also be enhanced when perceived group entitativity is high. As previously mentioned, high group entitativity is found to be associated with more extreme judgments of the group (Dasgupta et al., 1999). Moreover, extreme
judgments will in turn lead to more negative outcomes among high entitativity groups because people would perceive them as more morally accountable for their actions as a unified agent than low entitativity groups (Malle, 2010). For instance, high entitativity groups were associated with more retaliation and less collaboration compared to low entitativity groups (Dasgupta et al., 1999). People also tend to choose more severe punishments for perpetrator groups with high entitativity than low entitativity (Newheiser, Sawaoka, & Dovidio, 2012).

To summarize, in highly entitative groups, members are seen as alike in the way they think, speak, and act. Impressions about high entitativity group members are formed in an integrative manner that is relatively fast and more resistant to inconsistent information. These impressions also aligned with the global impression of the group. Generally, higher entitativity perceptions of groups lead to more extreme judgments of the group (Smith et al., 2012) and stronger accountability of the group for its’ collective behaviors (Waytz & Young, 2012), and to both positive outcomes, such as greater group cohesion (Blanchard et al., 2018), higher group identification (Hogg et al., 2007), and negative outcomes as more retaliation (Dasgupta et al., 1999) and severe punishments (Newheiser et al., 2012).

**Ingroup Entitativity**

The previous discussion of entitativity perceptions focuses on the definition of entitativity and its relationship with other related variables. It is important to note that the pattern of these relationships might be different depending on the perceiver’s relationship with the target group (Blanchard et al., 2018). People can examine a group’s entitativity level as members of the group or as nonmember observers. In the case of members perceiving their own group, ingroup entitativity is involved. Previous researchers have primarily focused on examining ingroup entitativity among categorical groups and observer perceived group entitativity among dynamic
groups (Blanchard et al., 2018). It is theoretically argued and empirically supported that ingroup entitativity is usually perceived as a positive feature of a group and related to higher ingroup identification, higher commitment, and positive attitudes toward the ingroup (Gaertner & Schopler, 1998; Lickel et al., 2000; Sherman, Hamilton, & Lewis, 1999).

As members of a highly entitative group, people might experience stronger group identification (Castano et al., 2003), which then results in more favorable treatment from the group (van Dick & Haslam, 2012). Members of a highly entitative team might be able to achieve common goals faster because they are more likely to engage in collective actions (Abelson, Dasgupta, Park, & Banaji, 1998). But being a member of a highly entitative group might not always be a good thing. As previously discussed, there are negative consequences associated with high group entitativity (e.g., Dasgupta et al., 1999; Newheiser et al., 2012), and these negative consequences are mostly associated with attitudes and behaviors of nonmember observers instead of members of the target group. Whether there are situations when high perceived entitativity of a group is associated with negative judgments and reactions from its’ own members is a question that needs to be answered. For instance, how group members react to their own group upon receiving undesired treatment from the group might depend on members’ perceived ingroup entitativity. On one hand, members from high entitativity group might be less likely to react negatively toward the group based on single unpleasant event that is inconsistent with their impression of the group compared to members from low entitativity group (McConnell et al., 1997). On the other hand, when people hold negative impressions of their own group and have limited freedom to leave the group, it is possible that members of high entitativity group may react more negatively to the group after an unpleasant event than members of low entitativity group. Without empirically examining the situation described above, it is hard to
conclude that high ingroup entitativity will always be associated with positive outcomes for the group and its’ members.

To summarize, consequences of group entitativity relate to the role of the perceiver. When perceivers are ingroup members, higher entitativity is usually related to stronger positive outcomes. such as commitment, identification, and satisfaction among others (Abelson et al., 1998; Blanchard et al., 2018; Castano et al., 2003). If perceivers are nonmember observers or members from a competing group, higher entitativity of the target outgroup is likely to be associated with more negative attitudes and severe behaviors towards the outgroup (Dasgupta et al., 1999; Newheiser et al., 2012).

Entitativity of Organizations

Organizations as a common type of group receive far less attention than they should considering the fact that most adults belong to work organizations. On average, a full time American employee works 47 hours a week (Saad, 2014), which take up to almost 40% of his/her waking hours. This means American employees spend more than one third of a typical day in their work organization and might interact with coworkers and supervisors more often than their closest friends, family members, and fellows from other social groups. Employees’ perceptions of organizations, coworkers, and supervisors are likely to affect their attitudes toward these parties and behaviors in the workplace. On one hand, even there has been no research directly targeting entitativity in organization, there are some studies hinting at a possible pattern of relationships between entitativity and related variables in organizations based on research using small work groups. For instance, using hypothetical work groups and undergraduate students, Lickel et al. (2000) found perceived entitativity was related to all important antecedents, including similarity, interactivity, shared goals, and boundary. Although
the issues with undergraduate participants and their methods could be seen as weakening the strength of their conclusions, the idea that important antecedents relate to entitativity in an organizational context in a similar way as observed in other social groups is still theoretically valid and worth pursuing. Blanchard and colleagues (2020) provided another piece of evidence in their studies in which they measured the perceived entitativity of small work groups using their newly developed scale and tested its relationship with antecedents, including similarity, interactivity, shared goals, history, and boundaries, and outcome variables such as group identification and satisfaction. Using structural equation modeling (SEM), they further showed that interactivity displays the strongest positive correlation with entitativity among all antecedents, followed by similarity and history. This is aligned with findings that interactivity is more important among dynamic groups than similarity (Rutchick et al., 2008).

On the other hand, compared to other types of social groups, including small work groups, organizations are usually granted power by key external stakeholders to select its members and control members’ actions, making decisions without consent of their members, even when these decisions might potentially harm their members (King et al., 2010). Pfeffer (1997) also pointed out that organizations, compared to other social groups, are more likely to have goals that are survival oriented, have boundaries that are clearly defined and demarcated by specific roles, and are often formally recognized as social entities by governmental agencies.

Moreover, the characteristics that define an organization as an entity might not be limited to the commonly identified antecedents of entitativity for other social groups. As noted by Huber (2011), organizations are characterized as socially constructed, goal-directed, boundary-maintaining, hierarchically differentiated, and have open systems of human activity that interact with their environment. Thus, there are characteristics that are important to organizations other
than goals, boundaries, interactivity, and similarity. For example, the structure of an organization is considered one of its most important features, which is a function of the complexity of an organization’s hierarchical structure, the flexibility of routines and policies, and the authority of decision making (Huber, 2011). Organizational structure has been found to be related to both employees’ job performance (Huber 2011) and their attitudes toward the organization (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). It is possible that differences in the complexity of organizational structure, the formalization and centralization of the structure, affects to what extent employees perceive their organizations as an entity. Hall (1982) also argued that organizations usually extend beyond their members and have systems of norms and expectations for members to follow, which also hinted that organizations can be seen as independent entities because of features that are different from the antecedents of entitativity identified among other social groups.

Therefore, these potential differences between organizations and typical social groups might be associated with significant difference in the way people construe these groups. The effect of entitativity as well as its’ relationships with antecedents discussed above might not generalize to organizational settings. Thus, it is important to investigate the function of ingroup entitativity perceptions of organizations and fill in the puzzle of potential consequences of ingroup entitativity.

Although entitativity has not been directly examined and linked to organizational outcomes in organizational contexts, researchers have examined the relationship between key antecedents of entitativity and important organizational outcomes (e.g. Gonzalez & Chakraborty, 2012; Heffner & Rentsch, 2001; Kammeyer-Mueller, Livingston, & Liao, 2011; Piasentin & Chapman, 2007). For example, perceptions of similarity as one important characteristic and antecedent of perceived entitativity has been found to be positively associated with job
satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions (Piasentin & Chapman, 2007). Similar results were reported by Kammyerer-Muller and colleagues (2010) in a longitudinal study among newly hired employees. They distinguished demographic similarity from attitudinal similarity between employees and their organizations and found that demographic similarities in gender and education related to employees’ organizational citizenship behaviors and creative performance, and attitudinal similarity was correlated with higher role clarity. Another study examined the role of interaction in an organizational setting and found that at different levels in organization, interaction was associated with higher affective commitment (Heffner & Rentsch, 2001), which linked interactivity to organizational outcomes. Even though these researchers only examined the relationship between antecedents of entitativity and organizational outcomes in organizational settings, the idea that entitativity might play an important role in influencing organizational outcomes can be inferred but should be directly explored.

**Entitativity and Social Exchange Theory**

Social Exchange Theory (SET) emphasizes the process of resource exchange between two parties over a long-term, open-ended time frame (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). According to SET, the social exchange process often starts with a positive initiating action from an organizational actor to a target individual employee. In response to the initiating action, the target reciprocates the positive treatment with positive attitudes and behaviors. The theory suggests that the organizational actor could be a supervisor, a coworker, or the organization itself and the positive treatment received from one organizational actor should be reciprocated back to that same (Blau, 1964).

As previously mentioned, underlying the proposed social exchange relationship between employees and organizations is a fundamental assumption that organizations would be viewed as
equivalent actors as supervisors and coworkers. It is possible that if employees do not see organizations as independent entities capable of initiating positive treatment, there might be no exchange of resources between employees and organizations. If employees are only engaging in exchange relationship with supervisors or coworkers, SET might not be the best theoretical explanation for the positive relationship between positive treatment from organizations and organizational commitment and employee organizational citizenship behaviors, perceived organizational support, justice, and trust observed in many previous studies. However, despite the importance of the assumption that the organization is an entity that can engage in exchange relationships to SET, this assumption is rarely explicitly tested in organizational research; thus, the consequence of the violation of this assumption remains unknown to organizational researchers. I argue that perceived organizational entitativity is the key construct to test the assumption because it is a direct index of employees’ perception of their organization’s group-ness. Examining the quality of exchange relationships between employees and their organizations at various level of perceived organizational entitativity would allow researchers to understand the function of entitativity in the social exchange process within an organization context and test the fundamental assumption directly.

Among many of the theories that have been used to explain justice issues in the organizations, Social Exchange Theory (SET) was the first to be applied to justice research and is still the dominant one in the literatures (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015). Justice researchers adopting the SET framework emphasize not only the importance of reciprocity rules, but also the importance of having an accountable party in the exchange relationship for the justice treatment (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015). Previous researchers have suggested that not only supervisors but also coworkers are often seen by employees as the representatives of organizations in these exchange
relationships, and it is important to incorporate exchange relationships with supervisors, coworkers, and organizations simultaneously (Shanock, Roch, & Mishra, 2012). It is possible that entitativity might be relevant in understanding organizational justice perceptions, although almost no prior studies have linked justice perceptions with perceived entitativity of the organization. As mentioned earlier, organizational justice researchers often consider the organization as a valid independent source of justice treatment received by employees, which suggests that an organization can be perceived as a united entity by employees. This can be seen from the research investigating entity-based justice, which focused on employees’ perceptions of justice toward different entities within organizations, such as supervisors, coworkers, and organizations (Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, & Rupp, 2001b; Hollensbe, Khazanchi, & Masterson, 2008; Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002). It is clear that researchers investigating entity-based justice within social exchange framework implicitly assume that people see organizations as entities and engage in social exchange processes with them with this view in mind. Such an assumption indicates that there is a potential relationship between the perception of organizational entitativity and organizational justice perceptions. However, previous studies rarely provide empirical evidence to support such an assumption or consider the possibility that organizational entitativity perceptions might vary across different organizations. In addition, employees from same organization might perceive the organization differently in terms of entitativity. As previously discussed, entitativity perceptions are related to people’s impression formation process (Brewer & Harasty, 1996) and correlate with many important group outcomes (e.g., Abelson et al., 1998; Blanchard et al., 2018; Castano et al., 2003). It is possible that the perceived entitativity of organizations might influence employees’ evaluation of organizational justice and affect their emotional and behavioral reactions. Therefore, investigating perceived
organizational entitativity in an organizational justice framework will enable me to examine the
effect of entitativity on the relationship between organizational justice and outcomes and expand
our understanding of both organizational justice and organizational entitativity, which has direct
implications for SET explanation for why just organizational treatment is reciprocated by
employees with positive organizational attitudes and behaviors.

Although organizational justice and perceived organizational entitativity have not been
investigated together, perceived entitativity has been related to justice perceptions in a social
group context (Brewer & Harasty, 1996). In their discussion of entitativity and justice, Brewer
and Harasty differentiated perceptions of justice that derived from social comparisons at the
individual level from perceptions of justice that resulted from comparisons at the intergroup level
and suggested judgments of justice and fairness relate to the level of social comparison. For
example, people using an individual level of social comparison might think that it is fair to
distribute resources among groups based on the number of group members, whereas people
making judgment based on intergroup level of social comparison might think that resources
should be distributed evenly between groups and that all groups are equal regardless of the size
of the group.

Decades of research exploring organizational justice mainly focused on answering three
questions: how do people form justice perception about their organizations, why do people care
about organizational justice, what is organizational justice, in other words, how do people define
it?

Formation of Justice Perception

To begin with, Adams (1965) proposed the classic Equity Theory and suggested that
people form judgments about justice by comparing the ratio of their input to the outcomes they
received with the ratios of others. This means employees will evaluate the fairness of outcomes they received based on comparisons with other employees who they believe work as hard as they do and bring the same KSAOs to the workplace. Therefore, according to Equity Theory, the outcomes people receive are an important source of evidence used to form justice perceptions. However, this theory has been criticized as being too narrow because it only considered the distribution of outcomes in forming justice judgments and failed to take into account how the process of decision making relevant to resource distribution influences the formation of justice judgments (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001). Different from Equity Theory, Folger and Cropanzano (2001) proposed a fairness theory suggesting that there are three questions people must answer before making justice judgments: would the situation be different, could someone do things differently, and should they have done things differently. For example, employees might think that it is unfair if they believe their organization should have provided promotion opportunities that the organization could have provided these because it has the resources and power to do so, and that if the organization had provided promotion opportunities, employees would have had the chance to be promoted to a better position. Folger and Cropanzano (2001) argue that the three judgments must be made before people reach their conclusion about justice. Their discussions focused on situations in which people have enough time and resources to make evaluations. However, people sometimes have limited access to answers to all three questions, or they do not have time to make the judgments before reaching a conclusion.

To address this important missing piece in justice evaluation process, Lind (2001) suggested the idea of fairness heuristics and argued that employees actively collect information regarding their interactions with organizations, make judgments based on the information available to them, and use the judgment to guide their reactions and evaluations of subsequent
events. According to Fairness Heuristic Theory (van den Bos, 2001), once employees form their justice perceptions about an organization, they will use these perceptions as heuristics to evaluate new situations they encounter, which frees up their cognitive resources to focus on other tasks. Fairness Heuristic Theory also emphasizes that the procedures organizations use to distribute resources are seen as an important source of information regarding how the organization treats them and whether they can trust their organizations.

In conclusion, employees form their judgments of organizational justice based on their comparisons with others, evaluations of the situations, and their perception of justice prior to the current situation (Cropanzano et al., 2001b). Different theories explain different components of the justice evaluation processes, but a more fundamental question related to organizational justice that should be answered is why employees care so much about justice.

Why Employee Care about Justice

In explaining why justice is important to employees, I found two key words emerged among varies theories, needs and uncertainty. Researchers believe that people pay attention to justice issues because they serve important psychological needs, whereas others argue that people use justice perceptions to combat the sense of uncertainty they experience in situations (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015; Cropanzano et al., 2001b).

The Multiple Needs Model of Williams (1997) is a good example of a theory emphasizing psychological needs. Models of psychological needs suggest that people care about justice because it is related to important basic needs they have and influences the way people interact with the rest of the world. Williams (1997) suggested that there are four types of needs that can be threatened when people experience mistreatment; need for control, need for belonging, need for self-esteem, and need for meaningful existence. The need for control
concerns people’s desire to predict and manage the process and possible outcomes of the allocation of resources. Feelings of justice allow people to have more power over the prediction and management regarding the allocation of resources. People desire not only tangible resources but also meaningful attachments to other human beings; such attachments help people to form a sense of self-identity (Cropanzano et al., 2001b). For example, employees make judgments about their organizations not only based on the salary and rewards they received, but also based on their daily interactions with the organization (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). If employees perceive their organization as honest and transparent with its’ decision-making process and as showing genuine concern about employees’ well-being, employees should feel accepted and valued by the organization and see themselves as worthy individuals. Therefore, employees who believe that they are being treated fairly by the organization would more likely to believe that they are valuable human beings and important members of the organization, which in turn fulfill the need for belonging and need for self-esteem (Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, & Rupp, 2001a). The need of meaningful existence maps onto the basic quality of human beings, morality (Cropanzano et al., 2001b). People seek meaning in their lives and belief in a just world helps to reinforce meaning of human society. People will see injustice as a violation of the moral rules and a threat to the meaning of their lives, and therefore react strongly to unjust situations to protect their existence (Colquitt et al., 2015).

Different from theories that emphasize psychological needs, theories focusing on uncertainty tend to explain the need for justice from another perspective. Social Exchange Theory is one example of theories that emphasize uncertainty about trustworthiness (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015). According to Blau (1964), employees form two kinds of exchange relationships in workplace, economic exchange and social exchange. For example, employees could engage in
either economic exchanges where they finish their job duties in exchange for paychecks, or social exchanges in which they help coworkers with their tasks in exchange for good relationships with coworkers and possible assistance when needed in the future. Uncertainty emerges when the resources employees exchange are not available to them immediately after their investments, which is often the case for both tangible rewards and symbolic resources such as high-quality relationships (Colquitt et al., 2013). Employees use justice evaluations as evidence to inform them of the probability of receiving the resources from parties with whom they interact. For instance, employees would consider whether their organization is trustworthy in the exchange relationship before completing their tasks to evaluate their possibility of getting the resources they deserved in the future. Once employees believe that their exchange partner (in this case, the organization) would treat them fairly, the feeling of uncertainty is reduced, and they are more confident about the exchange relationship. Therefore, justice perceptions are one important way people combat the fear of uncertainty when interacting with others.

In summary, people care about justice mainly because of two kinds of reasons: to fulfill their psychological needs or to help manage the feeling of uncertainty they experience during interpersonal interactions. Next, it is important to more deeply understand what justice is before studying its relationship with important outcomes.

**Definition of Justice**

As mentioned earlier, according to Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964), people follow a set of normative rules to form long-term, trusting relationships and exchange valuable concrete or symbolic resources with other parties (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). In this social exchange context, organizational justice represents one kind of symbolic resource that organization could use to exchange for beneficial actions on the part of employees. Therefore, the formation of
justice perceptions also follows a set of normative rules, which are often defined as four dimensions of justice, distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, and informational justice (Colquitt et al., 2001).

Early justice researchers focused their attention on the fairness of the distribution of outcomes among employees and followed the equity theory framework, and distributive justice was identified in this stream of research (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Distributive justice concerns the perceived fairness of outcomes one received, such as pay, promotion, and training opportunities (Colquitt et al., 2001). The second justice dimension, procedural justice, by its definition, concerns the fairness of the processes used to determine outcomes (Thibaut & Walker, 1975) and employee voice (Leventhal, 1980). Both interpersonal and informational justice concerns the quality of employees’ interpersonal communication relevant to the implementation of procedure (Greenberg, 1993). Interpersonal justice emphasizes the politeness, dignity, and respect people receive from interactions, and informational justice reflects the accuracy, appropriateness, and degree of adequacy of the information being delivered during the interaction. Meta-analytic evidence supports the idea that interpersonal and informational justice are two distinct constructs and suggests that both dimensions are closely related to organizational outcomes, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Colquitt et al., 2001).

Despite the popularity of the four-dimension justice typology in organizational justice research, it is worth noticing that the four-justice typology does not explicitly focus on a target of the justice perceptions. As previously discussed, justice can be seen as a symbolic resource in the social exchange relationship between employees and another party (Cropanzano & Byrne, 2000). Employees evaluate the treatment they received from this party, fair or unfair, and repay it with corresponding actions of their own. This party could be coworkers, supervisors, or the
organization. Early researchers argued that specific parties are held responsible for specific dimensions of justice (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000; Tyler & Bies, 1990). For example, employees would believe that organizations are responsible for making rules and policies, therefore procedural justice exists at the organizational level and relates to organizational outcomes, whereas supervisors are more likely to engage in direct interactions with employees, therefore are perceived as the source of interpersonal justice (Malatesta & Byrne, 1997). These justice researchers assumed that there are no cross-foci effects involved in justice perceptions.

In recent years, researchers have begun to argue that all entities in the organization (supervisor, coworker, and organization as a whole) can be the source of any of the four dimensions of justice and proposed the idea of a multifoci justice model (Cropanzano & Byrne, 2000; Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002; Rupp et al., 2014). The multifoci approach of justice emphasizes the importance of having a responsible party in the justice model and argues that employees interact with myriad parties in a typical work setting and that they are capable of distinguishing, evaluating, and reacting to each party (Rupp et al., 2014). This means employees will treat a kind coworker who had previously helped them differently from a coworker who was mean to them at work. It seems easy to imagine supervisors or coworkers as targets of justice appraisals because they are individual entities. However, when the target becomes the organization, it is more difficult to picture how people appraise a collection of people when they usually interact with its members. The concept of entitativity might be a possible explanation for such a process. As discussed above, a group that is high in perceived entitativity is usually seen as one unified entity. The way people interact with such groups is similar to their interaction with individuals (Campbell, 1958). Empirical evidence supports such a distinction by showing that
employees can differentiate between supervisory and organizational commitment (Byrne & Cropanzano, 2000; Masterson et al., 2000). It is possible that when employees see the organization as a high entitativity group, they are more likely to make judgments about the organization and interact with it as an independent source of justice similar to supervisors and coworkers. However, it is unclear how people evaluate and react to organization if they perceive the organization as having low entitativity.

Despite the possibility that employees can attribute justice to any of the entities in the organization, most researchers have only examined justice within the context of certain parties, including supervisor (Masterson et al., 2000), coworkers (Donovan, Drasgow, & Munson, 1998), and organizations (Colquitt & Shaw, 2005), and a few include more than one source of justice to directly investigate the multifoci model of justice. For example, to provide empirical evidence to support the multifoci approach, Rupp and colleagues (2014) conducted a meta-analytic review of the organizational justice literature, which included more than 500 studies. Their results supported the idea that employees are able to distinguish between different targets and form independent justice judgments toward certain targets. They further demonstrated support for a target similarity effect in which the relationship between multifoci justice perceptions and target similar outcomes is stronger than the relationship between the dimension-based justice perceptions with outcomes. Specifically, they found that organizationally-focused justice dimensions have a stronger relationship with most of the organization level outcomes compared to supervisory-focused justice dimensions, and when predicting outcomes targeting the supervisor, supervisory-focused justice dimensions performed better than organizationally-focused justice ones.

Furthermore, even though the four-dimension organizational justice model is perhaps the
dominant conceptualization in justice research, it is clearly not the only one. A group of researchers have shifted their attention from studying specific dimensions of justice perceptions to examining the role of overall justice judgments in organizations (Ambrose & Arnaud, 2005; Ambrose & Schminke, 2009; Lind, 2001). They argued that the use of overall justice perceptions might be better than specific dimensions of justice in capturing individual justice experience and suggested that an overall justice judgment is a more proximal predictor of employee attitudes and behaviors than judgements of specific dimensions of justice (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009).

Ambrose and Schminke examined and found a significant mediation effect of overall justice perceptions on the relationship between specific justice dimensions and outcomes. In other words, it appears that the justice dimensions seem to contribute to an overall justice perception, which relates to employee attitudes and behavior. The overall justice perception accounted for variance in outcomes beyond the specific justice dimensions (e.g., Ambrose & Schminke, 2009; Jones & Martens, 2009).

Further, the use of overall justice perceptions may also bring important practical value to justice research. Focusing on the overall justice perception instead of the justice dimensions provides a more parsimonious depiction of employees’ justice experience without losing information (Hillebrandt & Barclay, 2013). Given that the purpose of the current study is to explore the relationship between justice perceptions and entitativity and how these two together affect outcomes in the workplace, overall justice perceptions are preferred over separate justice dimensions because they are more proximal predictors of employee reactions (Hillebrandt & Barclay, 2013).

To summarize, the use of the four-dimension justice typology to define justice perceptions is incomplete because it only examines certain dimension of justice from specific
sources and ignores the possibility that all entities in the organizations can be targets of justice perceptions. The multifoci justice approach, on the other hand, takes the source of justice into account when defining justice; Rupp et al. (2014) provide empirical evidence to support the multifoci justice approach. Finally, overall justice perceptions potentially may better represent employees’ justice experiences than specific justice dimensions (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009).

**Injustice**

For decades, researchers investigating organizational justice have treated justice perceptions and injustice perceptions as two sides of the same coin and simply assumed that absence of one would indicate presence of the other. Recently Colquitt et al. (2015) proposed that people might react to justice rule violation and adherence in very different ways. They suggest that justice and injustice should be more carefully differentiated and examined in terms of their influence on people’s attitudes and behaviors. Very few studies have included both justice and injustice in their research design, with one exception being an empirical study by Gilliland, Benson, and Schepers (1998). They found across three studies that in a hypothetical layoff scenario, undergraduate participants were less likely to consider justice rule adherence when making decisions about their actions toward the scenario if more than three violations of justice rules were presented. Their results suggested that justice and injustice might affect people’s decision-making processes differently, which provides initial support to the idea that justice and injustice are not interchangeable in predicting outcomes.

Colquitt and colleagues (2015) measured both justice and injustice perceptions using a full-range measurement based on the four-dimension justice model. Their results showed that the model explained significant incremental variance in outcome variables when both justice and injustice were included in the model but kept separately. Moreover, they found that injustice
perceptions were more predictive than justice perceptions of reactions, such as hostility and counterproductive behaviors but not citizenship behaviors. Colquitt et al. (2015) explained such differences using a regulatory focus lens explanation (Higgins, 1997), suggesting that justice and injustice experiences trigger different psychological mechanisms that are associated with different reactions. For instance, when facing mistreatment or disrespect from supervisors, employees may view such justice rule violations as threats to their safety and may engage in counterproductive work behaviors that are prevention laden. In contrast, justice rule adherence is associated with positive behavioral outcomes that are promotion laden, which relate to a desire to become the ideal self (Colquitt et al., 2015). Thus, employees would feel the desire to become the ideal upon receiving fair treatment and would engage in more citizenship behaviors as a way to strive for the ideal self. Even though the implications of full range of justice scale have not yet been fully explored, there is evidence that assessing justice and injustice at the same time would add value in predicting certain outcome variables.

Taken together, it is clear that the influence of justice rule adherence and violation differs in psychological meaningful ways. Empirical research is needed to gain a better understanding of the difference between perceptions of justice and injustice and how they influence workplace outcomes.

**Justice Reactions**

As mentioned earlier, prior studies often link justice perceptions with behaviors in workplaces using the social exchange framework (Colquitt et al., 2013). This framework suggests that organizations and supervisors can offer justice as one of the intangible benefits in the exchange relationship, and employees in turn, may engage in beneficial behaviors, such as organizational citizenship behaviors, as a means of reciprocation. These behavioral outcomes
associated with justice perceptions tend to be cognition-driven in nature, involving cognitive evaluations of the events and the source of justice (Colquitt et al., 2015; Hillebrandt & Barclay, 2013).

Compared to behavioral reactions, emotions have received relatively little attention in the justice literature (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015). Even less research has focused on positive emotions and their relationship with justice perceptions (Cohen-Charash & Byrne, 2008). However, Lawler and Thye (1999) pointed out that emotions could be an important piece in the social exchange framework and suggest that positive emotions such as pride and gratitude can be triggered when positive exchange transactions happened between employees and organizations or supervisors. Weiss, Suckow, and Cropanzano's (1999) experiments supported the idea by demonstrating that justice perceptions are related to positive emotions like happiness and pride. Lawler and Thye’s (1999) discussion of emotions also suggests that different emotions are determined by the target of the attribution process. Pride emerges when people attribute the positive events to themselves, whereas gratitude results from attribution of such events to others.

Negative emotion like anger and anxiety, on the other hand, have been more closely linked to injustice perceptions in the literature (Colquitt et al., 2013). As previously discussed, justice perceptions and injustice perceptions might be associated with different psychological process and therefore also associated with different emotions (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015). Hillebrandt and Barclay (2013) suggest that positive emotions are more of an ancillary reaction to justice perceptions and less likely to drive cognitions to influence behaviors when associated with justice perceptions, whereas when experiencing injustice, negative emotions might drive the perceptual process and trigger some “hot” reactions. For example, employees may evaluate the fair treatment they received from the organization and decide to engage in more organizational
citizenship behaviors while experiencing gratitude toward the organization. On the other hand, emotions could also affect employees’ behavior directly without a change in attitudes at the time of action (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). As one example of these affect-driven behaviors, counterproductive behaviors has been found linked to justice perceptions through negative emotions like anger (Colquitt et al., 2013; Judge et al., 2006). Hillebrandt and Barclay (2013) further point out that these strong negative emotional reactions associated with injustice perceptions could be unitary and undifferentiated.

Therefore, it is possible that, given the assumption that justice and injustice perceptions link to emotional reactions through different processes, the role of entitativity might be different in the injustice – negative emotion relationship compared to the justice – positive emotion relationship.
Chapter III

Hypotheses
I will begin this chapter with a discussion of the first research question regarding and how the antecedents influence the degree of perceived organizational entitativity. As mentioned earlier, to what extent the organization is viewed as an entity has implications for the common use of SET as the theoretical explanation for why just organizational treatment of employees is reciprocated by employees in terms of positive organizational attitudes and behavior. This will be followed by a discussion of the hypotheses exploring the effect of entitativity perceptions on organizational justice – outcome relationships. Finally, the second research question regarding the relationship between entitativity perceptions and injustice perceptions and its’ influence on organizational outcomes will be discussed.

**Entitativity Antecedents**

As discussed in the literature review, entitativity and its relationship with key antecedents and important outcomes have been examined in many different types of groups, including both categorical and dynamic groups (e.g. Ip et al., 2006; Spencer-Rodgers et al., 2007). However, within the domain of dynamic groups, very few researchers have explored the role of entitativity in small work groups and how it might differ from other dynamic groups, such as social groups (e.g., Lickel et al., 2000). No published research, to the best of my knowledge, has directly explored the relationship between perceived organizational entitativity and its antecedents.

On one hand, the organization can be viewed as one kind of dynamic group; hence it is possible that entitativity functions similarly in organizational settings as it does in other dynamic groups. Indirect evidence to support this idea can be found in previous research with small work groups. As discussed in literature review, Lickel et al. (2000) and Blanchard et al. (2018) both provide evidence that perceived entitativity correlates with all important antecedents in small work groups, and its correlation with interactivity is the strongest among all antecedents, which
is a pattern of relationships that is similar to other dynamic groups.

On the other hand, it is also possible that the relationship between organizational entitativity and its antecedents is different from what people observed in other types of dynamic groups. Although organizations are similar to small work groups because they both are heavily goal oriented dynamic groups, organizations are different from small work groups in terms of group size, structure complexity, and duration. More importantly, organizations often have the power to act without considering its members’ preference (King et al., 2010). It is possible that such differences might change how employees perceive their organization and construe it as a group.

Therefore, it is possible that given the significant differences between organizations and other dynamic groups, including small work groups, the strength or the nature of the relationships between antecedents with perceived entitativity might be different in an organizational context. For instance, having shared goals is often considered a construct that affects perceived entitativity (Campbell, 1958; Lickel, Hamilton, & Sherman, 2001), especially among dynamic groups like small work groups, which are goal-directed (Brewer, Hong, & Li, 2004). Contrary to the findings of these researchers, Blanchard et al. (2018) showed that shared goals are not correlated with the perceived entitativity of small work groups in a SEM model. The inconsistent findings regarding shared goals makes it hard to predict its relationship with entitativity for organizations without further empirical examination.

Interactivity as another potentially important antecedent for organization entitativity that is likely to demonstrate a different relationship with organizational entitativity compared to its relationship with entitativity in small work groups. Brass, Galaskiewicz, Greve, and Tsai (2004) suggest that people can usually observe interpersonal interactions between members of small
work groups, but there can be two levels of interaction in an organization, interpersonal interactions and inter-unit interactions. Members of an organization can engage in interactions with individual members, with small work groups, or directly with the organization itself. Perhaps such differences in the levels of interaction involved in small work groups versus organizations might affect the strength of the relationship between interactivity and perceived entitativity. Therefore, it is possible to observe a pattern of relationships between perceived entitativity and key antecedents in an organizational context that is different from the pattern for small work groups and other social groups.

_Research Question 1: Do key antecedents such as similarity, interactivity, shared goals, and boundary relate to perceived entitativity in organizational contexts the same way as they do in social groups?_

**Entitativity and Organization Justice**

If employees are able to perceive organizations as entities and the key antecedents influence the formation of these perceptions, these findings would provide support for the use of SET as the explanation for why employees reciprocate just organizational treatment with positive organizational attitudes and behaviors. Then, the next question is how such entitativity perceptions influence the exchange relationships we observe between employees and their organizations. As previous discussed, organizational justice perceptions play an important role in employees’ battle with the feelings of uncertainty they experience in organizations (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015). As mentioned earlier, according to Social Exchange Theory, employees constantly seek information to evaluate the quality of their exchange relationships with supervisors, coworkers, and the organizations, and use justice perceptions as important evidence to inform them whether the party with whom they interact (i.e. organization) is trustworthy, which then
determines their reactions (Colquitt et al., 2013). When making justice judgments, the target of the justice perceptions can be an individual entity such as a supervisor, a coworker, or a group, such as an organization.

Entitativity might play an essential role when employees evaluate justice perceptions toward the organization, because entitativity perceptions are an important piece in people’s impression formation process of groups (Brewer & Harasty, 1996). Even though the concept of entitativity has rarely been linked to organizational justice in organizational research, it is possible that the two constructs interact to affect employees’ evaluation of their relationship with the organization. As previously discussed, people treat a group like an individual entity if they believe this group is highly entitative (Campbell, 1958). Hence, the more employees see their organizations as entities, the more likely the way that they judge the organization would be similar to how they judge their supervisor and coworkers. Thus, it would be reasonable to expect that employees who perceive their organization as highly entitative would be better at separating their justice perception of the organization from their justice perception of their supervisor and react to different targets accordingly. Moreover, high perceived group entitativity has been linked to more extreme reactions toward the group (Smith et al., 2012), and stronger accountability of the group for its members’ behaviors (Waytz & Young, 2012). Putting this together, employees’ perceived organizational entitativity may influence the way their justice perceptions shape their reactions in the workplace. These reactions might be directly aimed at the organization itself instead of other parties in the organization and be more extreme toward the organization if they perceive their organization to have high entitativity.

Employees could respond to justice perceptions in many forms, including emotional, attitudinal, or behavioral reactions (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015). As discussed earlier, emotions, as
an important part of the social exchange framework, have been linked to justice perceptions, such that positive emotions like pride and happy are positively related to justice perceptions and negative emotions such as anger are positively associated with injustice perceptions (Colquitt et al., 2013; Colquitt et al., 2015). Among different positive emotions, gratitude is the one that will likely emerge when people attribute a positive experience to other entities (Lawler & Thye, 1999). If employees perceive that their organization is high in entitativity, they may be more likely to see the organization as the source of justice and be more likely to direct their gratitude toward the organization. Moreover, employees with high organizational entitativity perceptions might also express stronger gratitude towards the organization compared to employees with low organizational entitativity perceptions. Therefore, employees are more likely to express gratitude to organizations when reacting to positive justice perceptions if their perceived organizational entitativity is high.

**Hypothesis 1a:** Employee perceived organizational entitativity moderates the relationship between organization-focused justice perception and gratitude towards the organization such that the relationship is stronger when perceived entitativity is high than when it is low.

In addition to emotional reactions, justice perceptions also can influence employees’ behaviors. As discussed in the literature review, people are likely to engage in behaviors that benefit the entities who treat them with respect and dignity (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Thus, employees who believe they are being treated fairly by supervisors or organizations will respond to fairness with positive extra-role behaviors (Organ, 1988). Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is one of the positive extra-role behaviors in which employees engage to reciprocate the fair treatment they receive (Lind, 2001). Many studies have explored and supported the positive relationship between justice perceptions and OCBs (e.g. Bies, Martin, &
Based on the previous discussion, it is possible that the strength of the positive relationship between justice perceptions and OCBs varies depending on the level of perceived organizational entitativity. Organization citizenship behaviors can be further separated into two major categories, behaviors that target the organization (OCBOs), and behaviors directed to individuals in the organization (OCBIs; Williams & Anderson, 1991). Specifically, employees will likely respond to fair treatment they received from the organization with OCBs that benefit the organization (OCBOs) if they perceive high organizational entitativity because they may perceive themselves to be in an exchange relationship with the organization directly. With lower perceived organizational entitativity, employees might not see organization as an entity that is accountable for the treatment that they have received and therefore might be less likely to direct their behaviors towards the organization. Thus, when adding organizational entitativity into the picture, one would expect the relationship between organization-focused justice perceptions and OCBOs to be stronger if perceived organizational entitativity is high than if it is low.

*Hypothesis 1b: Employee perceived organizational entitativity moderates the relationship between organization-focused justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors toward the organization such that the relationship is stronger when perceived entitativity is high than when it is low.*

**Entitativity and Multifoci Justice**

As mentioned in the literature review, Rupp et al. (2014) conducted a meta-analytical study to support the multifoci justice model by showing that justice perceptions are a better predictor of organizational outcomes when matching the source of justice and target of outcomes than when only differentiating justice dimensions but not sources. The exception in their results
being the cross-foci effects they found, which showed that supervisory-focused justice predicts organizational citizen behaviors toward the organization better than organization-focused justice. Even though they did not link the cross-foci effect with entitativity perceptions, it is possible that to what degree employees see their organization as one entity influences how they attribute their justice perceptions.

As previously discussed, people are less likely to attribute individual minds to group members and more likely to believe that the group is able to have intentions and take actions if they perceive the group as cohesive and united (Waytz & Young, 2012). Therefore, the group, but not its individual members, is held responsible for collective actions (Tanibe, Hashimoto, Tomabechi, Masamoto, & Karasawa, 2019). Such attributions could also direct employees’ emotions and behaviors. If the same argument holds true in organizational settings, employees who perceive high entitativity in regard to their organization will believe that the organization is responsible for the supervisory-focused justice they experienced and thus direct attitudes and behaviors toward the organization more than toward their supervisor. On the other hand, it is possible that if employees perceive lower organizational entitativity, they will be more likely to direct their responses to supervisory-focused justice toward their supervisor instead of toward their organization because they will hold their supervisor accountable but not the organization for the treatment they received from their supervisor; thus, fewer cross-foci effects in justice perceptions will be expected when perceived entitativity level is low. Specifically, supervisory-focused justice perceptions will be more strongly related to organizational outcomes (gratitude, OCBO) when employees perceive organizational entitativity as high versus low. Thus, the relationship between supervisory-focused justice perceptions and organizational outcomes (gratitude toward supervisor, organizational citizenship behaviors toward supervisor) will be
stronger when perceived organizational entitativity is high.

_Hypothesis 2a_: Employee perceived organizational entitativity moderates the relationship between supervisory-focused justice perceptions and gratitude towards the organization such that the relationship will be stronger when perceived entitativity is high than when it is low.

_Hypothesis 2b_: Employee perceived organizational entitativity moderates the relationship between supervisory-focused justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors toward the organization such that the relationship is stronger when perceived entitativity is high than when it is low.

**Entitativity and Injustice**

The majority of the prior research on organizational justice focused on justice and treated injustice as the same as the absence of justice (e.g. Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Recently, Colquitt et al. (2015) found justice and injustice have a different psychological focus and that injustice is more strongly related to negative outcomes and justice is more strongly associated with positive outcomes. They further suggest that researchers should consider measuring justice and injustice at the same time to obtain a more complete view of the adherence-violation continuum for justice rules.

Because it is possible that justice and injustice perceptions relate to emotional reactions through different psychological mechanisms, how employees judge the source of just treatment might also be different from how they judge the source of unjust treatment. Therefore, an open question is whether the relationship between target similar (in)justice perceptions and outcomes are stronger than target dissimilar relationships in justice rule violation conditions than it is in justice rule adherence conditions. Given the possible negative consequences associated with emotional reactions, such as anger, and behavioral reactions, such as counterproductive work
behaviors (CWBs), it would be helpful to better understand who takes the blame for justice rule violations and is the target of employees’ negative reactions.

Examining justice rule violations above and beyond justice rule adherence in a multifoci justice model would provide evidence for the statement above. However, the effect of entitativity on the injustice – outcome relationship remains unclear because there is no empirical information available to clarify the mechanism of entitativity in the context of justice rule adherence in a multifoci justice model. It is possible that if perceived organizational entitativity is high, employees will react to justice rule violations with anger and engage in CWBs directed their organization because they believe that their organization is responsible. Alternatively, because negative behavioral reactions like CWBs are more likely to be affect driven without thorough cognitive processing (Colquitt et al., 2015), it is also possible that employees will blame the entity directly involved in the injustice event (Jones, 2009), which in most of the cases may be their supervisor, and direct anger and CWBs toward their supervisor without evaluating the entitativity of the organization. Thus, entitativity perceptions will not affect the injustice – negative reaction relationship. Hence the research question here is:

Research Question 2: Do entitativity perceptions of the organization interact with injustice perceptions to influence negative emotions, such as anger, and negative behavioral reactions, such as counterproductive work behaviors, the same way as they interact with justice perceptions, or does entitativity function differently in injustice contexts than in justice contexts?
**Figure 1**

*Model of Research Question 1*
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**Figure 2**

*Model of Hypothesis 1 & 2*
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Method
**Participants and procedures**

A total of 500 participants were recruited using a crowdsourced sample via Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk) service. Using MTurk as the recruitment method allows me to access participants with more diverse backgrounds compared to student samples or an organizational sample (Landers & Behrend, 2015). Several requirements were set to limit the sample to participants based in U.S. and to full-time employees. Participants completed three surveys with one week apart between each one. In all three surveys, participants were asked to think about their current organization, work group, and supervisor. The first wave collected information on each of the entitativity antecedents at the organizational level and overall justice and injustice perceptions. The second wave contained measures of entitativity perceptions targeting organizations and entitativity antecedents targeting work groups. Emotional reactions and behavioral reactions, such as OCBs and CWBs, were obtained during the third wave. Each survey took 10-15 minutes to complete. Incentives were sent out upon completion of each survey. Participants were compensated 50 cents for the initial survey, 50 cents for second survey, and one dollar for the final survey as a graduated incentive to complete the full study.

Participants were asked to provide their emails in the first survey, which was used to contact them about the second and the third surveys. One week after completing the first survey, participants were emailed the link to second survey. They were given one week to complete the second survey until the link was closed. The emailed invitation to the third survey was sent out to those participants who completed both the first and second surveys one week after the completion of the second survey. They were given one week to take the survey before the link was closed.
A total of 500 participants completed the first round of data collection, 395 participants completed the second survey, and a total of 343 participants completed all three surveys for a response rate of 68.6%. The final sample was 46.6% female and 71.7% White. The rest of the sample was comprised of the following categories: Asian (6%), African American (16.7%), Native American (0.6%), others (2.1%), and two or more races (2.4%). More than half of the sample participants work 21 to 40 hours a week (52.8%), 38.2% of participants work more than 40 hours a week. Only 9% of participants work less than 20 hours a week. The majority (94.7%) of participants had been working at their current organization for at least one year. About 26.5% of participants work for an employer with less than 50 employees, 62.7% of participants work for an employer with between 50 and 10,000 employees, and 10.8% of participants work for an employer with greater than 10,000 employees.

**Measures**

All scales can be found in Appendix A. **Entitativity.** In order to compare entitativity scales in organizational settings, participants’ entitativity perceptions were measured using two different scales, one 3-item scale developed by Blanchard (2018) and one 4-item scale developed by Ford (2016) from an unpublished study. Both scales contain items focused solely on entitativity and make clear distinctions between entitativity and its antecedents and other related constructs. I modified the scales to target both work group entitativity and organizational entitativity. An example item from Blanchard (2018) is, “My organization/work group is a unit.” Participants responded to each of the item on a five-point scale (1 = “Strongly Disagree,” 5 = “Strongly Agree”). An example item from the Ford (2016) scale is “To what extent do you see your organization/work group as a single, unified whole: 1 = “Not at all,” 5 = “To a very great extent”.
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**Entitativity Antecedents.** Each entitativity antecedent (similarity, interactivity, common goals, and boundaries) was measured using the scales developed by Blanchard (2018). The 14-item scale contains four items to measure similarity, five items to measure interactivity, three items to measure common goals, and two items for boundaries. I modified the scale to target both the work group and the organization. An example item is, “Employees of my organization/unit strive for the same thing (Common goals)”. All items are being rated on a five-point scales (1 = “Strongly Disagree,” 5 = “Strongly Agree”).

**Overall Justice Perceptions.** A six-item scale developed by Ambrose and Schminke (2009) was used to measure overall justice perceptions. I modified the scale based on the target of the justice perception (organization vs. supervisor). An example item is, “In general, I can count on my organization/supervisor to be fair.” Participants was told to indicate the level of agreement with all items using a five-point scale (1= “Strongly Disagree,” 5= “Strongly Agree”).

**Overall Injustice Perceptions.** The scale of overall injustice perceptions was constructed based on the 6-item overall justice scale developed by Ambrose and Schminke (2009). The polar-opposite version of each of the six items was created to capture the presence of injustice. Colquitt et al. (2015) created a set of injustice items based on his earlier (Colquitt, 2011) scale of four justice dimensions by using the same approach and demonstrated adequate reliability (coefficient α = .96) and validity of the new scale. All items were rephrased to assess participants’ experience with injustice within the organization. I modified the scale based on the target of justice perception (organization vs. supervisor). An example item is, “In general, the treatment I received from my organization/ supervisor is unfair.” Participants were told to indicate the level of agreement with all items using a five-point scale (1= “Strongly Disagree,” 5= “Strongly Agree”). See Appendix A for the full measure used.
Gratitude. Participants’ gratitude was measured with a 4-item scale that I adapted from Ford, Wang, Jin, and Eisenberger (2018) asking whether they had felt the following emotions toward their organizations over the past two weeks. These emotions are gratitude, thankful, appreciative, and grateful. Participants responded on a 5-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. I modified each item to capture gratitude toward the supervisor by replacing the word “organization” with “supervisor”.

Anger. Participants’ anger was measured with a 4-item scale also adapted from Ford et al. (2018) asking whether they had felt the following emotions toward their organizations over the past two weeks. These emotions are mad, angry, enraged, and furious. Each item was rated on a 5-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Again, I modified the four items to measure anger toward the supervisor by replacing the word “organization” with “supervisor”.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. Organizational citizenship behaviors were measured using the scale developed by Lee and Allen (2002). The scale consisted of 16 items, with 8 items measuring citizenship behaviors directed toward individuals (OCBI) and 8 items measuring citizenship behaviors directed toward the organization (OCBO). I modified the 8 items OCBI scale to measure citizenship behaviors directed specifically toward the supervisor instead of other individuals in general. Instead of measuring supervisor-rated OCB, I collected data on OCB using self-report measures. Carpenter, Berry and Houston (2014) showed in their study that the mean differences between self-rated OCB scores and supervisor-rated OCB scores is relatively small, and the other-rated OCB only contributed meaningful incremental variance to behavioral variables that are also other-rated. Since current study measured all other constructs using self-report method, using other-rated method to measure OCB will not bring additional value to the study. Therefore, using self-rated OCB is a reasonable choice given the small
differences between other-rated OCB and self-rated OCB. Participants were asked to rate how often they perform these behaviors using a five-point scale (1= “Never,” 5= “Always”). One sample item is, “I help my supervisor who have been absent”.

**Counterproductive Work Behaviors.** A ten-item counterproductive work behavior checklist adapted from Spector, Bauer, and Fox (2010) was used to measure counterproductive work behaviors, with five items targeting counterproductive work behaviors directed toward the organization (CWBO) and five items targeting counterproductive work behaviors directed toward individuals (CWBI). I modified the five CWBI items to measure counterproductive behaviors directed specifically toward the supervisor instead of other individuals in general. An example item that measures CWB directed toward organization is, “I complained about insignificant things at work”, and an example item that measures CWB directed toward the supervisor is, “I made fun of supervisor’s personal life”. Participants were asked to rate how often they perform these behaviors using a five-point scale (1= “Never,” 5= “Always”).
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Results
Descriptive statistics including means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations can be seen in Table 1 and Table 2. Cronbach’s alpha of each scale can be found on the diagonal in the tables.
Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics of Entitativity Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organizational Similarity</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational Boundaries</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizational Interactivity</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organizational Common Goal</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organizational Entitativity (Blanchard)</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organizational Entitativity (Ford)</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Group Similarity</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Group Boundaries</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Group Interactivity</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Group Common Goal</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Group Entitativity (Blanchard)</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Group Entitativity (Ford)</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Coefficient alphas are listed along the diagonal, *p < .05, **p < .01, N = 343
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organizational Entitativity</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Blanchard)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational Entitativity</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ford)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizational Justice</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organizational Injustice</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervisory Justice</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervisory Injustice</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gratitude toward Organization</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Anger toward Organization</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gratitude toward Supervisor</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Anger toward Supervisor</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. OCBO</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. OCBS</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. CWBO</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. CWBS</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.80**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Coefficient alphas are listed in parentheses along the diagonal, *p < .05, **p < .01, N = 343. OCBO: Organizational citizenship behavior targeting organizations, OCBS: Organizational citizenship behaviors targeting supervisors, CWBO: Counterproductive workplace behaviors targeting organizations, CWBS: Counterproductive workplace behaviors targeting supervisors.
Table 2 Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organizational Entitativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Blanchard)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational Entitativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ford)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizational Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organizational Injustice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervisory Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervisory Injustice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gratitude toward Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Anger toward Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gratitude toward Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Anger toward Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. OCBO</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. OCBS</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. CWBO</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. CWBS</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Coefficient alphas are listed in parentheses along the diagonal, *p < .05, ** p < .01, N = 343. OCBO: Organizational citizenship behavior targeting organizations, OCBS: Organizational citizenship behaviors targeting supervisors, CWBO: Counterproductive workplace behaviors targeting organizations, CWBS: Counterproductive workplace behaviors targeting supervisors.
Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Justice

Given the strong correlations among organization focused justice perceptions, supervisor focused justice perceptions, gratitude towards the organization, gratitude towards the supervisor, OCBOs, and OCBSs, a set of confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) was performed to demonstrate discriminant validity of these latent variables using R package Lavaan (Rosseel, 2012). Distinctiveness of these variables was examined by comparing three CFA models, a one factor model that combined all latent variables together, a three-factor model that distinguished justice perceptions, gratitude, and OCBs, and the hypothesized six-factor model that further distinguished justice perceptions, gratitude, and OCBs toward the organization from justice perceptions, gratitude, and OCBs toward the supervisor. As can be seen in Table 3, the three-factor model ($\chi^2(591) = 1957.92, p = .001, \text{CFI} = .83, \text{RMSEA} = .09, \text{SRMR} = .07$) fit better than the one factor model ($\chi^2(594) = 4353.39, p = .001, \text{CFI} = .55, \text{RMSEA} = .14, \text{SRMR} = .15$), which was indicated by $\Delta \chi^2(3) = 2359.47, p < .01$ and lower RMSEA and SRMR. Next, I found that the hypothesized six-factor CFA model ($\chi^2(579) = 1102.13, p = .001, \text{CFI} = .94, \text{RMSEA} = .05, \text{SRMR} = .05$) fit better than the three-factor model. This was supported by $\Delta \chi^2(12) = 855.8, p < .01$ and lower RMSEA and SRMR. This suggests that despite the strong correlations among participants’ ratings regarding organization focused justice perceptions, supervisor focused justice perceptions, gratitude towards the organization, gratitude towards the supervisor, OCBOs, and OCBSs, participants were able to distinguish these constructs from each other.

Injustice

A similar set of CFAs was performed to demonstrate the discriminant validity of organization focused injustice perceptions, supervisor focused injustice perceptions, anger
towards the organization, anger towards the supervisor, CWBOs, and CWBSs by comparing three CFA models. The three CFA models consisted of a one factor model that combined all latent variables together, a three-factor model that distinguished injustice perceptions, anger, and CWBs, and the hypothesized six-factor model that further distinguished injustice perceptions, anger, and CWBs toward the organization from injustice perceptions, anger, and CWBs toward the supervisor. As can be seen in Table 3, the three-factor model ($\chi^2(402) = 1359.62, p = .001, CFI = .90, RMSEA = .09, SRMR = .04$) fit better than the one factor model ($\chi^2(405) = 2890.57, p = .001, CFI = .75, RMSEA = .14, SRMR = .08$), which was indicated by $\Delta \chi^2(3) = 1530.95, p < .01$ and lower RMSEA and SRMR. Next, I found that the hypothesized six-factor CFA model ($\chi^2(390) = 1055, p = .001, CFI = .93, RMSEA = .07, SRMR = .04$) fit better than the three-factor model. This was supported by $\Delta \chi^2(12) = 304.62, p < .01$ and lower RMSEA and SRMR. The evidence from the CFAs suggests that despite the strong correlations among participants’ ratings regarding organization focused injustice perceptions, supervisor focused injustice perceptions, anger towards the organization, anger towards the supervisor, CWBOs, and CWBSs, participants were able to distinguish these constructs from each other.

**Entitativity**

Another two CFAs were performed to examine construct structures among perceived group entitativity and perceived organizational entitativity (both the Ford et al. and the Blanchard et al. scales) and the antecedents measures (similarity, interactivity, and common goals) before hypotheses testing. The group and organizational boundary scales were excluded from this analysis and further analyses because of the low reliability of the two-item scales (.20 for organizational boundary and .18 for group boundary). The two items in the scale asked whether it is easy for participants to leave or join the group/organization. I would argue that leaving a
group or an organization is conceptually different from joining one. It is possible that participants were thinking about different things when rating these two items. Blanchard at al. (2018) also point out in their results that group boundary is less relevant for work groups because individuals cannot determine whether to enter a work group. The same logic could be applied to organizational boundary as well because that it is rare that entry to an organization can be determined by the individual. Thus, only three antecedents were included in the two CFAs.

As also can be seen in Table 3, for both group entitativity and organizational entitativity, four CFA models were compared to demonstrate the construct structures. The one factor model combined all latent variables together, perceived entitativity was separated from the antecedents in the two-factor model, the four-factor model further separated among similarity, interactivity and common goals, the five-factor model separated the two entitativity scales from each other.

The result for the organizational entitativity model showed that the five-factor model fits the best ($\chi^2(142) = 287.33, p = .001$, CFI = .94, RMSEA = .06, SRMR = .05). It fits better than the four-factor model with $\Delta \chi^2(4) = 150.79, p < .01$ and has the highest CFI and lowest RMSEA and SRMR among all four tested models. Similar results were found for the group entitativity model indicating that the five-factor model fits best ($\chi^2(142) = 275.10, p = .001$, CFI = .95, RMSEA = .05, SRMR = .05) with highest CFI and lowest RMSEA and SRMR. The CFA results suggest that the two entitativity scales are distinct and cannot be combined into one factor.

In addition, a CFA with the two organizational entitativity scales and the two group entitativity scales was performed to investigate whether participants distinguished between group and organizational entitativity. Four model solutions were compared, the one factor model, two-factor model that separates organizational entitativity from group entitativity, two-factor model that separates Blanchard et al.’s scale from Ford et al.’s scale, and the four-factor model that
separate between different scales and different level of entitativity. Results showed that the four-factor model has the best fit ($\chi^2(71) = 201.88$, $p = .001$, CFI = .93, RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .05) with highest CFI and lowest RMSEA and SRMR. This indicates that organizational entitativity and group entitativity should be separated into two factors, and different scales of entitativity should be also separated.

Close examination of the items in the scales developed by Ford et al. showed that it is possible that these items overlap with the antecedents, given that the wording of these items is similar to that of some of the items from antecedent scales. Moreover, Ford et al. only used the entitativity scale they developed among university staff and students in an unpublished study whereas Blanchard and colleagues (2018) tested and validated their scale not only using social groups, but also virtual online groups and small work groups. Therefore, the scale developed by Blanchard et al. (2018) appears to be a better scale of both group entitativity and organizational entitativity for this study and was used as the primary entitativity scale in all further analyses.
## Table 3

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis Model Fit Indices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Δχ²</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justice Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Factor</td>
<td>4353.39</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-Factor</td>
<td>1957.92</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>2395.47*</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-Factor</td>
<td>1102.13</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>855.80*</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Injustice Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Factor</td>
<td>2890.57</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-Factor</td>
<td>1359.62</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>153.95*</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-Factor</td>
<td>1055.00</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>304.62*</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization Entitativity Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Factor</td>
<td>986.55</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Factor</td>
<td>745.73</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>240.82*</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Factor</td>
<td>438.13</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>307.61*</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Factor</td>
<td>287.33</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>150.79*</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Group Entitativity Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Factor</td>
<td>874.43</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Factor</td>
<td>625.19</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>249.24*</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Factor</td>
<td>378.06</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>247.12*</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Factor</td>
<td>275.10</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>102.97*</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* CFI: Comparative fit index; RMSEA: Root mean square error of approximation; SRMR: Standardized root mean residual. *p < .05.

### Covariates

Covariates for hypothesis testing were selected based on the suggestions proposed by Bernerth and Aguinis (2016). Three covariates were included in the analyses investigating antecedents of entitativity. First, for the entitativity model, I included participants’ organizational tenure as covariate when examining the differences between the relationship patterns of entitativity with its antecedents for small work groups and for organizations, which is the first research question. Previous empirical research provides evidence of a relationship between individuals’ history with the group and their perceived group entitativity (Blanchard et al., 2018), which is tenure of employees when the target group becomes their organizations. Such history
could have an impact on participants’ perceived organizational entitativity. Second, I controlled for percentage of time participants spend working with their coworkers every week, given that the time participants spend with coworkers may influence their experience of within group interactivity. Third, I controlled for the number of major divisions in participants’ organizations. The number of major divisions in an organization as a reflection of the complexity of the organization could also potentially reflect the level of interactivity participants may have within the organization.

For the justice related analyses, I included participants’ gender, organization tenure, percentage of time they spend working with their coworkers every week, and major working location (office versus home), given that these characteristics may affect their attitudes and behaviors toward their organizations, as suggested by Becker (1964).

**Structural Equation Models**

**Entitativity**

The first proposed model examined three antecedents (similarity, interactivity, and common goals) of perceived organizational entitativity using R package Lavaan (Rosseel, 2012). Results showed that the model has good fit with $\chi^2(140) = 245.98, p < .001$, comparative fix index (CFI) = .95, root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .05. Perceived organizational entitativity was significantly predicted by interactivity only (standardized coefficient = .48, $p < .001$), indicating higher levels of perceived interactivity relate to stronger perceptions of entitativity. Neither similarity (standardized coefficient = .03, $p > .05$) nor common goals (standardized coefficient = .18, $p > .05$) significantly predicted perceived organizational entitativity (standardized coefficient = .18, $p > .05$). All path coefficients are reported in Figure 4.
Note. Three antecedents were measured in the first survey (Time 1). Entitativity was measured in the second survey which is one week after the first survey (Time 2).

The second proposed model examined the relationships between perceived work group entitativity and related antecedents using the same R package Lavaan (Rosseel, 2012). Results showed the model has good fit with $\chi^2(112) = 185.54, p < .001$, comparative fit index (CFI) = .97, root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .05. Results showed that perceived work group entitativity was significantly predicted by both interactivity (standardized coefficient = .42, $p < .05$) and common goal (standardized coefficient = .41, $p < .05$), with both relationships indicating a positive relationship. No significant relationship was found between similarity and perceived organizational entitativity. All path coefficients are reported in Figure 5. The results show that the relationship patterns between perceived organizational entitativity and its’ antecedents are slightly different from the relationship patterns among small work groups. Specifically, among the three normally identified entitativity antecedents, greater group interactivity and stronger group common goals were significantly associated with increased perceived group entitativity, but higher group similarity did not significantly predict increased group entitativity. The relationship pattern between the three antecedents and perceived organizational entitativity is different such that organizational interactivity is the only antecedent
that significantly predict perceived organizational entitativity. The differences suggest that the
normally identified antecedents for perceived group entitativity might function differently when
the target unit changes from small work groups to an organization. Therefore, it might be
problematic to take conclusions and findings from group research and apply them directly to
organizational research when investigating the construct of entitativity.

For both the organizational entitativity model and the group entitativity model, the
relationships among entitativity and all antecedents were examined excluding all covariates. The
results did not change.

**Figure 5**

*Model with path coefficients of work group entitativity.*

![Model with path coefficients of work group entitativity.](image)

Note. Three antecedents were measured in the first survey (Time 1). Entitativity was measured in
the second survey which is one week after the first survey (Time 2).

**Justice**

Given the difficulties testing interactions in SEM and to make sure that there is enough
power to detect interactions based on the sample size, all models with only main effects were
operationlalized using SEM, and the models with both main effects and interactions were
operationalized as observed variable path analysis with parameters estimated using the means of
all items in a scale. R package Lavaan (Rosseel, 2012) was used for all analyses. The result of SEM showed that the main effects justice model has an acceptable fit with $\chi^2(828) = 1623.27$, $p< .001$, comparative fix index (CFI) = .91, root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .06. All standardized path coefficients are reported in Figure 6 below. Next, I examined the path analysis model including the interaction between overall organizational justice and perceived organizational entitativity and the interaction between overall supervisory justice and perceived organizational entitativity. All standardized path coefficients are reported in Figure 7 below. Results showed that both overall organizational justice and perceived organizational entitativity had a significant main effect on gratitude towards the organization are significant, but the interaction was not significant, failing to support Hypothesis 1a that proposed perceived organizational entitativity would moderate the positive relationship between overall organizational justice and gratitude towards the organization.

In addition, the direct main effects of overall organizational justice and entitativity on OCBOs were not significant. The interaction effect of the two on OCBOs was also not significant, failing to support Hypothesis 1b that proposed perceived organizational entitativity moderate the positive relationship between overall organizational justice and OCBO. Also different from expectations, results showed that the main effect of overall supervisory justice on gratitude towards the organization was not significant when organizational justice was included in the model. The main effect of overall supervisory justice on OCBOs was not significant either. Thus, both Hypothesis 2a, proposing perceived organizational entitativity would moderate the relationship between overall supervisory justice and gratitude toward organization, and 2b, proposing perceived organizational entitativity would moderate the relationship between overall supervisory justice and OCBO, were not supported. I did find that the main effect of overall
supervisory justice on gratitude towards the supervisor is significant (standardized coefficient = .63, p < .001).

The indirect effect of organizational justice, supervisory justice, and entitativity on OCBOs via gratitude towards the organization and the indirect effect of overall supervisory justice on OCBS via gratitude towards the supervisor were estimated by defining new parameters that represent the product of the path coefficients of the independent variable and the mediator using R package Lavaan (Rosseel, 2012) in the path analysis model. The results can be seen in Table 4. Specifically, the indirect effect of organizational justice on OCBOs via gratitude towards the organization is significant (standardized coefficient = .16, p < .001), the indirect effect of perceived organizational entitativity on OCBO via gratitude towards the organization is also significant (standardized coefficient = .15, p < .001). Further, the indirect effect of supervisory justice on OCBSs via gratitude towards the supervisor is significant (standardized coefficient = .23, p < .001).
Figure 6

Justice SEM model

Note. Organizational justice and supervisory justice were measured in the first survey (Time 1). Entitativity was measured in the second survey, which was one week after the first survey (Time 2). All outcome variables were measured in the third survey, one week after the second survey (Time 3).

Figure 7

Justice path analysis model

Note. Organizational justice and supervisory justice were measured in the first survey (Time 1). Entitativity was measured in the second survey which was one week after the first survey (Time 2). All outcome variables were measured in the third survey, one week after the second survey (Time 3).
2). All outcome variables were measured in the third survey, one week after the second survey (Time 3).

**Injustice**

The same analyses were conducted for the injustice model: All models with only main effects were operationalized using SEM, and the models with both main effects and interactions were operationalized as observed variable path analysis with parameters estimated using the means of all items of the scale. R package Lavaan (Rosseel, 2012) was used for all analyses. Results of the SEM showed that the model has an acceptable fit with \( \chi^2(597) = 1534.82, p < .001 \), comparative fit index (CFI) = .91, root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .07. All path coefficients are reported in Figure 8 below. Next, I examined the path analysis model including the interaction between overall organizational injustice and perceived organizational entitativity and the interaction between overall supervisory injustice and perceived organizational entitativity. All results are reported in Figure 9 below. Results showed that the main effect of overall organizational injustice on anger towards the organization is significant (standardized coefficient = .58, \( p < .001 \)). But, neither the main effect of perceived organizational entitativity nor the interaction of injustice and entitativity on anger towards the organization was significant. In addition, the direct main effects of organizational injustice and the main effect of entitativity on CWBOs were not significant. The interaction of the two on CWBO was not significant either. The main effect of supervisory injustice on CWBOs was significant (standardized coefficient = .31, \( p < .001 \)) with organizational injustice included in the model. In addition, the main effect of overall supervisory injustice on anger towards the supervisor was significant (standardized coefficient = .68, \( p < .001 \)), and the main effect of supervisory injustice on CWBS was significant (standardized coefficient = .35, \( p < .001 \)).
The indirect effect of organizational injustice, supervisory injustice, and entitativity on CWBOs via anger towards the organization and the indirect effect of overall supervisory injustice on CWBSs via anger towards the supervisor were estimated using R package Lavaan (Rosseel, 2012) in the path analysis model. The indirect effect of organizational injustice on CWBOs was significant (standardized coefficient = .22, \( p < .001 \)), but neither the indirect effect of entitativity on CWBOs via anger towards the organization, nor the indirect effect of supervisory injustice on CWBOs was significant. The indirect effect of supervisory injustice on CWBSs via anger towards the supervisor was significant (standardized coefficient = .31, \( p < .001 \)). All the indirect effect results can be found in Table 4.

Results of the injustice model show that neither the main effect of perceived organizational entitativity nor the interaction effect of it with injustice perceptions on anger towards the organization or CWBOs was significant. Compared to the significant main effects of perceived organizational entitativity on gratitude towards the organization and OCBOs found in justice model, the non-significant effect of entitativity in the injustice model suggests that participants; perceived organizational entitativity may not influence their negative emotions and negative behavioral reactions toward the organization the same way as it does in the justice model. This further suggests that perceived organizational entitativity might function differently in an injustice context than in a justice context.
Figure 8

Injustice SEM Model

Note. Organizational injustice and supervisory injustice were measured in the first survey (Time 1). Entitativity was measured in the second survey which is one week after the first survey (Time 2). All outcome variables were measured in the third survey one week after the second survey (Time 3).

Figure 9

Injustice Path Analysis Model

Note. Organizational injustice and supervisory injustice were measured in the first survey (Time 1). Entitativity was measured in the second survey which is one week after the first survey (Time 2). All outcome variables were measured in the third survey one week after the second survey (Time 3).
Table 4

Indirect effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCBO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justice – gratitude toward organization</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitativity - gratitude toward organization</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Justice - gratitude toward organization</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Justice - gratitude toward supervisor</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWBO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Injustice – anger toward organization</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitativity – anger toward organization</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Injustice - anger toward organization</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Justice – anger toward supervisor</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. N=312. LLCI and ULCI represent the 95% lower-limit and 95% upper-limit confidence interval, respectively.

Ancillary Analysis

Entitativity Model

I tested one additional entitativity model using SEM, which included organizational dimensions, to explore other possible antecedents of perceived organizational entitativity. The new model included the three commonly identified entitativity antecedents (similarity, interactivity, and common goals), three organizational dimensions (hierarchy of authority, rule observation, and decision making, Hage & Aiken, 1967), and all the covariates from the previous entitativity model. The SEM results suggested that the model has acceptable model fit with $\chi^2(378) = 672.6$, p< .001, CFI = .93, RMSEA = .05. Results show that interactivity is the only one that has a significant effect on perceived organizational entitativity among all factors (standardized coefficient = .48, p < .001), and none of the three organizational dimensions has a
significant effect on perceived organizational entitativity. The results suggest that the three organizational dimensions do not account for significant amount of variance in perceived organizational entitativity above and beyond interactivity.

**Alternative Entitativity Scale**

Although the entitativity scale developed by Blanchard et al. (2018) was used in all analyses, I also examined both the perceived organizational entitativity model and perceived group entitativity model using the Ford et al.’s entitativity scale to compare the results with the results of the model with the Blanchard et al.’s (2018) entitativity scale. Similar results are found for the perceived organizational entitativity model for both scales. In both models, interactivity was found to be the only significant antecedent predicting perceived organizational entitativity. Similarity and common goals did not have significant effects on any of the perceived organizational entitativity scales.

Results of the group entitativity model showed that common goals and interactivity had significant effect on perceived group entitativity measured using Blanchard et al.’s (2018) scale (standardized coefficient common goals = .41, p < .001, standardized coefficient interactivity = .42, p < .001), but there is no significant effect of similarity on entitativity (standardized coefficient similarity = -.14, p > .05). However, when perceived group entitativity is measured using Ford et al.’s scale, results of the model show that interactivity and similarity are the two antecedents that have significant effects on perceived group entitativity (standardized coefficient interactivity = .39, p < .001, standardized coefficient similarity = .38, p < .001), but not common goals (standardized coefficient common goals = -.08, p > .05).

The results suggest that there is no clear difference in how antecedents relate to entitativity between the two entitativity scales when they are used to capture perceived
organizational entitativity. However, when the target is work group, even though interactivity still has significant effects on entitativity in both models, common goals significantly predict perceived group entitativity for Blanchard et al.’s scale, and similarity significantly predicts perceived group entitativity for Ford et al.’s scale. This suggests that the two entitativity scales might be getting at different aspects of the same entitativity construct at the group level.

I explored a set of similar model comparisons using different entitativity scales for both the justice model and the injustice model. Results of both the justice SEM and the justice path analysis suggest that the relationships between perceived organizational entitativity and both gratitude and OCBs are similar between Blanchard et al.’s scale and Ford et al.’s scale. Specifically, the relationship between entitativity and gratitude towards the organization is significant for both scales, and the interaction between organizational justice perceptions and entitativity has no significant effect on any outcome variables. The only difference between Blanchard et al.’s entitativity scale and Ford et al.’s scale is that the main effect of entitativity on OCBs is significant in both the SEM model (path coefficient = .2, p < .01) and the justice path analysis (path coefficient = .15, p < .01) for Ford et al.’s scale but not for Blanchard et al.’s (2018) scale.

Results of both the injustice SEM model and the injustice path analysis show the same relationship patterns between entitativity and other variables for the two different entitativity scales. Specifically, there is no main effect nor interaction effect between entitativity and organizational injustice on any of the outcome variables for both Blanchard et al.’ (2018) scale and Ford et al.’s scale. Comparisons of the results between the two different entitativity scales suggest that the two scales are getting at the same latent constructs in predicting organizational
outcomes, even though the relationship patterns between antecedents of entitativity and two scales are slightly different.
Chapter VI

Discussion
The aim of the present research was to investigate the foundation of Social Exchange Theory as applied to organizational justice, which assumes employees can perceive organizations as entities with whom they can engage in social exchange relationships. To achieve the goal, the influence of employees’ entitativity perception of their organization on the relationship between both their justice and injustice perceptions and their emotional and behavioral reactions was investigated using a multifoci approach. The study adds to prior research by examining the role of entitativity in an organization context and by testing a multifoci framework of both justice perceptions and injustice perceptions.

The results add to the research literature in four ways. First, this research is one of the first to test the fundamental assumption of Social Exchange Theory by examining whether employees perceive organizations as entities and to what extent do the previously identified entitativity antecedents relate to these perceptions. Second, the results of the study show that organizational entitativity perceptions explain a significant amount of variance in gratitude toward organizations even when justice perception is included in the model, which suggests that entitativity perceptions can have direct effect on employees’ emotional reactions, even accounting for justice perceptions. Third, this study provides initial evidence that organizational entitativity perceptions are positively associated with positive organizational outcomes but not with negative organizational outcomes. Specifically, according to the results, higher entitativity perceptions of organizations relate to increased gratitude towards the organization and more OCBOs, but higher entitativity perceptions of organizations have no relationship with how angry employees feel towards their organizations or the amount of CWBOs. Four, this study provides evidence that the relationship between justice perceptions and employees’ reactions can be investigated using a multifoci approach and provides support for the idea that target similar
relationships are stronger than target dissimilar relationships.

**Social Exchange Theory and Entitativity**

First, this research investigated the Social Exchange Theory assumption that employees are able to see their organizations as entities and examined if employees’ perceived organizational entitativity is related to previously identified entitativity antecedents. As previously stated, much of the research on entitativity has focused on social groups and small work groups (e.g., Blanchard et al., 2018; Lickel et al., 2000). Examining employees’ perceived organizational entitativity and its relationships with previously identified antecedents not only expands on previous entitativity research by showing which antecedents relate to entitativity perceptions of organizations and how the relationships between organizational entitativity and its antecedents differ from the relationships between entitativity perceptions of social groups and antecedents, but also provide evidence that employees can and will see their organizations as independent entities. The results suggest that most employees do perceive organizations as entities, given the mean of almost 4 on the 5-point scale of organizational entitativity.

The current study explored how entitativity perceptions related to similarity, interactivity, and common goals in both organizations and small work groups. Results showed that when the target is the organization, only employees’ perceived interactivity among members was significantly associated with entitativity perceptions of the organization but not similarity or common goals. Further, results showed that when the target is the employee’s work group, both interactivity among members and common goals related to perceived entitativity of the work group. The strong relationship between interactivity and perceived entitativity for both organizations and work groups found in the current study is consistent with previous research, which suggested that the relationship between interaction cues and target group’s entitativity is...
stronger for dynamic groups (Rutchick et al., 2008).

Furthermore, the non-significant relationship between similarity and entitativity perceptions was observed for both organizations and work groups. Although it was expected that the magnitude of the relationship between similarity and target group’s entitativity would be weaker than the interactivity – entitativity relationship for dynamic groups (Rutchick et al., 2008), it is a little surprising that the relationships between similarity and entitativity for both organizations and work groups were not significant in current study. Given that the zero order correlations between similarity and target group’s entitativity in current study were significant ($r_{\text{organization}} = .27$; $r_{\text{work group}} = .34$), the non-significant similarity-entitativity relationship found in the SEM model result suggests that similarity does not explain a significant amount of unique variance in entitativity perceptions when other antecedents are included in the model. This finding supports Brewer et al.’s (2004) proposition that the development of entitativity perceptions of dynamic groups is mostly based on the group’s goals and the interrelations among members. Therefore, for goal-oriented dynamic groups like organizations and work groups, group interactivity appears to have a stronger influence on member’s perceived group entitativity than group similarity.

Not all the relationship patterns between the three antecedents and entitativity are the same for organizations and work groups. Even though common goals had a significant relationship with entitativity perceptions of work groups, the results show no significant effect of common goal on entitativity perceptions of organizations, suggesting that employees might not consider whether they share common goal with others in their organizations when evaluating the entitativity of their organizations. One possible explanation for this difference might be the difference in goal setting procedures between organizations and work groups. In most task
groups, members are actively involved in and contribute to the goal setting process. However, given that organizations have the power to determine goals without considering employees’ preferences, employees have less opportunity to be directly involved in the goal setting procedure for the organization. Therefore, it is possible that employees may be less likely to utilize goal related cues when construing their organization as an entity.

Although not explicitly mentioned in the formal research questions, the relationship between entitativity perceptions of organizations and key organizational demographic characteristics were also explored in this study. Results suggest that the three organizational structural properties, hierarchy of authority, rule observation, and decision making, did not significantly relate to participants’ entitativity perceptions of organizations above and beyond interactivity. Participants might not utilize organizational characteristics and properties included in the current study as cues when they make judgment of the entitativity of their organizations. The results suggest that although an organization is different from typical dynamic groups in terms of how power is distributed and how goals are set (Huber, 2011), the measure of organizational properties included in current study might not be adequately capture the differences. Future researchers might consider investigating organizational characteristics related to power distribution and goal setting processes to further explore possible antecedents of perceived organizational entitativity.

In summary, employees are able to perceive organizations as independent entities and separate their evaluation of group entitativity from organizational entitativity, which provide direct support to the assumption of Social Exchange Theory that organizations can serve as exchange partners. To answer research question 1 in regard to whether key antecedents such as similarity, interactivity, and common goals relate to perceived entitativity in an organizational...
context the same way as they do in social groups, the answer is not all antecedents relate to perceived organizational entitativity in the same way as they relate to perceived work group entitativity. Specifically, the findings of this research suggest that people are able to perceive organizations as an entity and utilize interaction cues, but not physical similarity cues, to make entitativity judgements of their organizations in a way that is similar to how they perceive small work groups. However, employees are less likely to consider goals and plans when they construe organizations as an entity, which is different from how they perceive small work groups.

**Entitativity Perceptions and Positive Organizational Outcomes**

The second contribution of the study is to show that entitativity perceptions might have the direct effect as justice on employees’ emotional reactions in the justice model. The results of the justice model showed that both the main effect of organizational justice perceptions and the main effect of entitativity perceptions of the organization explained a significant amount of variance in gratitude towards the organization. This suggests that both organizational justice perceptions and perceived organizational entitativity perceptions are positively associated with employees’ experience of gratitude towards their organizations. This indicates that employees will experience higher gratitude towards their organizations not only when they have higher organizational justice perceptions, but also when they perceive their organizations to be highly entitative. Thus, employees’ experienced gratitude level will be higher and more extreme as their organizational entitativity perceptions increase. This finding is consistent with the results reported by Smith et al. (2012) in their study of perceived group entitativity, which showed that higher perceived entitativity of the target group would lead to more extreme reactions toward the group.

The significant effect of entitativity perceptions on employees’ gratitude, independent
from their organizational justice perceptions, might be related to their organizational
identification. Previous researchers investigating group entitativity and group identification have
argued that highly entitative groups are more attractive to people because they believe these
groups can better meet their basic needs. Once people become members of these highly entitative
groups, they have a higher level of identification with the ingroup than people who are in groups
with low entitativity (Yzerbyt, Castano, Leyens, & Paladino, 2000). Hogg et al. (2007) found
that participants identified more strongly with groups that are highly entitative than groups low
in entitativity, which provides further support that entitativity might be an important determinant
of group identification. Although there is no direct examination of the relationship between
organizational entitativity and organizational identification in previous studies, it is possible that
employees see organizations with high entitativity as more attractive and identify with such
organizations more strongly.

Furthermore, research integrating social exchange theory and social identity perspectives
suggests that employees with higher organizational identification would act more positively
toward their organizations, such as have higher job satisfaction and affective commitment
(Riketta, 2005), and be more likely to engage in extra-role behaviors (Tavares, Knippenberg, &
vand Dick, 2016). Therefore, although the current study did not establish the direct theoretical
linkage between organizational entitativity and employees’ positive emotional reactions toward
organizations, it is possible that organizational entitativity could influence individual’s attitudinal
reactions toward an organization, including positive emotions, through its’ effect on
organizational identification. Future researchers should consider testing this proposed
relationship to better understand how entitativity perceptions influence employees’ attitudes and
behaviors toward the organization.
Next, the interaction effect of organizational justice perceptions with entitativity perceptions in relation to gratitude was examined to better understand the relationship between entitativity perceptions and employees’ gratitude. Results for Hypotheses 1 and 2, exploring whether perceived organizational entitativity interacts with organizational justice perceptions (Hypothesis 1) and supervisory perceptions (Hypothesis 2) to influence employees’ gratitude toward the organization (1a) and supervisor (2a) and the amount of OCBO (1b) and OCBS (2b), are not significant. The non-significant interaction model suggests that regardless of the source of the justice perceptions (organization versus supervisor), the interaction of perceived organizational entitativity with justice perceptions does not explain any significant additional variance in employees’ emotional or behavioral reactions over organization-focused justice perceptions, supervisory-focused justice perceptions, organizational entitativity perceptions, and control variables. Employees engaging in external attributions would be more likely to reciprocate justice treatment with externally focused positive emotions like gratitude to the external causes (Weiner, 1985). If employees perceive organizations as entities and thus treat organizations as the external causes of the justice treatment they received, they should be more likely to direct their positive emotions and behaviors toward the organization. However, the non-significant results of the current study suggest differently. This finding might again suggest that one cannot simply claim that employees’ perceived organizational entitativity influences organizational outcomes in a similar way as group entitativity affects group outcomes. This finding further hints that even though employees can see organizations as independent entities, to what extent they see organizations as entities might not capture the whole picture of how they construe organizations and to further influence the social exchange relationship between justice perceptions and emotional and behavioral outcomes. More research is needed investigating
organizational entitativity and how exactly employees construe organizations before we can apply previous findings in group entitativity research to organizational context.

**Entitativity Perceptions and Negative Organizational Outcomes**

The third contribution of the current study is to provide initial evidence that organizational entitativity perceptions are positively associated with positive organizational outcomes but not with negative organizational outcomes.

As previously discussed, the results show that entitativity perceptions of the organization are associated with employees’ emotional reactions toward the organization in the justice model, but the role of entitativity perceptions in the injustice model appear to be different. Research question 2 explores whether entitativity perceptions of organization predict employees’ anger towards the organization and CWBOs in a way that is similar to how entitativity perceptions of organization relate to gratitude towards the organization and OCBOs. The results of the injustice interaction model show that the interaction effects of perceived organizational entitativity with organizational injustice on anger towards the organization and CWBOs are non-significant. This means that despite the source of justice perceptions, whether employees perceive their organization as an entity does not relate to how they react to injustice perceptions, and that employees might not utilize their evaluation of organizational entitativity when determining their reactions to any unjust treatment they experienced in the organization. For example, employees who experienced unjust treatment from their supervisors or organizations appear to feel similar levels of anger toward their organizations regardless of whether they construe their organizations as entities. The non-significant interaction between perceived entitativity and injustice was expected. This is because different from how justice perceptions influence employees’ emotional reactions, it is possible that injustice perceptions influence employees’ negative emotions and
behaviors without thorough cognitive processing; thus, employees’ evaluation of an organization’s entitativity might not be considered and therefore has no effect on the relationship between injustice perception and anger toward organization.

Moreover, the results showed that there was no significant main effect of entitativity perception of organizations on anger toward organizations observed in the injustice model. This finding suggests that entitativity perceptions of the organization do not explain any additional variance in anger towards the organization or CWBOs over injustice perceptions and control variables. Compared to the results found in the justice model, the non-significant main effect of perceived organizational entitativity in the injustice model clearly suggests that the function of organizational entitativity perceptions is different in the two models. Specifically, it appears that higher entitativity perceptions of the organization are related to increased gratitude towards the organization, but entitativity perceptions of the organization have neither a positive nor a negative relationship with anger toward the organization or CWBOs. This is contradictory to the findings from Smith et al.’s (2013), which suggested that participants would lower the amount of donation if they associated negative traits with the target group and perceived the group has high entitativity. One possible explanation is related to the relationship between the participants and the target group. In the Smith et al.’s study, participants are observers rating target groups with which they have no connection. Participants in the current study, on the other hand, are members of their organizations. As discussed previously, when participants are ingroup members, they often perceive high ingroup entitativity as a positive feature of their group and associate positive outcomes with high entitativity (Gaertner & Schopler, 1998; Lickel et al., 2000). However, it appears that negative consequences are associated with high group entitativity only when the perceiver is an outside observer instead of member the target group (Dasgupta et al., 1999;
Newheiser et al., 2012). There are very few studies examining the possible negative consequences related to high group entitativity when the perceiver is a member of the target group. The current study provides initial evidence to suggest that it may be the case that high group entitativity does not enhance or buffer the negative emotions people experience when they are members of the group and receive negative treatment, and entitativity has no effect on how people react to negative treatment behaviorally.

It is also possible that the wording of the items measuring entitativity might have influenced the relationship between entitativity and organizational outcomes. It is worth noticing that all the items in the entitativity scale were positively phrased, which could potentially introduce response bias into the measures and underestimate the strength of the relationships between entitativity and negative organizational outcomes, such as anger and CWBs. In fact, Lai (1994) has found that the predictive power of positively worded items and negatively worded items could be different; Lai found that only positively worded items correlated with the target construct but not negatively worded items. Therefore, it is possible that the relationship between organizational entitativity perceptions and negative organizational outcomes would be different if both positively worded items and negatively worded items were included in the entitativity scale. However, most existing entitativity scales include only positively worded items. Future entitativity researchers should consider including both positively worded items and negatively worded items when investigating the relationship between entitativity and other constructs. In summary, with the current organizational entitativity scale, the results suggest that an employee’s entitativity perception of an organization is only associated with positive emotions (gratitude) and positive behaviors (OCBO) toward the organization but not negative emotions (anger) or negative behaviors (CWBO) toward the organization.
**Multifoci Justice/Injustice**

The final contribution of the current study is to support the use of the multifoci approach to study justice/injustice and to provide empirical evidence that target similar relationships are stronger than target dissimilar relationship between justice/injustice perceptions and employees’ reactions. Results of the multifoci justice model will be discussed first, followed by results of the multifoci injustice model.

**Justice Model**

To better understand the relationship between the source of justice/injustice perceptions and the target of employees’ reaction to the perceptions, justice and injustice perceptions were examined in a multifoci framework by including justice and injustice perceptions that target both supervisors and organizations. The results of the justice model show a clear pattern indicating that organizational justice has a stronger relationship with gratitude towards organizations and OCBOs than supervisor-focused justice. This finding serves as a piece of evidence to support the assumption that employees can appraise their organizations as an entity, attribute justice to their organizations, and direct their emotional and behavioral reactions toward organizations. During this process, they appear to separate their judgment of organizational justice from their perceptions of supervisor-focused justice and react accordingly. The results of the confirmatory factor analysis of the justice model also supports the idea by showing that organizational justice and supervisor-focused justice are two distinct factors despite the strong correlation between the two. This finding also provides evidence for the multifoci model of justice by suggesting that employees can distinguish between different entities in the organization and attribute justice to certain entities independently (Rupp et al., 2014). In addition, the stronger direct effect of organizational justice on gratitude towards the organization compared to supervisor-focused
justice, and the stronger indirect effect of organizational justice on OCBOs via gratitude compared to supervisor-focused justice indicate that organizational justice has a stronger relationship with organization level outcomes compared to supervisor-focused justice, further providing empirical support to the target similarity effect proposed by Rupp et al., (2014).

**Injustice Model**

The results of the injustice model also show that organizational injustice has a stronger relationship with anger towards organizations than supervisor-focused justice. This finding indicates that, similar to the target similar effect observed in the justice model, the effect of injustice on negative emotional reactions appears to be stronger when the focus and target match. These results, combined with the CFA results, again provide empirical evidence to support the idea that employees can separate their judgments of organizational injustice from their perceptions of supervisor-focused injustice and direct emotional reactions to the target based on the focus of the injustice perception.

However, not all the matching focus-target relationships in the injustice model are stronger than the mismatching correlations. For example, the total effect of supervisor-focused injustice on CWBOs (standardized coefficient = .31, p < .001) is stronger than the total effect of organization-focused injustice on CWBOs (standardized coefficient = .24, p < .001). Colquitt and Zipay (2015) suggest a possible reason is that supervisor-focused justice is more predictive in general. However, this explanation does not seem to fit the results found in the current study given the total effects of organization-focused justice on both emotional and behavioral outcomes are stronger than the total effect of supervisor-focused justice. I argue that one possible explanation for the stronger supervisor-focused injustice on CWBO could be related to the differences between justice and injustice perceptions. As previously discussed, justice rule
violations (injustice) cannot be simply equal to the absence of justice rule adherence (Colquitt et al., 2015). Unlike how employees respond to justice perceptions, employees usually respond to injustice in a quick and automatic manner where effortful evaluation is not required. It is possible that employees take actions when experiencing unfair treatments before further differentiating whether the organization or the supervisor should be responsible for the unfair treatment. Supervisors, as the ones to interact with employees on a daily basis, may be considered as the more proximal source of any unfair treatment employees receive than organizations. Therefore, it may be that employees are more likely to hold supervisors responsible for unfair treatment without careful evaluation. Future researchers should consider measuring employees’ responses following the just/unjust events and tracking their emotional and behavioral reactions to further explore the possible different effects of justice and injustice perceptions.

Implications for Practice

The results of this study have important implications for practitioners as well. First, it is important for practitioners to identify factors that can enhance employees’ positive attitudes and behaviors toward the organization so they can develop possible plans to influence employees’ attitude and behavior in a positive direction. This research now provides practitioners one possible factor to work with, which is employees’ entitativity perceptions of the organization. For instance, practitioners could design the workplace and distribute work tasks to increase the opportunity for employees to interact in their work groups, in departments across groups, and within organizations across departments, so that employees would be more likely to perceive their organizations as high entitative. In turn, these employees may tend to experience more gratitude towards their organization and may be more likely to perform citizenship behaviors targeting the organization.
Second, from a practitioner’s point of view, understanding how justice and injustice perceptions influence employees’ behaviors is important for developing effective interventions to increase citizenship behaviors and reduce counterproductive behaviors. The results of the current study suggest that matching focus-target justice perceptions – reaction relationships are stronger than mismatching relationships. For example, an intervention that improves organizational justice perceptions, such as training and activities that promote the justice workplace climate, would work better to promote positive attitudes toward the organization and citizenship behaviors that directly benefit the organization than interventions that promote supervisor-focused justice perceptions. However, it is also important to notice that interventions that aim to reduce supervisor-focused injustice perceptions might be effective to reduce counterproductive behaviors targeting both organizations and supervisors. For example, supervisor training on how to better communicate with employees and how to provide feedback may help supervisors to learn better communication skills and reduce employees’ unfair experiences caused by miscommunications, so that employees would be less likely to engage in counterproductive workplace behaviors toward both supervisors and organizations. This information can be useful when there are only limited resources available for organizations to implement interventions.

**Limitations and Future Research**

Although this study makes theoretical contributions and as practical implications, it still has limitations. To begin with, this study suffers from potential common method variance, inherent in all single source survey research (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2003). The three-wave survey design was able to temporally separate key predictors from outcome variables, but the fact that the data came from a single point of view and only survey methodology was used may introduce potential bias to the results. Future researchers should
consider using alternative methods to investigate if the results of the current study can be replicated. For example, this study only asked participants to rate their workplace experiences retrospectively. A daily diary design would allow researchers to gain information about participants’ workplace experiences prospectively and capture participants’ reactions right after they occur.

Second, this study included organizational similarity, interactivity, common goals, and boundary scales developed by Blanchard and her colleagues (2018). Most of the items from the Blanchard et al. (2018) scales performed well, but the reliabilities of the boundary scale for both organizations and work groups were relatively low. In addition, the entitativity measurement model did not converge when the two boundary items were included in the model. Boundary was excluded from both the organizational entitativity model and the work group entitativity model so that the measurement model can be tested. As a consequence, I did not investigate the relationship between boundary and entitativity perceptions of the organization with the other antecedents included in the model. However, organizations are thought to be different from other social groups in boundary permeability (Blanchard et al., 2020), so it is reasonable to expect that having boundary included as an antecedent of entitativity might change the relationship pattern of entitativity with other antecedents. Therefore, future researchers could use alternative measures to capture boundary and explore its’ relationship with entitativity to fill in the puzzle.

Another limitation of the current study and opportunity for future researchers is to explore whether the differences between an organization and a work group influences how employees form their entitativity perceptions of organizations. I only examined the relationship between three organizational characteristics (hierarchy of authority, decision making, and rule observation) with perceived organizational entitativity. As previously discussed, even though I
found that none of these characteristics explained additional variance in organizational entitativity over interactivity and control variables, it is possible that the choice of these characteristics is not adequate to capture meaningful differences between organizations and other types of dynamic groups. Therefore, the possibility that some organizational structures are better predictors of organizational entitativity than interactivity in organizational contexts still exists. It is worth the effort for future researchers to further explore possible unique antecedents of organizational entitativity as it would help deepen our understanding of entitativity in organizational contexts.

Furthermore, as one of the first studies to examine how entitativity perceptions function in an organizational context, I only included the role of entitativity perceptions in a justice framework. However, it is reasonable to expect entitativity perceptions to be related to other important organizational constructs such as organizational identification, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions, given that entitativity researchers have found entitativity perceptions relate to these outcomes in group settings (i.e., Castano et al., 2003; Gaertner et al., 2006). In addition, the results suggest that high organizational entitativity perceptions do not relate to negative emotions or behaviors toward the organization when employees experience injustice treatment. This does not indicate that high levels of perceived organizational entitativity would always lead to positive outcomes. It is important for future researchers to examine the influence of entitativity perceptions on organizational outcomes and investigate if high entitativity perceptions would be detrimental for individuals and/or organizations in some situations.

**Conclusion**

The present study provides initial evidence showing that employees are able and will
perceive organizations as independent entities and can separate their perception of organizational entitativity from group entitativity. The study further clarifies the role of entitativity perceptions in organizations and explores the relationship between entitativity perceptions, justice and injustice perceptions, and important organizational outcomes. This study also provides empirical evidence to support the mediating role of emotional reactions in justice perception – behavioral outcome relationships and provides evidence to support the use of a multifoci approach to study justice and injustice perceptions in organizational research. Despite the limitations of the current study, gaining more understanding of entitativity perceptions in an organizational context and how entitativity perceptions relates to other organizational variables is of importance to both researchers and practitioners.
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Appendix A

Measures
Entitativity Antecedents (Blanchard et al., 2018)

Instructions: Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements using the following scale:

1 Strongly Disagree
2 Disagree
3 Neutral
4 Agree
5 Strongly Agree

Similarity
1 Members of my organization/work group are alike.
2 Members of my organization/work group have similar attitudes.
3 Members of my organization/work group have similar values.
4 Members of my organization/work group see things much in the same way.

Interactivity
1 Members of my organization/work group respond to each other’s messages.
2 Members of my organization/work group interact with each other in these messages.
3 Members of my organization/work group communicate with each other.
4 Members of my organization/work group spend time interacting.
5 Members of my organization/work group build on each other’s thoughts and ideas.

Common Goals
1 Members of my organization/work group share a common goal.
2 Members of my organization/work group strive for the same things.
3 Members of my organization/work group want to achieve the same goals.

Boundaries
1 It is easy to join my organization/work group.
2 It is easy to leave my organization/work group.
Entitativity

Entitativity (Blanchard et al., 2018)

Instructions: Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements using the following scale:

1 Strongly Disagree  
2 Disagree  
3 Neutral  
4 Agree  
5 Strongly Agree

1. My organization/work group is a unit.  
2. My organization/work group is a group.  
3. My organization/work group feel like a group to me.

Entitativity (Ford, 2016)

Instructions: Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements using the following scale:

1 Not at All  
2 Very Little  
3 Somewhat  
4 To a Great Extent  
5 To a Very Great Extent

1. Some groups possess a core personality; although there may be differences and similarities in the behaviors of their members, underneath they are basically the same. To what extent does your organization/work group possess a core personality?  
2. Some groups are coherent; their attitudes, values, and goals seem to be harmonious and compatible. Other groups attitudes, values, and goals seem to be incompatible or in disagreement. How coherent is your organization/work group?  
3. Some groups have the characteristic of being distinctive or unique. That is, they do not share many qualities or characteristics with other groups. How distinctive is your organization/work group?  
4. To what extent do you see your organization/work group as a single, unified whole?
Overall Justice Perception (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009)

Instructions: Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements using the following scale:

1 Strongly Disagree
2 Disagree
3 Neutral
4 Agree
5 Strongly Agree

1 Overall, I am treated fairly by my organization/my supervisor.
2 Generally, the way things work in my organization/my supervisor is fair.
3 In general, the treatment I receive around here/from my supervisor is fair.
4 In general, I can count on my organization/my supervisor to be fair.
5 For most part, my organization/my supervisor treats its employees/his(her) subordinates fairly.
6 Most of the people who work here/for my supervisor would say they are often treated fairly.

Overall Injustice Perception (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009)

Instructions: Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements using the following scale:

1 Strongly Disagree
2 Disagree
3 Neutral
4 Agree
5 Strongly Agree

1 Overall, I am treated unfairly by my organization/my supervisor.
2 Generally, the way things work in my organization/my supervisor is unfair.
3 In general, the treatment I receive around here/from my supervisor is unfair.
4 In general, I cannot count on my organization/my supervisor to be fair.
5 For most part, my organization/my supervisor treats its employees/his(her) subordinates unfairly.
6 Most of the people who work here/for my supervisor would say they are often treated unfairly.

Gratitude (Ford et al., 2017)
Instructions: Read each item carefully. Then rate how often do you feel the following emotions in the past two weeks using the following scale.

1 Never
2 Rarely
3 Sometimes
4 Often
5 Always

1. I feel grateful toward my organization/my supervisor.
2. I feel thankful toward my organization/my supervisor.
3. I feel appreciative toward my organization/my supervisor.
4. I feel gratitude toward my organization/my supervisor.

Anger (Ford et al., 2017)

Instructions: Read each item carefully. Then rate how often you feel the following emotions in the past two weeks using the following scale.

1 Never
2 Rarely
3 Sometimes
4 Often
5 Always

1. I feel anger toward my organization/my supervisor.
2. I feel enraged toward my organization/my supervisor.
3. I feel mad toward my organization/my supervisor.
4. I feel furious toward my organization/my supervisor.
Organizational Citizenship Behavior (Lee & Allen, 2002)

Instructions: Read each item carefully. Then rate how often you engage in each behavior in the past two weeks, using the five-point scale.

1. I attend functions that are not required but that help the organizational image.
2. I keep up with developments in the organization.
3. I defend the organization when other employees criticize it.
4. I show pride when representing the organization in public.
5. I offer ideas to improve the functioning of the organization.
6. I express loyalty toward the organization.
7. I take action to protect the organization from potential problems.
8. I demonstrate concern about the image of the organization.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Items (Supervisor)

1. I help my supervisor who have been absent.
2. I willingly give my time to help my supervisor who have work-related problems.
3. I adjust my work schedule to accommodate my supervisor’s requests.
4. I go out of my way to help my supervisor make newer employees feel welcome in the work group.
5. I show genuine concern and courtesy toward my supervisor, even under the most trying business or personal situations.
6. I give up time to help my supervisor who have work or non-work problems.
7. I assist my supervisor with their duties.
8. I share personal property with my supervisor to help his/her work.
Counterproductive Work Behavior (Spector et al., 2010)

Instructions: Read each item carefully. Then rate how often you engage in each behavior in the past two weeks, using the five-point scale.

1 Never
2 Rarely
3 Sometimes
4 Often
5 Always

Counterproductive Work Behavior (Organization)
1. Purposely wasted my employer’s materials/supplies.
2. Complained about insignificant things at work.
3. Told people outside the job what a lousy place I work for
4. Came to work late without permission.
5. Stayed home from work and said I was sick when I wasn’t.

Counterproductive Work Behavior (Supervisor)
6. Insulted my supervisor about his/her job performance.
7. Made fun of my supervisor’s personal life.
8. Ignored my supervisor at work.
9. Started an argument with my supervisor at work.
10. Insulted or made fun of my supervisor at work.
Demographic Questions

1. Gender
   a. Female
   b. Male
2. Race/Ethnicity
   a. Asian/Pacific Islander
   b. Black
   c. Hispanic
   d. Native American
   e. White
   f. Two or more races
   g. Prefer not to tell.
3. How many hours a week do you work at your current organization?
   a. Less than 5 hours
   b. 5-10 hours
   c. 11-20 hours
   d. 21-40 hours
   e. More than 40 hours
4. During your working hours, what is the percentage of time you work in an office with your coworkers?
   a. Less than 10%
   b. About 25%
   c. About 50%
   d. About 75%
   e. 100%
5. How long have you been with your current organization?
   a. Less than 1 year
   b. 1 year – 5 years
   c. 5-10 years
   d. More than 10 years
6. What is your current position?
   a. Entry level
   b. Junior professional
   c. Senior professional
   d. Supervisor
   e. Manager
   f. Director
   g. Executive
7. In general, how satisfied are you with your current job?
   a. Very dissatisfied
   b. Dissatisfied
   c. Neither
   d. Satisfied
8. In general, how much do you like your current organization?
   a. Extremely
   b. Very
   c. Moderately
   d. Slightly
   e. Not at all

9. In what major industry do you work?
   a. Accounting
   b. Aerospace/Aviation/Automotive
   c. Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing
   d. Business/Professional Services
   e. Computers
   f. Construction
   g. Education
   h. Engineering/Architecture
   i. Entertainment/Recreation
   j. Finance/Banking/Insurance
   k. Food Service
   l. Government/Military
   m. Healthcare/Medical
   n. Hospitality
   o. Legal
   p. Manufacturing
   q. Marketing/Public Relations
   r. Media/Printing/Publishing
   s. Non-Profit
   t. Research/Science
   u. Real Estate
   v. Retail
   w. Telecommunications
   x. Transportation/Distribution
   y. Utilities
   z. Other

10. What is the size of your current organization?
    a. Fewer than 10 employees
    b. 10-49 employees
    c. 50-499 employees
    d. 500-1,999 employees
    e. 2,000-10,000 employees
    f. Over 10,000 employees

11. What is the location of your workplace?
    a. On site
    b. At home
c. Half of the time on site, half of the time at home

12. What is the geographic spread of your organization?
   a. One location
   b. Multiple locations state-wide
   c. Multiple locations nation-wide
   d. Multinational

13. How many major divisions does your organization have?
   a. 1-3
   b. 4-6
   c. 7 or more
   d. Not sure

14. On average, how many subdivisions per department does your organization have?
   a. 1
   b. 2
   c. 3
   d. 4 or more
   e. Not sure

15. How many employee levels are there in your organization as a whole?
   a. 2-3
   b. 4-5
   c. 6-7
   d. 8 or more
   e. Not sure

16. How many employee levels are there in your division?
   a. 1-2
   b. 3-4
   c. 5 or more
   d. Not sure

17. In my organization, there can be little action taken until a supervisor approves a decision.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Neutral
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree

18. In my organization, a person who wants to make his/her own decisions would be quickly discouraged.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Neutral
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree

19. In my organization, even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer.
   a. Strongly Disagree
b. Disagree
c. Neutral
d. Agree
e. Strongly Agree
20. In my organization, I have to ask my boss before I do almost anything.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Neutral
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree
21. In my organization, any decision I make has to have my boss’s approval.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Neutral
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree
22. In my organization, employees are constantly being checked on for rule violations.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Neutral
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree
23. In my organization, people feel as though they are constantly being watched to see that they obey all rules.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Neutral
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree
24. How often do you usually participate in the decision to hire new staff in your organization?
   a. Never
   b. Rarely
   c. Sometimes
   d. Often
   e. Always
25. How often do you usually participate in the decision on the promotion of any of the professional staff in your organization?
   a. Never
   b. Rarely
   c. Sometimes
   d. Often
   e. Always
26. How often do you usually participate in the decision on the adoption of new policies in
27. How often do you usually participate in the decision on the adoption of new programs in your organization?
   a. Never
   b. Rarely
   c. Sometimes
   d. Often
   e. Always

Random Response Detection (will be placed in with other scales)

1. Please select “Disagree.”
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Neutral
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree
Appendix B

Supplemental Tables
Table 5

Results of Entitativity SEM models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Entitativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Goals</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactivity</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time working with coworker</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Organization Division</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Entitativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Goals</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactivity</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time working with coworker</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. N=312.
Table 6

Results of Justice SEM model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gratitude toward Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justice</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitativity</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Justice</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time working with coworker</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratitude toward Organization</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justice</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitativity</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Justice</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time working with coworker</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratitude toward Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Justice</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time working with coworker</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratitude toward Supervisor</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Justice</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time working with coworker</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. N=312. LLCI and ULCI represent the 95% lower-limit and 95% upper-limit confidence interval, respectively.
Table 7

*Results of Injustice SEM model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>(p)</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anger toward Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Injustice</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitativity</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Injustice</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time working with coworker</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWBO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger toward Organization</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Injustice</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitativity</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Injustice</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time working with coworker</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger toward Supervisor</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Injustice</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time working with coworker</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger toward Supervisor</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Injustice</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time working with coworker</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* \(N=312\). LLCI and ULCI represent the 95\% lower-limit and 95\% upper-limit confidence interval, respectively.
Table 8

Results of Justice Path model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gratitude toward Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justice</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitativity</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justice X Entitativity</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Justice</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Justice X Entitativity</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time working with coworker</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratitude toward Organization</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justice</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitativity</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justice X Entitativity</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Justice</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Justice X Entitativity</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time working with coworker</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratitude toward Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Justice</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time working with coworker</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratitude toward Supervisor</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Justice</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time working with coworker</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. N=312. LLCI and ULCI represent the 95% lower-limit and 95% upper-limit confidence interval, respectively.
Table 9

Results of Injustice Path model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anger toward Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Injustice</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitativity</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Injustice X Entitativity</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Injustice</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Injustice X Entitativity</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time working with coworker</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWBO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger toward Organization</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Injustice</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitativity</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Injustice X Entitativity</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Injustice</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Injustice X Entitativity</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time working with coworker</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger toward Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Injustice</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time working with coworker</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger toward Supervisor</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Injustice</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time working with coworker</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. N=312. LLCI and ULCI represent the 95% lower-limit and 95% upper-limit confidence interval, respectively.