**Methods**

**Sample**

Participants were 291 (*Mage* = 19.35, *SDage* = 2.38) undergraduate students enrolled at Brock University.  Participants recruited on Brock’s online platform SONA and compensated with class credit. Five participants were excluded from the analyses after failing one or more of the attention check measures. An additional twelve participants were excluded for leaving the majority of the survey blank and one participant was excluded for not answering either manipulation check. Thus, only 291 participants were included in the reported analyses. Of the remaining sample, 67% was under the age of 20 with only 2.4% over the age of 25. The vast majority of the sample was female (83.8%) with one non-binary participant and the remainder identifying as male (15.8%). The majority also identified as White/Caucasian/European (64.6%), Asian (12.7%) or Black/African-American (6.5%). Participants were asked which department of Brock they belonged to and the sample mostly studied Social Sciences (35.2%), Health Sciences (29.3%) and Education (22.4%). It is of note that only 5.1% of the sample consisted of students studying Mathematics and Science.

**Procedure**

Participants were randomly assigned into one of two conditions that differed based on the presence of clan-culture signalling perks in the experimental condition and lack thereof in the control condition. All participants encountered the same initial introduction that described a fictitious employee named John who worked as a software developer at a company called CCM. Next, participants in the control condition were shown an online brochure displaying the employee benefits available to members within CCM. These can be seen in appendix (A?). They describe a generic set of benefits including prescription drug coverage, vision and dental coverage, and mental health benefits. Members of the experimental condition were provided with an online brochure containing a set of benefits that included the following clan-culture signalling perks: several free meal options such as on-site cafes, a staff games room, an onsite gym, and an employee nap room. This brochure can also be seen in appendix (A). Participants in both conditions then completed the set of measures for our three key dependent variables as well as a variety of exploratory measures.

**Key Outcome Measures**

**Exploitation Justification.** After learning about CCM, participants completed two items designed to measure the degree to which they justified exploitative behaviour being carried out towards John. The inter-item correlation was significant but not sufficient for aggregation (*r* = 0.28, *p* < .001).

Both items presented the participant with a vignette describing an instance of exploitation from leadership at CCM (e.g., “A manager at CCM is sick, and no one from management can fill in. John is asked to take over the manager's duties until they come back so things can continue moving smoothly”) before asking them to rate, on a 7-point Likert scale from "1" (*strongly disagree)* to "7" *(strongly agree*), the degree to which they believed the leader’s behaviour was reasonable. Both items can be seen in full in appendix B.

**Expectations of Perfectionism.** Two items were then used to assess the degree to which participants supported employees of CCM being held standards of perfectionism. These were not significantly correlated (*r* = -.01, *p* = 0.92). As such they were also analyzed independently instead of being aggregated into an overall score.

As with the items assessing exploitation justification and mistreatment justification, vignettes describing an instance of a leader at CCM exhibiting expectations of perfectionism towards employees were shown to participants. For example, the following vignette was presented in item 1 of the measure:

John finds that every time he submits work, it is sent back for revisions. Even when his code works, it will be sent back and not considered organized or formatted well enough. John goes in to talk with his team lead and asks why his work is never good enough when it has always been acceptable at his previous places of work. John’s team lead tells him that the standard for employees is higher at CCM than at other companies. While he understands John’s frustration and thinks John is a great employee, he will need to raise his standards even more if he wants to fit in here.

Next, participants were asked ton a 7-point Likert scale from "1" (*strongly disagree)* to "7" *(strongly agree*). Both items can be seen in full in appendix B.

**Mistreatment Justification.** The last key outcome to be assessed was the degree to which participants justified observed instances of mistreatment from CCM’s leadership towards John. As with the items measuring exploitation justification, the two items measuring mistreatment justification which were significantly correlated (*r* = 0.33, *p* <.001) but analyzed independently due to the correlation only being of medium size.

Both items presented the participant with a vignette describing an instance of interpersonal mistreatment from leadership at CCM. Once such question is as follows:

John has been with CCM for several years and risen to the ranks of a senior developer with a team of junior developers working underneath him on an important project. Things are going well until the core software that CCM produces and distributes goes down. The error is quickly found and corrected, but CCM still received several customer complaints while the bug was being fixed. After it comes to light that John was the one who wrote the code that caused the error, he is verbally reprimanded then sent back to work. However, this error embarrassed John’s team lead, and they start to only give John tasks suitable for a newly hired junior developer to make a point.

After reading this vignette, participants were then presented with the following statement: “The team lead’s response to John’s error is understandable” and asked to rate, on a 7-point Likert scale from "1" (*strongly disagree)* to "7" *(strongly agree*), the degree to which agreed with it. Both items can be seen in full in appendix B.

**Manipulation Check.** To assess the effectiveness of our manipulation, participants completed two items designed to measure the degree to which they perceived CCM to be providing its employees with perks. The first item asked participants to agree to the following statement on a 7-point Likert scale from "1" (*strongly disagree)* to "7" *(strongly agree*): “From the description of CCM, I got the sense that they provide employees with considerable perks.” The second item asked participants to briefly summarize their impression of CCM as a company. These items were positively correlated (*r* = 0.27, *p* = <.001), however it was insufficient to justify aggregation, so they were analyzed separately.

**Attention Check.** To ensure that participants were attentive while reading the information presented about CCM, they were asked to answer two items that required they correctly identify the name of CCM and John amongst 4 multiple-choice options. If a participant failed to answer either question correctly, they were excluded from the study. Both items can be seen in appendix B.