

Response Letter (Stage: 2, Round: 1)

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. Celniker (reviewer 1), Dr. Ziano (reviewer 2), and Prof. Dr. Inzlicht (reviewer 3),

thank you for your positive and constructive reviews on our first version of the Stage 2 manuscript. We were glad to read, that the overall impression of the current version was positive and we hope to have further increased the quality in this review round. As suggested by Dr. Fillon, we only address the feedback by Dr. Celniker below. We hope to have adjusted the language and style in the manuscript according to the feedback by Dr. Ziano and Prof. Dr. Inzlicht adequately.

Best regards

Leopold Roth (corresponding author)

Dr. Celniker (reviewer 1)

Dear Dr. Celniker,

thank you again for your time and effort, spend on our project. We were very pleased to see you joining this review round as well.

Below, we address your comments in the order of reception and hope to have reacted to them adequately.

Best regards

Leopold Roth

Comments:

First, I think the authors should spend more time in the introduction and discussion talking about the implications (societal and theoretical) of the null age findings. In the introduction, I was left wondering what the interpretation of a null effect might be, and I was left with that question unresolved by the time I finished the paper. The Bayesian statistical approach used by the authors provides moderate to strong evidence of a null age effect. I want to authors to grapple with this more, what it means for the social issues they start the paper with and for theories about the generalizability of effort moralization effects. E.g., the lack of moderation by age seems to further support the idea that effort moralization is generalizable, beyond the effects that were replicated in different cultures than prior work. As written, I am not clear on the way these data further illuminate psychological theory or contemporary issues in society. To be clear, I believe these data can be written up such that they provide clear value, but I think some revisions to the introduction and discussion will be necessary to accomplish that.

Response: Thank you very much for sharing your impression of the finding and its integration with us! This perspective is very valuable to us and we hope to have addressed this point sufficiently in the manuscript by now. Following the suggestion by Dr. Fillon, we focused our efforts on implementing your suggestions in the discussion section and kept the changes in the introduction small. In the discussion, we have included a section on theoretical implications. This section addresses the two issues raised, namely societal implications and implications regarding the generalizability of effort moralizations. Specifically, we concluded that effort moralization does not appear to contribute to the explanation of the social movements discussed, but rather that it continues to play a fundamental role in the judgment of moral character across generations. In addition, we stated that our findings support the generalizability of the effect as a deeply rooted heuristic that emerges globally and independently of age.

I also found the presentation of the warmth and competence results to be surprising, given those analyses were not discussed earlier in the manuscript. Since it was not part of the authors' focal hypotheses, I might relegate those analyses to the supplemental materials to open up more space for discussing the issues I described above. Alternatively, if the authors think it is important to keep those analyses in the main text, I would ask them to set up those analyses a bit better, to provide a reader a sense of why these results are important to highlight despite not being directly connected to the main replication or extension.

Response: Thank you for this helpful point. We agree that the measures were not sufficiently introduced, as they were only displayed in the measures table (Table 4). We added this to the section 'current study' to raise awareness for future readers. While we were not against directing the results to the supplemental material, we think they deliver informative contributions for future studies. Hence, we decided to keep them in the 'results' section, which we hope is an adequate solution for you.

Lastly, there were some verb tense and other grammatical issues throughout the manuscript that, while minor, should be addressed. E.g., on page 18, it reads "We have no a priori assumptions..." when it should read "We had no...", presumably this is a leftover from the Round 1 version of the manuscript. I'd advise the authors to carefully review the manuscript to address these types of issues.

Response: Thank you for highlighting this to us. We corrected the manuscript within our abilities and hope that it is now in an adequate grammatical and stylistic shape.

P.S. The pay deservingness findings were interesting and a little perplexing to me. The authors may want to discuss these findings a bit more through the lens of cultural differences in the importance of morality in partner choice decision-making. The pay deservingness finding isn't a partner choice outcome, but it may be a proxy for it. I believe Duncan

Stibbard-Hawkes has some work on cultural differences on the role of moral judgment in partner choice, though I can't find the paper at the moment. This isn't essential to discuss in the current paper, but it may be useful for the authors to consider when bulking up their theoretical discussion.

Response: Thank you for this very interesting addition, which is definitely food for thought.

We consulted the literature as well as some colleagues, and we did not end up with a satisfactory solution to the question, apart from 'further research needed'. We added this to the manuscript, especially with the remark that future studies should test whether the pattern in Mexican data will be replicated. If so, a more nuanced assessment could potentially shed light on this effect. In addition, the note points out that the published literature with American data from countries south of the United States is still sparse and an inadequate source for cross-cultural queries such as these.