

WEB APPENDIX A
Main Effects (Study 1)

Task Significance	Discount	No Discount
Mean (S.D.)	6.31 (1.03)	6.58 (.60)
ANOVA: discount vs. no discount	$F(1,161) = 4.16, p < .05$	
Perceived Appreciation	Discount	No Discount
Mean (S.D.)	5.43 (1.41)	5.94 (1.06)
ANOVA: discount vs. no discount	$F(1,161) = 6.83, p < .05$	
Intrinsic Motivation	Discount	No Discount
Mean (S.D.)	5.05 (1.62)	5.35 (1.24)
ANOVA: discount vs. no discount	$F(1,161) = 1.79, n.s.$	
Ambivalent Identification	Discount	No Discount
Mean (S.D.)	2.96 (1.67)	2.31 (1.39)
ANOVA: discount vs. no discount	$F(1,161) = 7.25, p < .01$	
Turnover Intentions	Discount	No Discount
Mean (S.D.)	2.82 (1.67)	2.18 (1.29)
ANOVA: discount vs. no discount	$F(1,161) = 7.70, p < .01$	

WEB APPENDIX B
Correlation Matrix (Study 2)

		M (SD)	DF	SIG	APP	AID	IMT	TUI
Discount Frequency	(DF)	3.02 (1.80)	1					
Task Significance	(SIG)	5.99 (1.23)	-.12*	1				
Perceived Appreciation	(APP)	5.38 (1.59)	-.16**	.48**	1			
Ambivalent Identification	(AID)	3.04 (1.96)	.28**	-.24**	-.44**	1		
Intrinsic Motivation	(IMT)	5.74 (1.41)	-.18**	.53**	.52**	-.45**	1	
Turnover Intentions	(TUI)	2.79 (1.83)	.27**	-.26**	-.54**	.65**	-.56**	1

* $p < .05$ (two-tailed); ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed).

WEB APPENDIX C
Main Effects (Study 2)

Discount Frequency		Effect
→	Task Significance	$\beta = -.12, p < .05$
→	Perceived Appreciation	$\beta = -.16, p < .01$
→	Intrinsic Motivation	$\beta = -.18, p < .01$
→	Ambivalent Identification	$\beta = .28, p < .001$
→	Turnover Intentions	$\beta = .27, p < .001$

WEB APPENDIX D
Correlation Matrix (Study 3)

		M (SD)	DD	SIG	APP	AID	IMT	TUI
Discount Depth [in %]	(DD)	11.08 (12.87)	1					
Task Significance	(SIG)	6.52 (.78)	-.16**	1				
Perceived Appreciation	(APP)	5.09 (1.59)	-.11*	.26**	1			
Ambivalent Identification	(AID)	3.31 (1.88)	.12*	-.14**	-.55**	1		
Intrinsic Motivation	(IMT)	4.56 (1.78)	-.04	.38**	.44**	-.28**	1	
Turnover Intentions	(TUI)	3.62 (1.97)	.08	-.21**	-.57**	.71**	-.41**	1

* $p < .05$ (two-tailed); ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed).

WEB APPENDIX E
Main Effects (Study 3)

Discount Depth	Effect
→ Task Significance	$\beta = -.16, p < .01$
→ Perceived Appreciation	$\beta = -.11, p < .05$
→ Intrinsic Motivation	$\beta = -.04, \text{n.s.}$
→ Ambivalent Identification	$\beta = .12, p < .05$
→ Turnover Intentions	$\beta = .08, \text{n.s.}$

WEB APPENDIX F

Experimental Pre-Study (Study 3)

Research Design

Procedure and measures. We recruited 205 service-experienced participants from the MTurk panel, who were incentivized with \$1 for their participation. A one-factorial between-subjects design was employed (i.e., no discount, 10% discount, 30% discount, 50% discount). The instructional background scenario was identical to the one used in Study 1, where subjects pictured the role of a personal trainer at a hypothetical local gym. Customer discount depth varied in terms of the treatment conditions, otherwise participants were exposed to the same information as used in Study 1. Likewise, the multi-item measures for task significance, appreciation, and the three workplace responses were identical to the initial experiment (see also Web Appendix H).

Manipulation checks. In a first step, we examined the perceptual manipulation between the zero-level condition –which also constitutes a no-discount scenario– to the aggregated discount manipulations. Using the same manipulation checks as in Study 1, we find that this overall discount manipulation was successful ($M_{\text{no_discount_condition}} = 1.64$, $M_{\text{discount_conditions}} = 6.89$; $t(203) = 40.96$, $p < .001$). An additional set of manipulation check items was deployed subsequently to assess the effectiveness of the differentiated discount depth manipulations. These items were only captured in the three conditions that included a discount (since they do not apply in the absence of a discount). Specifically, participants responded to the following items: “In the scenario, the discount given to the customer was very large” and “In the scenario, the discount amount was extremely high” ($r = .96$). An ANOVA on the respective composite

score shows a significant effect. Likewise, mean directions were as expected ($M_{\text{discount10\%}} = 1.89$, $M_{\text{discount30\%}} = 5.55$, $M_{\text{discount50\%}} = 6.15$; $F(2,162) = 232.77$, $p < .001$).

Results

Main effects. Between-subjects ANOVAs and mean comparisons underline that discount depth affects the levels of perceived task significance ($F(3,201) = 3.48$, $p < .05$) and experienced appreciation ($F(3,201) = 4.88$, $p < .01$) as predicted by and in support of Hypothesis 5. Planned contrasts illustrate these effects, demonstrating larger effect sizes when comparing increasing discount levels to the no-discount baseline condition (see Web Appendix G). The non-significant contrasts between the 10%-level cells and the neutral baseline ($ps > .10$) reflect the low discount depth boundary condition identified by Guha et al. (2018).

Indirect effects on workplace responses. We tested whether the effects of discount depth on task significance and appreciation further translate to workplace responses. In so doing, discount depth served as the independent variable, task significance and appreciation as mediating mechanisms, and workplace responses (i.e., intrinsic motivation, ambivalent identification, and turnover intentions) as downstream outcomes. Given the multiple levels of discount depth, we specified the independent variable as multi-categorical in nature. Hayes' (2018) PROCESS macro (model 4) was used to generate 5,000 bootstrap subsamples. Ninety-five percent bias-corrected confidence intervals (CI) were estimated.

As expected (Guha et al. 2018), no significant effects emerged when comparing the 10%-level scenario to the no-discount condition. Conversely, we find that providing a 30% discount (vs. no discount) significantly reduces employees' intrinsic motivation via perceived appreciation ($b = -.20$, 95% CI $[-.48, -.02]$) but we do not find an indirect effect via task significance. Likewise, a 30% discount significantly increases employees' ambivalent

identification via appreciation ($b = .63$, 95% CI [.22, 1.10]), whereas the respective indirect effect via task significance is not significant. Also, a 30% discount level significantly increases employees' turnover intentions via appreciation ($b = .49$, 95% CI [.17, .91]) but not through task significance.

Moreover, a 50% discount (vs. no discount) significantly lowers intrinsic motivation via appreciation ($b = -.23$, 95% CI [-.54, -.03]) but not through task significance, and also significantly amplifies ambivalent identification via appreciation only ($b = .71$, 95% CI [.31, 1.14]). Lastly, a discount depth of 50% significantly increases turnover intentions via perceived appreciation ($b = .56$, 95% CI [.21, .95]) but exerts no such indirect effect through task significance.

Discussion

Overall, these supplementary findings illustrate how increasing degrees of discount depth are reflected in gradually reduced levels of task significance and appreciation perceptions in line with Hypothesis 5. Respective variations in effect sizes and –correspondingly– evidence of the low discount depth boundary condition (Guha et al. 2018) underline this finding. The experiment further underscores the mediating role of experienced appreciation as asserted by Hypothesis 6b, whereas task significance facilitates no such indirect effects. Thus, the results of the pre-study do not support H6a.

WEB APPENDIX G
Experimental Pre-Study: Mean Differences (Study 3)

Task Significance	No Discount	10%	30%	50%
Mean (S.D.)	6.68 (.70)	6.49 (.62)	6.33 (1.00)	6.13 (.90)
ANOVA: Overall mean difference	$F(3,201) = 3.48, p < .05$			
Planned contrast: no discount vs. discount ₁₀	$F(3,201) = 1.26, n.s.$			
Planned contrast: no discount vs. discount ₃₀	$F(3,201) = 4.37, p < .05$			
Planned contrast: no discount vs. discount ₅₀	$F(3,201) = 9.25, p < .01$			
Perceived Appreciation	No Discount	10%	30%	50%
Mean (S.D.)	6.19 (.96)	5.94 (1.02)	5.45 (1.44)	5.35 (1.40)
ANOVA: Overall mean difference	$F(3,201) = 4.88, p < .01$			
Planned contrast: no discount vs. discount ₁₀	$F(3,201) = 1.00, n.s.$			
Planned contrast: no discount vs. discount ₃₀	$F(3,201) = 8.85, p < .01$			
Planned contrast: no discount vs. discount ₅₀	$F(3,201) = 9.65, p < .01$			

WEB APPENDIX H

Measures

Construct	Item	Reliability	Source
Task Significance	I feel that how I treat this (my) customer(s) is important. ^{a*}	.84 ¹	Hackman and Oldham (1975), Morgeson and Humphrey (2006)
	I feel that how I serve this (my) customer(s) is critical. ^a	.89 ³	
	I feel that the service level I provide to this (my) customer(s) is important. ^a		
Perceived Appreciation	I feel that my employer appreciates the work I do. ^{a*}	.97 ¹	Frey, Bayon, and Totzek (2013)
	I feel that my employer values what I do. ^a	.95 ³	
	I feel that my employer acknowledges the work I do. ^a		
Ambivalent Identification	I have mixed feelings about my affiliation with this firm. ^a	.95 ¹	Kreiner and Ashforth (2004)
	I have contradictory feelings about this firm. ^a	.96 ³	
	I feel conflicted about being part of this firm. ^{a*}		
Intrinsic Motivation	I serve this (my) customer(s) for the pleasure of it. ^a	.91 ¹	Oliver and Anderson (1994)
	I am motivated to serve this (my) customer(s) because I enjoy it. ^{a*}	.95 ³	
	I serve this (my) customer(s) because it is my own desire. ^a		
Turnover Intentions	I would prefer to work for a different firm rather than this one. ^{a*}	.94 ¹	Brockner and Guare (1983), Ganesan and Weitz (1996), Keaveney (1992)
	I intend to leave this firm in the short term. ^a	.91 ³	
	I would be inclined to work somewhere else. ^a		
Discount Frequency	Does your company usually offer price discounts (e.g., customer discounts, rebates, weekend fares) on services to customers? (“not at all” [1] to “very frequently” [7]). [*]	n.a.	Own measure
Discount Depth	What is the average price reduction (in percent) provided by customer discounts of your firm? ^{**}	n.a.	Own measure
Instrument	Item	Reliability	Source
Discount Popularity	In this industry, customer discounts (e.g., reductions, rebates, and weekend rates) are particularly popular. ^{a*}	n.a.	Own measure
Discount Effectiveness	In this industry, customer discounts are particularly suitable to increase sales. ^{a*}	n.a.	Own measure
Discount Expectations	In this industry, customers expect to receive discounts (e.g., reductions, rebates, and weekend rates). ^{a*}	n.a.	Own measure

Notes. ^a Responses were obtained using seven-point scales, anchored by 1 (“disagree completely”) and 7 (“agree completely”).

^{*}Single-item used in Study 2; ^{**}single-item used in Study 3.

^{1, 3} Cronbach’s Alphas obtained from Study 1, 3 respectively.

References

- Brockner, Joel and John Guare (1983), "Improving the Performance of Low Self-Esteem Individuals: An Attributional Approach," *Academy of Management Journal*, 26 (4), 642–656.
- Frey, Regina-Viola, Tomás Bayon, and Dirk Totzek (2013), "How Customer Satisfaction Affects Employee Satisfaction and Retention in a Professional Services Context," *Journal of Service Research*, 16 (4), 503–517.
- Ganesan, Shankar and Barton A. Weitz (1996), "The Impact of Staffing Policies on Retail Buyer Job Attitudes and Behaviors," *Journal of Retailing*, 72 (1), 31–56.
- Guha, Abhijit, Abhijit Biswas, Dhruv Grewal, Swati Verma, Somak Banerjee, and Jens Nordfält (2018), "Reframing the Discount as a Comparison Against the Sale Price: Does It Make the Discount More Attractive?," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 55 (3), 339–351.
- Hackman, J. Richard and Greg R. Oldham (1975), "Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60 (2), 159–170.
- Hayes, Andrew F. (2018), *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis: A Regression-Based Approach*, 2nd ed. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Keaveney, Susan M. (1992), "An Empirical Investigation of Dysfunctional Organizational Turnover Among Chain and Non-Chain Retail Store Buyers," *Journal of Retailing*, 68 (2), 145–173.
- Kreiner, Glen E. and Blake E. Ashforth (2004), "Evidence Toward an Expanded Model of Organizational Identification," *Journal of Organizational Behavior* (1), 1–27.
- Morgeson, Frederick P. and Stephen E. Humphrey (2006), "The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): Developing and Validating a Comprehensive Measure for Assessing Job Design and the Nature of Work," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91 (6), 1321–1339.
- Oliver, Richard L. and Erin Anderson (1994), "An Empirical Test of the Consequences of Behavior-and Outcome-based Sales Control Systems," *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (4), 53–67.