**Results**

**Manipulation check**

The analysis of item one revealed that the manipulation was not successful. On average, participants in the experimental condition had the sense that CCM provided their employees with a similar amount of perks (M = 4.36, SD = 1.58), to those in the control condition (M = 4.23, SD = 1.65). This difference was not significant 95% CI [-0.49, 0.25], t(288) = -0.64, *p* =.52; it represented a no effect (d =-0.08) as seen in Figure 1.

Figure 1

A screenshot of a computer

Description automatically generated with medium confidence

*Note.* A visualization of the spread and distribution of the perceived amount of perks offered by CMM between the control and experimental condition for item 1 of the manipulation check

**Exploitation justification**

Inline with the ineffective manipulation, participants presented with a scenario in which the employer provided additional perks did not justify more exploitation of a fictional employee than those presented with a scenario in which no additional perks were mentioned in either item 1 (Control: M = 3.52, SD = 1.46, Experimental: M = 3.71, SD = 1.43, as seen in figure 2) or item 2 (Control: *M* = 3.37, *SD* = 1,43, Experimental: *M* = 3.11, *SD* = 1.46, as seen in figure 3). Analysis did not produce a significant result for either item 1 (95% CI [-0.52, 0.14], t(289) = 0.28, *p* =.27, D = -0.13) or item 2 (95% CI [-0.06, 0.61], t(289) = 1.63, *p* =.10), D = 0.19).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Figure 2*Text  Description automatically generatedNote*. A visualization of the spread and distribution of justification of exploitation between the control and experimental condition for item 1 | Figure 3*A screenshot of a computer  Description automatically generated with medium confidenceNote*. A visualization of the spread and distribution of justification of exploitation between the control and experimental condition for item 2 |

**Expectations of Perfectionism**

Similar to justification of exploitation, participants in the experimental condition did not hold greater expectations of perfectionism towards John than those in the control condition for item 1 (Control: M = 3.34, SD = 1.66, Experimental: M = 3.28, SD = 1.65, as seen in figure 4) or of item 2 (Control: *M* = 4.26, *SD* = 1.49, Experimental: *M* = 4.47, *SD* = 1.41, as seen in figure 5) of the expectation of perfectionism measure. Analysis did not produce a significant result for either item (item 1: *t*(289) = 0.33, *p* = 0.74, 95% CI [-0.31, 0.44], D= 0.04, item 2: *t*(288) = -1.24, *p* = 0.22, 95% CI [-0.54, 0.12], D = -0.15).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Figure 4  Text  Description automatically generated  *Note*. A visualization of the spread and distribution of expectations of perfectionism between the control and experimental condition for item 1 | Figure 5*Text  Description automatically generatedNote*. A visualization of the spread and distribution of expectations of perfectionism between the control and experimental condition for item 2 |

**Mistreatment Justification**

The last of the key outcome variables, mistreatment justification, show similar results to those of its peers. Participants in the experimental condition did not show greater justification of mistreatment towards John than participants in the control condition for item 1 (Control: M = 2.84, SD = 1.43, Experimental: M = 2.74, SD = 1.33, as seen in figure 6) or of item 2 (Control: *M* = 2.23, *SD* = 1.36, Experimental: *M* = 2.25, *SD* = 1.52, as seen in figure 7) of the expectation of perfectionism measure. Analysis did not produce a significant result for either item (item 1: *t*(287) = 0.63, *p* = 0.53, 95% CI [-0.22, 0.42], D= 0.07, item 2: *t*(286) = -0.15, *p* = 0.88, 95% CI [-0.39, 0.31], D = -0.02 ).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Figure 6  A picture containing text  Description automatically generated  *Note*. A visualization of the spread and distribution of justification of mistreatment between the control and experimental condition for item 1 | Figure 7*Text  Description automatically generatedNote*. A visualization of the spread and distribution of justification of mistreatment between the control and experimental condition for item 2 |

**Exploratory analysis**

**Difference in means amongst attitudes towards employee.** Student’s T-tests were conducted for all exploratory items that measured attitudes and perceptions relating to John. All showed insignificant differences between conditions with the exception of expectations for the typical number of hours John should work per week (*t*(288) = 2.07, *p* < .05 , 95% CI [-0.32, 2.94], D = 0.24), as shown in Table 1). Participants in the control condition, on average, reported that they believed John should work 39.7(SD = 5.4) hours a week while participants in the experimental condition responded with an average of 38.4(SD = 5.8) hours per week, as shown in Figure 8.

**Difference in means amongst attitudes towards CCM.** Student’s T-tests were conducted for all exploratory items measuring attitudes and perceptions of CCM as a company. There was no significant differences in perceptions of CCM caring for the well being of it’s employees or being a desirable and competitive employer in the field between conditions. However, participants in the experimental condition agreed significantly more with the statement that CCM was a fun place to work than participants within the control condition (*t*(280) = -2.49, *p* < .05 , 95% CI [-0.72, -0.08], D = -0.29), as shown in Table 1 and Figure 9).

Table 1

*Summary of Students t-tests, mean and standard deviation differences (experimental – control), confidence intervals and Cohen’s d measures of effect size for differences of expectations for negative outcomes: extra work, expected number of hours worked, belief that work is it’s own reward, expectations of company-first attitude, loyalty and gratitude, and perception that CCM is a competitive employer in the industry between control and experimental conditions.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  | |  | 95% CI | |  |
|  | df | T-Statistic (p) | | Mean Diff | SD Diff | Lower | Upper | Cohen’s d |
| Extra Work 1 | 289 | .74 (.459) | -0.15 | | 0.03 | -0.242 | 0.535 | 0.09 |
| Extra Work 2 | 289 | .28 (.781) | -0.05 | | 0.01 | -0.304 | 0.404 | 0.03 |
| **Work Hours 1** | **288** | **2.07 (.039)\*** | **-1.36** | | **0.42** | **-0.323** | **2.935** | **0.24** |
| Work Hours 2 | 289 | 0.07 (.941) | -0.10 | | -0.06 | -2.590 | 2.793 | 0.01 |
| Work as a Reward 1 | 289 | -0.08 (.939) | 0.01 | | -0.03 | -0.307 | 0.284 | 0.01 |
| Work as a Reward 2 | 288 | -1.09 (.275) | 0.18 | | 0.08 | -0.516 | 0.147 | -0.13 |
| Company First | 284 | -.95 (.340) | 0.14 | | 0.18 | -0.435 | 0.151 | -0.11 |
| Loyalty | 289 | 0.27 (.789) | 0.05 | | 0.06 | -0.391 | 0.298 | -0.03 |
| Gratitude | 287 | -.75 (.454) | 0.11 | | 0.11 | -0.402 | 0.180 | -0.09 |
| Competitive 2 | 284 | -.55 (.582) | 0.09 | | -0.18 | -0.390 | 0.220 | -0.06 |

*Note.* \*\* p < .01 level. \*  p < .05 level. Negative Mean Difference or SD Difference means a higher respective mean or SD in the experimental condition.

Table 2

*Summary of Students t-tests, mean and standard deviation differences (experimental – control), confidence intervals and Cohen’s d measures of effect size for differences of expectations for perceptions of clan culture: between control and experimental conditions.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  | |  | 95% CI | |  |
|  | df | T-Statistic (p) | Mean Diff | SD Diff | | Lower | Upper | Cohen’s d |
| Well-Being | 289 | -.16 (.873) | 0.02 | | -0.02 | -0.328 | 0.279 | -0.02 |
| **Fun** | **280** | **-2.49 (.013)\*** | **0.40** | | **0.26** | **-0.720** | **-0.084** | **-0.29** |
| Competitive 1 | 289 | 0.21 (.837) | -0.04 | | 0.01 | -0.334 | 0.412 | 0.02 |

*Note. \*\* p* < .01 level. \*  p < .05 level. Negative Mean Difference or SD Difference means a higher respective mean or SD in the experimental condition.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Figure 8  *Note*. A depiction of the means and standard deviations of the number of hours participants believed John should work on a typical work  week in the control condition and experimental condition. | Figure 9  *Note*. A depiction of the means and standard deviations of degree to which participants agreed with the statement that CCM seemed like a fun place to work in the control condition and experimental condition. |

**Correlation**

Correlational analysis was performed on the quantitative manipulation check and all 19 outcome variables, including the 6 key outcome variables and the 13 exploratory items. These can be seen in Tables 3 and 4.

**Key outcome variables.** Items 2-7 encompass the key outcome variables from the studies three main hypotheses. With regards to the quantitative manipulation check, the only item that was significantly correlated was the second item in the Expectations of Perfectionism measure. The belief that it was fair for CCM to hold it’s employees to higher standard than the rest of the industry was positively correlated to the perception that CCM provided its employees with considerable perks (r = .26, p < .001).

**Relationships between perception of perks and exploratory items measuring attitudes or perceptions of CCM.** Within Tables 3 and 4, items 12, 17 and 18 measure positive perceptions of CCM. The believe that CCM seemed like a highly desirable employer in their field (item 12) was significantly and positively correlated to the perception that CCM provided its employees with considerable perks (*r* = .40, *p* < .001). It was also positively correlated each item relating to the studies key outcomes and all exploratory items measuring positive perceptions of CCM and increased expectations on John with the sole exception of the number of work hours participants believed John should work on a typical week (Item 10). Similarly, both the believe that CCM was a fun place to work and that CCM cared about its employees were positively correlated with the perception that CCM provided its employees with considerable perks and all items measuring key outcomes except the second item in the perfectionism measure.

Table 3

*Summary of correlations (significance) across manipulation check and all outcomes, part 1.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | 8 | | 9 | | 10 | |
| 1. Manipulation | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Exploitation 1 | .01 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Exploitation 2 | .08 |  | **.26** | **\*\*\*** | ­- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Mistreatment 1 | -.02 |  | .09 |  | **.18** | **\*\*** | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Mistreatment 2 | .03 |  | .09 |  | **.18** | **\*\*** | **.35** | **\*\*\*** | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Perfectionism 1 | .04 |  | **.13** | **\*** | .28 |  | **.21** | **\*\*\*** | **.25** | **\*\*\*** | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Perfectionism 2 | **.26** | **\*\*\*** | .06 |  | **.04** | **\*** | -.04 |  | .05 |  | .02 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Extra Work 1 | **.23** | **\*\*\*** | .10 |  | **.12** | **\*** | .06 |  | .09 |  | **.16** | **\*\*** | **.27** | **\*\*\*** | **-** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Extra Work 2 | **.19** | **\*\*** | **.14** | **\*** | **.18** | **\*\*** | **.21** | **\*\*\*** | **.18** | **\*\*** | **.23** | **\*\*\*** | **.22** | **\*\*\*** | .**42** | **\*\*\*** | - |  |  |  |
| 10. Work Hours 1 | .09 |  | -.04 |  | .03 |  | **-.12** | **\*** | -.04 |  | .04 |  | **.13** | **\*** | .09 |  | **.17** | **\*\*** | - |  |
| 11. Work Hours 2 | **.21** | **\*\*\*** | .01 |  | .11 | **†** | -.08 |  | .07 |  | -.07 |  | **.15** | **\*\*** | .**15** | **\*** | **.19** | **\*\*** | **.33** | **\*\*\*** |
| 12. Competitive 1 | **.40** | **\*\*\*** | **.12** | **\*** | **.18** | **\*\*** | .**13** | **\*** | **.20** | **\*\*** | **.13** | **\*** | **.28** | **\*\*\*** | **.23** | **\*\*\*** | **.31** | **\*\*\*** | .09 |  |
| 13. Competitive 2 | **.21** | **\*\*\*** | -.03 |  | .04 |  | .03 |  | -.02 |  | .**17** | **\*\*** | **.12** | **\*\*** | **.16** | **\*\*** | **.13** | **\*** | .06 |  |
| 14. Company First | **.10** | **\*\*** | **.13** | **\*** | **.23** | **\*\*\*** | **.24** | **\*\*\*** | **.35** | **\*\*\*** | **.25** | **\*\*\*** | .06 |  | **.23** | **\*\*\*** | **.28** | **\*\*\*** | .04 |  |
| 15. Loyalty to Co | **.17** | **\*\*** | .07 |  | **.15** | **\*\*** | **.19** | **\*\*** | **.27** | **\*\*\*** | **.19** | **\*\*** | .06 |  | **.23** | **\*\*\*** | **.30** | **\*\*\*** | **.15** | **\*** |
| 16. Gratitude to Co | **.33** | **\*\*\*** | **.13** | **\*** | **.17** | **\*\*** | .**20** | **\*\*** | **.21** | **\*\*\*** | **.23** | **\*\*\*** | **.20** | **\*\*** | **.16** | **\*\*** | **.35** | **\*\*\*** | .05 |  |
| 17. Co is Fun Place | **.30** | **\*\*\*** | **.20** | **\*\*** | **.25** | **\*\*\*** | **.12** | **\*** | **.32** | **\*\*\*** | **.20** | **\*\*** | .06 |  | **.21** | **\*\*\*** | **.29** | **\*\*\*** | .11 | **†** |
| 18. Emp Well Being | **.29** | **\*\*\*** | **.13** | **\*** | **.24** | **\*\*\*** | **.14** | **\*** | **.36** | **\*\*\*** | **.28** | **\*\*\*** | .05 |  | **.24** | **\*\*\*** | **.28** | **\*\*\*** | .06 |  |
| 19. Work is Reward 1 | **.20** | **\*\*** | .04 |  | **.19** | **\*\*** | **.22** | **\*\*\*** | **.22** | **\*\*\*** | **.17** | **\*\*** | .10 | **†** | .08 |  | **.16** | **\*\*** | **.14** | **\*** |
| 20. Work is Reward 2 | **.28** | **\*\*\*** | **.12** | **\*** | **.24** | **\*\*\*** | **.16** | **\*\*** | **.31** | **\*\*\*** | **.22** | **\*\*\*** | **.13** | **\*** | **.21** | **\*\*\*** | **.19** | **\*\*** | .07 |  |

*Note.* †*p < .10, \*p* < .05 level*, \*\* p* < .01 level, *\*\*\* p* < .001 level.

Manipulation = Manipulation Check, Exploitation = Exploitation Justification, Mistreatment = Mistreatment Justification, Perfectionism = Expectations of Perfectionism, Extra Work = Extra Work Justification, Work Hours = Work Hours, Competitive = Perception of Competitive Work Place, Company First = Company First Attitude, Loyalty to Co = Expectation of Loyalty, Gratitude to Co = Expectation of Gratitude, Co is Fun Place = Perception of Fun Workplace, Emp Well Being = Perceived Care for Employee Well Being, Work is Reward = View of Work as its own Reward.

Table 4

*Summary of correlations (significance) across manipulation check and all outcomes, part 2.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 11 | | 12 | | 13 | | 14 | | 15 | | 16 | | 17 | | 18 | | 19 | | 20 | |
| 1. Manipulation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Exploitation 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Exploitation 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Mistreatment 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Mistreatment 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Perfectionism 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Perfectionism 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Extra Work 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Extra Work 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Work Hours 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Work Hours 2 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Competitive 1 | **.20** | **\*\*** | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Competitive 2 | .07 |  | **.23** | **\*\*\*** | **-** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14. Company First | **.14** | **\*** | **.20** | **\*\*** | .03 |  | **-** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15. Loyalty to Co | **.13** | **\*** | **.22** | **\*\*\*** | .04 |  | **.44** | **\*\*\*** | **-** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16. Gratitude to Co | **.12** | **\*** | **.36** | **\*\*\*** | **.19** | **\*\*** | **.36** | **\*\*\*** | **.47** | **\*\*\*** | **-** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17. Co is Fun Place | **.20** | **\*\*** | **.46** | **\*\*\*** | .04 |  | **.29** | **\*\*\*** | **.35** | **\*\*\*** | **.30** | **\*\*\*** | **-** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18. Emp Well Being | **.17** | **\*\*** | **.37** | **\*\*\*** | .06 |  | **.38** | **\*\*\*** | **.38** | **\*\*\*** | **.33** | **\*\*\*** | **.65** | **\*\*\*** | **-** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19. Work is Reward 1 | **.18** | **\*\*** | **.31** | **\*\*\*** | **.20** | **\*\*** | **.31** | **\*\*\*** | **.33** | **\*\*\*** | **.28** | **\*\*\*** | **.28** | **\*\*\*** | **.32** | **\*\*\*** | **-** |  |  |  |
| 20. Work is Reward 2 | **.23** | **\*\*\*** | **.39** | **\*\*\*** | **.11** | **\*** | **.31** | **\*\*\*** | **.24** | **\*\*\*** | **.31** | **\*\*\*** | **.56** | **\*\*\*** | **.60** | **\*\*\*** | **.32** | **\*\*\*** | **-** |  |

*Note.* †*p < .10, \*p* < .05 level*, \*\* p* < .01 level, *\*\*\* p* < .001 level.

Manipulation = Manipulation Check, Exploitation = Exploitation Justification, Mistreatment = Mistreatment Justification, Perfectionism = Expectations of Perfectionism, Extra Work = Extra Work Justification, Work Hours = Work Hours, Competitive = Perception of Competitive Work Place, Company First = Company First Attitude, Loyalty to Co = Expectation of Loyalty, Gratitude to Co = Expectation of Gratitude, Co is Fun Place = Perception of Fun Workplace, Emp Well Being = Perceived Care for Employee Well Being, Work is Reward = View of Work as its own Reward.