

Response Letter (Revision Round 2)

Is it Worth the Hustle? A Multi-Country Replication of the Effort Moralization Effect and an Extension to Generational Differences in the Appreciation of Effort

Dear Dr. Fillon (recommender), Dr. Ziano (reviewer 1), and Dr. Celniker (reviewer 2),

Thank you once again for the time and effort you have put into our project. We have carefully studied the reviews and recommendations and will respond to all of them in the following pages. Below, we respond first to the reviews provided by Dr. Ziano, followed by those provided by Dr. Celniker. We hope to have addressed all points adequately.

Best regards

Leopold Roth (corresponding author)

Comments by Prof. Dr. Ziano (reviewer 1)

Dear Prof. Dr. Ziano,

Thank you for your valuable contribution to our project. Below are our responses to your comments in chronological order.

Detailed comments:

I want to point to you a Twitter thread regarding older people saying that now, young people do not want to work anymore, by Paul Fairie: link [4]. If not useful, certainly funny

Response: Thank you very much for recommending this to us!

I still have some observations about the writing:

I still think you should be more to the point in the introduction and tell your reader immediately that you want to replicate the EME (which is the primary thing you do) and test whether age moderates it, rather than having this overly complicated introduction. For instance, the sentence 'The current study aims to replicate and extend the original findings by Celniker et al. (2023), specifically Study 6' should be at p.6 and not at p.10, perhaps replacing the useless reference to Aristotle. Sorry for insisting! (Actually, I am not sorry at all).

Response: Thank you for suggesting this point. We added a sentence on the suggested page, which specifies the aim of the project (replication of Celniker et al., 2023, Study 6 as well as prediction by age). We hope this updated version offers a clearer introduction to the reader now. We left the sentences, referring to the reoccurrence of the comments about the 'lazy youth' in place as Dr. Celniker suggested to pick this argument up in a later paragraph (see below).

The text is still full of unnecessary commas, including the very sentence I copy-edited last time. Another example: ‘Naturally, these require some sort of quantification to tell, how moral a person is, based on mostly trivial actions’. Only the comma after ‘naturally’ is needed. The others separate verb and subject and are mistakes. Again, sorry for insisting (not sorry).

Response: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript so thoroughly. We have double-checked the entire manuscript, including using Grammarly, and hope that we have removed all unnecessary commas.

Comments by Dr. Celniker (reviewer 2)

Dear Dr. Celniker,

Thank you once again for taking the time to review our project and provide us with detailed suggestions for improvement. Below are our responses to your comments in chronological order.

Detailed comments:

I found the introduction significantly improved from the initial submission, so I thank the authors for streamlining that section. That said, I think there’s possibly even more they can trim from the introduction, and this relates to my comments in my prior review about references to “bullshit jobs”. I appreciated the authors’ decision to drop the reference to bullshit jobs from the title of their proposal, yet there is still a small section with bullshit jobs referenced. I’m still not totally sure what the relevance is of bullshit jobs to what the authors are testing in these studies. My suggestion would be to cut the bullshit jobs references out of the introduction. I think that material could be saved for the general discussion (if it then seems relevant to make

those connections). The studies are not designed to test questions related to bullshit jobs directly, and I think allusions to bullshit jobs raise more questions than they help clarify.

Response: Thank you very much. We remodeled the section as suggested and think it is more specific and easier to understand now.

I think the short section of the intro I'm referring to (pg. 10) could be made stronger if it forwards something like the following argument (it need not be exactly this argument, but I think something along these lines will be more satisfying and address some of the concerns that Dr. Inzlicht raised in his review):

- *As described earlier in the intro, older generations seem to always think that younger generations are less hardworking than themselves, despite little evidence to justify that assertion.*
- *Yet recent movements like the great resignation, quiet quitting, etc. suggest some real cultural or generational shifts around work and/or perceptions of effort.*
- *Prior work on effort moralization has not found consistent individual difference moderators of that effect. E.g., work ethic beliefs do not consistently moderate these effects.*
- *We (the authors) believe it is plausible that younger generations are moralizing economically unproductive effort less than older generations. There may be some generational differences in this specific facet of effort judgments (any literature to support or suggest this hypothesis would be welcomed here).*
- *Such differences could help explain these social movements more than the perpetual (and unverified) claims about young people being lazier than their ancestors. Younger people may not perceive unproductive work the same way as older people, and that might help explain why they are opting out of jobs they perceive to be unproductive*

(this last point could be the one place to make a quick allusion to bullshit jobs, but it still may be better saved for the general discussion).

- *We are interested in testing age differences in effort moralization to inform these important cross-cultural discussions about workforce participation.*

Response: Thank you for these very clear suggestions. We have incorporated them closely into the updated version of the manuscript. We are confident that these changes have significantly improved the readability and clarity of the project.

There should be slightly more justification for the Germany & Mexico choices in the main text. There are lots of places where these effects haven't been tested yet (like the other countries the authors originally included, the Netherlands and South Africa). The authors told us in their letter why they chose these countries (convenience based on language), which I think is completely reasonable. Just stating this explicitly (even in a footnote) would help fend off questions from readers about why a more theoretically-driven selection process wasn't undertaken.

Response: We added a footnote to the manuscript that offers greater detail to this choice.

The authors may want to reference the work by Warren Tierney and colleagues (including Eric Uhlmann) that investigated similar effort moralization effects. They have studied these effects in places such as the UK and India. This could fit in a few different places (e.g., work ethic effects don't seem to make much of a difference), but it seems like it would be an omission if left out of the literature review. Apologies for not thinking about or mentioning this in my first review.

Response: Thank you very much for this suggestion! We included the respective reference in the manuscript and hope it made the review more complete. This was very helpful advice.

Lastly, there are still some typos, grammatical issues (e.g., misplaced commas), and formatting issues that could be addressed (I believe the other reviewers noted these as well). It isn't particularly important to me that these are addressed before the proposal is approved, but I do think they should be further attended to at some point.

Response: Thank you for pointing this out to us. We went through the manuscript multiple times and cross-checked with Grammarly and hope that the issues are resolved by now.