I appreciate the effort the authors put into their revised proposal. They addressed most of the concerns I raised, and I felt like they generally dealt with the issues raised by the editor and other reviewers as well. In particular, I’m glad that the authors decreased the number of countries they will be testing in and that they will power the studies to test for d = 0.2 effects. At this point, I’m generally satisfied with this proposal, but I will note a few things here that I think can further enhance their document.

* 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.
  + 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.
* 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.
* 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.
* 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.

I continue to wish the authors good luck and success with this proposal!

Jared Celniker