

Appendix A: Survey Instrument

Performance-based Remuneration

1. In this company, how likely would you get a salary increase based on your performance?
2. In this company, how likely would you receive a promotion based on your performance?
3. In this company, how likely would you have a social status based on your performance?

Self-Expression

1. In this company, how likely would you need to misrepresent your lifestyle that you enjoy outside the work?
2. In this company, how likely would you need to misrepresent your preferences that you have about things outside the work?
3. In this company, how likely would you need to misrepresent your views that you maintain about things outside the work?
4. In this company, how likely would you need to misrepresent your activities that you take part in outside the work?

Social Welfare

1. In this company, how likely would you be able to give back to the community?
2. In this company, how likely would you be able to assist the community?
3. In this company, how likely would you be able to improve the community?

Job Fit

1. To what extent does your knowledge match the requirements of the job in this company?
2. To what extent do your skills match the requirements of the job in this company?
3. To what extent do your abilities match the requirements of the job in this company?

Future growth opportunities

1. How likely are you to get training opportunities to improve your technical skills in this company?
2. How likely are you to get opportunities for personal growth and development in this company?
3. How likely are you to get advanced-level skills growth opportunities in this company?

Work-life balance

1. In this company, how much would your job and your family life interfere with each other?
(reverse coded)
2. In this company, how difficult would it be for you to manage the demands of your work and your personal or family life? (reverse coded)
3. In this company, how often would you have enough time for your family or other important people in your life because of your job?

Workplace Culture

1. To what extent do your values match or fit the current employees of this company?
2. To what extent do your goals match or fit the current employees of this company?
3. To what extent do your personality match or fit the current employees of this company?

Appendix B: Sub-Group Analyses

In this appendix, we show the results of our analyses for different groups of candidates separately for direct and easier interpretation of the results. Despite the decrease in estimation efficiency because of performing analyses at the group level, all the results are qualitatively similar to the results from the analyses of all candidates together as discussed in the paper. In addition, we also test the mediation analyses using the Baron and Kenny (1986) approach.

Table B1 shows the results for the effects of the content about employees' work efforts and outcomes (WE) on the candidates' motivation to apply for the job. The results show that WE content not only demotivates low performing candidates (-1.322, $p < 0.05$, for junior candidates; and -2.828, $p < 0.05$ for senior candidates), it also motivates high performing candidates (1.707, $p < 0.05$ for junior candidates; and 2.653, $p < 0.05$ for senior candidates) to apply for positions. As we can see that including content on employees' personal interests in online communication about a job has a positive effect on junior candidates to apply and this is true for both high-performing (2.016, $p < 0.05$) and low-performing (1.708, $p < 0.05$) candidates. The difference in the coefficients for high-performing junior and senior candidates is 3.53 ($=2.016 - (-1.514)$), and its p-value is 0.011, which is statistically significant at 5% significance level. Similarly, the difference for low-performing junior and senior candidates is 3.225 ($=1.708 - (-1.517)$) and its p-value is 0.037 which is also statistically significant at a 5% significance level. This supports that the content about employees' personal interests and beliefs (PI) has significant more impact on the motivation of junior candidates than for senior candidates.

Table B1: DV = Apply

In these models, we investigate how content on work efforts and personal interests (PI) motivates candidates in comparison to when there is no such content. The models include controls for gender, current employer size, duration at current job, current salary, whether the candidate clicked on the post in the email to navigate to the underlying social media page, time spent on social media, and whether a candidate applied directly without opening any other jobs.

Key results: In comparison to not including content, including content on employees' work efforts motivate high-performers to apply and discourage low-performers from applying; while including content on personal interests motivates junior candidates more than senior candidates to apply.

Variable	High Performers	Low Performers
----------	-----------------	----------------

	Junior	Senior	Junior	Senior
Content on employees' work efforts and outcomes (WE)	1.707** (0.797)	2.653** (1.26)	-1.322* (0.695)	-2.828** (1.416)
Content on employees' personal interests and beliefs (PI)	2.016** (0.826)	-1.514 (1.108)	1.708** (0.812)	-1.517 (1.312)
Months at Current Job	-0.002 (0.053)	0.042 (0.04)	0.086 (0.053)	0.072* (0.043)
Gender	0.035 (0.736)	-0.545 (0.968)	-0.42 (0.717)	1.398 (0.984)
Age	0.023 (0.112)	-0.392 (0.366)	-0.116 (0.13)	-0.299 (0.206)
Current Employer Size	0.161 (0.601)	-0.706 (1.084)	-1.04 (0.734)	-0.479 (0.742)
Current Salary	-0.034 (0.119)	-0.122 (0.228)	-0.125 (0.155)	-0.133 (0.153)
Opened Social Media Page	0.614 (0.687)	-0.688 (1.08)	0.141 (0.639)	0.634 (0.852)
Time Spent on Social Media	0.205 (0.275)	0.014 (0.316)	-0.353 (0.228)	0.187 (0.311)
Direct Apply	0.153 (1.319)	0.187 (1.705)	1.011 (0.955)	-0.892 (1.286)
n	71	48	99	70

Results shown in Tables B1, B2, B3, and B4 provide support for the mediating effects of performance-based remuneration and self-expression. Based on Baron and Kenny (1986) the four conditions involved in conducting the mediation test are satisfied: (1) content on employees' work efforts and outcomes (WE) significantly affect the perception of performance-based remuneration and content on employees' personal interests and beliefs (PI) significantly affect the perception of self-expression. The significant effect of WE as shown in Table B2 and of PI as shown in Table B3 for all groups of candidates supports this step. (2) Performance-based remuneration significantly affects the motivation to apply, and self-expression effects the motivation to apply for junior candidates. The significant effects of performance-based remuneration for each group of candidates and effects of self-expression for junior candidates as shown in Table B4 provides support for this step. (3) Including content on WE and PI significantly affect the motivation to apply when instrumentality variables are not included in the model. Results shown in Table B1 provide support for this step. Lastly, (4) when instrumentality variables are included in the model, the direct effects of including content on employees' work efforts and outcomes as well as

personal interests and beliefs on the motivation to apply are no longer significant. That is, the significant effects of including content on work efforts and personal beliefs become insignificant when the mediating instrumentality variables are included in the model. The insignificant effect of WE for all group of candidates and of PI for junior candidates in Table B5 provides support for this step. Altogether, we find support that the performance-based remuneration mediates the effect of employees' work efforts and outcomes (WE) related content on the candidates' motivation to apply. We also find support that self-expression mediates this effect for junior candidates.

Table B2: DV = Performance-based Remuneration				
In these models, we investigate how including the content on employees' work efforts (WE) creates the perception of performance-based remuneration in comparison to when there is no such content. The models include controls for gender, current employer size, duration at the current job, current salary, whether the candidate clicked on the post in the email to navigate to the underlying social media page, time spent on social media, and whether a candidate applied directly without looking at other jobs.				
Key results: In comparison to no there is no WE content, including WE content creates a positive perception of performance-based remuneration.				
Variable	High Performers		Low Performers	
	Junior	Senior	Junior	Senior
Content on employees' work efforts and outcomes (WE)	0.477* (0.268)	0.625* (0.337)	0.729*** (0.247)	0.811** (0.316)
Content on employees' personal interests and beliefs (PI)	-0.633** (0.271)	-0.733* (0.428)	-0.389* (0.215)	-0.521* (0.267)
Months at Current Job	-0.017 (0.017)	0.008 (0.013)	-0.009 (0.014)	0.0001 (0.01)
Gender	0.144 (0.249)	-0.313 (0.306)	0.086 (0.207)	-0.47 (0.309)
Age	0.025 (0.036)	-0.047 (0.105)	-0.044 (0.036)	0.011 (0.055)
Current Employer Size	0.27 (0.203)	-0.513 (0.383)	0.137 (0.191)	0.259 (0.178)
Current Salary	-0.045 (0.04)	-0.015 (0.066)	-0.019 (0.043)	-0.052 (0.046)
Opened Social Media Page	-0.3 (0.213)	0.103 (0.32)	0.107 (0.203)	-0.086 (0.264)
Time Spent on Social Media	0.198** (0.083)	-0.091 (0.115)	0.036 (0.074)	-0.248*** (0.084)
Direct Apply	0.222 (0.397)	-0.277 (0.484)	0.111 (0.303)	0.085 (0.317)
N	71	48	99	70

Table B3: DV = Self-Expression
In these models, we investigate how including content on personal interests (PI) creates the perception of freedom of self-

expression in comparison to the scenario with no such content. The models include controls for gender, current employer size, duration at the current job, and current salary, whether the candidate clicked on the post in the email to navigate to the underlying social media page, time spent on social media, and whether a candidate applied directly without opening any other jobs.

Key results: In comparison to no there is no PI content, including the PI content creates a positive perception of freedom of self-expression.

Variable	High Performers		Low Performers	
	Junior	Senior	Junior	Senior
Content on employees' work efforts and outcomes (WE)	0.300 (0.339)	0.061 (0.298)	0.276 (0.299)	0.048 (0.309)
Content on employees' employees' personal interests and beliefs (PI)	0.943*** (0.343)	0.859** (0.378)	0.511* (0.261)	0.541** (0.261)
Months at Current Job	-0.026 (0.022)	-0.016 (0.011)	0.042** (0.018)	-0.001 (0.01)
Gender	0.037 (0.046)	0.479* (0.27)	0.219 (0.25)	0.313 (0.302)
Age	0.306 (0.315)	-0.102 (0.093)	0.028 (0.044)	-0.017 (0.053)
Current Employer Size	0.058 (0.258)	-0.231 (0.339)	0.135 (0.232)	-0.063 (0.175)
Current Salary	-0.043 (0.05)	0.074 (0.058)	-0.073 (0.052)	0.004 (0.045)
Opened Social Media Page	0.332 (0.27)	-0.474 (0.282)	0.37 (0.246)	0.11 (0.258)
Time Spent on Social Media	0.117 (0.105)	-0.128 (0.101)	0.061 (0.089)	0.11 (0.082)
Direct Apply	-0.456 (0.504)	0.1 (0.427)	0.676* (0.366)	-0.226 (0.31)
N	71	48	99	70

Table B4: DV = Apply

In these models, we investigate the effect of mediating variables—the perception of performance-based remuneration and perception of self-expression—on the log of odds of applying for a job. Other plausible explanatory mediating variables, specifically perceptions of social welfare, work-life balance, future growth opportunities, and work-place culture, are controlled for. The models include controls for gender, current employer size, duration at current job, current salary, whether the candidate clicked on the post in the email to navigate to the underlying social media page, post diversity, and whether a candidate applied directly without looking at other jobs.

Key results: Perception of performance-based remuneration motivates high-performers to apply for a job, whereas, it discourages low-performers from applying. Perception of self-expression motivates junior candidates to apply but it may not influence senior candidates.

Variable	High Performers		Low Performers	
	Junior	Senior	Junior	Senior
Performance-based Remuneration	1.354* (0.724)	3.003* (1.674)	-2.356*** (0.818)	-1.389** (0.67)
Self-Expression	2.809*** (0.895)	0.218 (1.291)	1.336*** (0.466)	0.561 (0.674)

Social Welfare	-1.018 (0.892)	-1.199 (1.006)	-0.261 (0.46)	-1.206 (0.797)
Work-life Balance	0.605 (0.565)	-1.19 (0.901)	0.978** (0.453)	1.092* (0.566)
Job Fit	0.107 (0.515)	-0.251 (1.007)	0.862 (0.536)	0.815 (0.767)
Future Growth Opportunities	0.873 (0.542)	0.652 (0.842)	0.604 (0.429)	0.274 (0.828)
Workplace Culture	0.203 (0.594)	-0.002 (1.119)	0.396 (0.417)	0.257 (0.756)
Months at Current Job	0.098 (0.09)	0.12 (0.075)	0.089 (0.069)	0.108* (0.061)
Gender	-1.819 (1.557)	-0.579 (1.624)	0.04 (0.876)	1.579 (1.283)
Age	0.019 (0.147)	-1.099 (1.062)	-0.199 (0.161)	-0.289 (0.251)
Current Employer Size	-0.591 (1.06)	1.217 (2.083)	-1.95 (1.373)	-1.723 (1.267)
Current Salary	0.175 (0.197)	-0.108 (0.226)	-0.342 (0.246)	-0.159 (0.22)
Opened Social Media Page	0.866 (1.01)	-2.947 (3.013)	0.357 (0.765)	0.037 (1.104)
Time Spent on Social Media	0.123 (0.41)	0.43 (0.58)	-0.454 (0.328)	0.089 (0.377)
Post Length Dispersion	-0.006 (0.004)	-0.003 (0.004)	0.001 (0.002)	0.008 (0.006)
Direct Apply	-0.104 (2.319)	-0.672 (2.462)	1.279 (1.252)	-1.038 (1.845)
n	71	48	99	70
Post Length Dispersion was measured as the Gini index, representing statistical dispersion of the lengths of the different posts shown to the candidates.				

Table B5: DV = Apply

In these models, we investigate how including content on employees' work efforts (WE) and personal interests (PI) motivate candidates in comparison to when there are no such content. The models include controls for gender, current employer size, duration at the current job, current salary, whether the candidate clicked on the link in the email to navigate to the underlying social media page, time spent on social media, and whether a candidate applied directly without looking at other jobs.

Key results: For senior candidates, the effect of WE content is mediated through the perceptions of performance-based remuneration, whereas for junior candidates, the effect of WE content is mediated through both performance-based remuneration and the effect of PI content is mediated through freedom of self-expression.

Variable	High Performers		Low Performers	
	Junior	Senior	Junior	Senior
Content on employees' work efforts and outcomes (WE)	2.351 (1.64)	2.830 (2.607)	-1.879 (1.144)	-3.654 (2.616)
Content on employees' personal interests and beliefs (PI)	2.996 (1.884)	-3.423 (2.869)	0.949 (1.117)	-2.927 (2.12)
Performance-based Remuneration	1.545* (0.805)	2.964* (1.615)	-2.409*** (0.915)	-1.391** (0.684)

Self-Expression	2.802*** (0.901)	2.828 (2.195)	1.391*** (0.488)	0.532 (0.688)
Social Welfare	-1.094 (0.895)	-0.47 (1.29)	-0.482 (0.546)	-1.256 (0.821)
Work/Life Balance	0.506 (0.586)	-1.099 (1.341)	0.628 (0.479)	1.085* (0.57)
Job Fit	0.118 (0.511)	0.866 (1.247)	0.961 (0.606)	0.891 (0.836)
Future Growth Opportunities	0.916* (0.541)	0.506 (0.867)	0.828* (0.498)	0.24 (0.839)
Workplace Culture	0.205 (0.593)	-0.212 (1.183)	0.513 (0.476)	0.228 (0.768)
Months at Current Job	0.117 (0.098)	0.165* (0.096)	0.074 (0.069)	0.111* (0.062)
Gender	-2.017 (1.608)	-2.291 (2.146)	-0.138 (0.938)	1.754 (1.471)
Age	0.049 (0.158)	-1.101 (0.941)	-0.212 (0.186)	-0.302 (0.26)
Current Employer Size	-0.653 (1.103)	1.583 (2.168)	-1.577 (1.475)	-1.723 (1.256)
Current Salary	0.185 (0.195)	-0.316 (0.363)	-0.268 (0.246)	-0.149 (0.221)
Opened Social Media Page	0.849 (1.007)	-0.474 (2.379)	-0.537 (0.938)	-0.051 (1.14)
Time Spent on Social Media	0.022 (0.44)	0.529 (0.53)	-0.484 (0.31)	0.169 (0.482)
Direct Apply	0.047 (2.219)	-4.515 (8.55)	1.807 (1.396)	-1.268 (2.091)
N	71	48	99	70

Appendix C: Robustness Analysis Using the Same Model as the Main Analysis

We performed an additional robustness analysis using the same independent variables as the main model. Tables representing equivalent results to the main analysis reported in the paper can be found below. In Tables C1 and C3, we substituted the dependent variable Apply with the alternative dependent variable of Minimum Acceptable Salary Increase and used only the 216 participants who answered the complete survey. These tables are equivalent to Tables 6 and 8. For Tables C2 and C4, the analysis using Apply as the dependent variable was performed using only these 216 participants for consistency. These tables are equivalent to Tables 7a and 9a. The results are qualitatively similar to the main model.

Table C1	
In this model, we investigate the effect of including employees' work efforts and outcomes (WE) related content on the candidates' minimum acceptable salary increase. The model includes controls for gender, current employer size, duration at current job, current salary, whether the candidate clicked on the link in the email to navigate to the underlying social media page, time spent on social media, and whether a candidate applied directly without looking at other jobs.	
Variable	Minimum Acceptable Salary Increase
Content on employees' work efforts and outcomes (WE)	2.154* (1.244)
Content on employees' personal interests and beliefs (PI)	-2.606** (1.215)
High Performer	-0.972 (1.52)
WE * High Performer	-7.693*** (1.97)
Junior Candidate	12.38*** (1.88)
Months at Current Job	0.166*** (0.06)
Gender	-2.803*** (0.964)
Age	-0.107 (0.181)
Current Employer Size	0.431 (0.834)
Current Salary	-0.089 (0.161)
Opened Social Media Page	-0.831 (0.94)
Time Spent on Social Media	-0.417 (0.362)
Direct Apply	1.753 (1.401)
n	216

Table C2

In the first model (Performance-based Remuneration), we investigate how including the content on employees' work efforts (WE) creates the perception of performance-based remuneration in comparison to when there is no such content. In the second model (Apply), we investigate the effect of including such content on the candidates' decision to Apply after controlling for mediating variables.

Variable	Performance-based Remuneration	Apply
Content on employees' work efforts and outcomes (WE)	0.573*** (0.135)	1.223 (1.506)
Content on employees' personal interests and beliefs (PI)	-0.41*** (0.126)	-1.288 (1.172)
High Performer		15.946*** (3.716)
WE * High Performer		-3.905** (1.952)
Junior Candidate		12.85*** (2.064)
Performance-based Remuneration		1.29** (0.598)
Performance-based Remuneration*High Performer		-4.589*** (0.959)
Self-Expression		-1.332*** (0.462)
Social Welfare		0.264 (0.535)
Work-life Balance		-0.816* (0.47)
Job Fit		-0.795* (0.467)
Future Growth Opportunities		-0.288 (0.452)
Workplace Culture		0.183 (0.466)
Months at Current Job	0.001 (0.006)	0.159*** (0.046)
Gender	-0.066 (0.12)	-2.382** (0.955)
Age	-0.006 (0.014)	-0.041 (0.188)
Current Employer Size	0.143 (0.102)	0.625 (0.881)
Current Salary	-0.031 (0.021)	-0.103 (0.176)
Opened Social Media Page	-0.043 (0.11)	-0.897 (0.916)
Time Spent on Social Media	-0.032 (0.041)	-0.127 (0.328)
Direct Apply	0.133 (0.169)	1.278 (1.338)
n	288	216

Table C3

In this model, we investigate the effect of including employees' personal interests and beliefs (PI) related content on the candidates' minimum acceptable salary increase. The model includes controls for gender, current employer size, duration at current job, current salary, whether the candidate clicked on the link in the email to navigate to the underlying social media page, time spent on social media, and whether a candidate applied directly without looking at other jobs.	
Variable	Minimum Acceptable Salary Increase
Content on employees' work efforts and outcomes (WE)	-1.36 (1.231)
Content on employees' personal interests and beliefs (PI)	-1.979 (1.74)
Junior Candidate	-5.615*** (2.289)
PI * Junior Candidate	-3.636* (2.105)
High Performer	-3.422** (1.141)
Months at Current Job	0.196*** (0.062)
Gender	-1.947* (1.101)
Age	-0.043 (0.219)
Current Employer Size	0.211 (0.896)
Current Salary	0.026 (0.15)
Opened Social Media Page	-0.756 (0.996)
Time Spent on Social Media	-0.59 (0.413)
Direct Apply	1.243 (1.335)
N	216

Table C4		
In the first model (Self-Expression), we investigate how including the content on employees' personal interests and beliefs (PI) creates the perception of performance-based remuneration in comparison to when there is no such content. In the second model (Apply), we investigate the effect of including such content on the candidates' decision to Apply after controlling for mediating variables.		
Variable	Self-Expression	Apply
Content on employees' work efforts and outcomes (WE)	0.259* (0.151)	-0.784 (1.387)
Content on employees' personal interests and beliefs (PI)	0.746*** (0.14)	-1.824 (1.784)
Junior Candidate		21.728*** (5.199)
PI * Junior Candidate		-1.937 (2.096)
High Performer		-3.555*** (1.002)
Performance-based Remuneration		-0.749

		(0.549)
Self-Expression		-0.197 (0.886)
Self-Expression * Junior Candidate		-1.948* (1.091)
Social Welfare		0.327 (0.614)
Work-life Balance		-0.365 (0.537)
Job Fit		-0.739 (0.537)
Future Growth Opportunities		0.254 (0.52)
Workplace Culture		0.546 (0.534)
Months at Current Job	-0.002 (0.006)	0.195*** (0.053)
Gender	0.276** (0.134)	-1.873* (1.104)
Age	0.027* (0.015)	-0.03 (0.216)
Current Employer Size	0.027 (0.114)	0.526 (1.011)
Current Salary	-0.021 (0.023)	-0.055 (0.203)
Opened Social Media Page	0.159 (0.122)	-0.653 (1.054)
Time Spent on Social Media	0.035 (0.045)	-0.517 (0.375)
Direct Apply	-0.028 (0.188)	1.273 (1.535)
n	288	216

Appendix D: Validation of Model through Second Study

To test for the robustness of our work, we repeated our field study with another set of content on employees' work efforts and outcomes (WE), and employees' personal interests and beliefs (PI). For this data collection, we worked with the same recruiter, where the recruiter sent emails to 180 candidates for a junior-level job. Out of these, emails to 90 candidates included posts on employees' work efforts & outcomes, while the remaining 90 candidates' emails included posts on employees' personal interests and beliefs. Sixty-five candidates completed the survey. For the control group, we used the records from the first study resulting in a total sample of 109 data points.

To verify the similarity of the treatment groups, we compared the nature of the posts across multiple dimensions and candidates' response rates in the two studies. The analyses indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in the nature of the posts, nor is there a difference in candidates' response rates in the two studies. Next, we discuss the details.

First, we compared the overall correlation matrices and overall means of the two studies using the multiple-sample multivariate test of correlations. The chi-sq value of 60.98 for the test of correlations and means fails to reject the null hypothesis of equal correlation matrices for the two studies. Next, we conducted t-tests to compare the average word lengths and post length dispersion for the posts across different treatment groups in the two studies. All the results confirm that the posts were comparable in the two studies. Table D1 shows the average word lengths and post length dispersion for the posts shown to the candidates in the two studies. Note that since the control group was the same in both studies, the values for the control group in the two studies are the same. The t-tests comparisons for the average word length (p-value = 0.78) and post length dispersion (p-value = 0.55) between the two studies were statistically insignificant suggesting that the posts were similar across the two studies.

	Average Word Length		Post Length Dispersion	
	Study 1	Study 2	Study 1	Study 2
Control Group	62.6	62.6	626	626

Work Efforts & Outcomes (WE)	70.0	68.4	229	175
Personal Interests & Beliefs (PI)	70.0	72.8	263	516
<p>Note: Candidates in the WE group received social media posts on employees' work efforts and outcomes; candidates in the PI group received social media posts on employees' personal interests and beliefs; and the candidates in the control group received company's promotional posts only.</p> <p>Post Length Dispersion was measured as the Gini index, representing statistical dispersion of the lengths of the different posts shown to the candidates. This statistic was linearly transformed by multiplying with a thousand.</p>				

We further compared the application rate across the different groups in the two studies. Table D2 below shows the percentage of applicants who applied for the jobs in the different treatment/ control groups. It should be noted that the second study was repeated with only junior candidates. Therefore, the numbers shown for the first study are only for junior candidates. As mentioned earlier, the control group was the same in both studies. The t-test comparing the application rate in the two studies shows that the application rates in the two studies were statistically similar ($p > 0.38$).

	Study 1 % applied/(n)	Study 2 % applied/(n)
Control Group	59.0 (44)	59.0 (44)
Work Efforts & Outcomes	61.2 (49)	70.8 (24)
Personal Interests & Beliefs	89.6 (71)	90.2 (41)
Total	0.76 (170)	0.73 (109)
<p>Note: As study 2 included junior candidates only, to facilitate comparison, the statistics for study 1 also show the application rates for junior candidates only.</p>		

Tables D3 and D4 show results from study 2 of how including certain content in online communication impacts high-performing and low-performing candidates. As in the tables below, the content about employees' work efforts and outcomes (WE) has a positive effect on the motivation of high performers and a negative effect on motivation for low performers to apply for the job. On the other hand, the content about employees' personal interests and beliefs (PI) has a positive effect on both candidates to apply for a job. Further, candidates' perceptions of performance-based remuneration and self-expression instrumentalities mediate the effects of such communication on the motivation to apply. The results are qualitatively similar to the results from the first study.

Table D3: Junior High Performers				
	Performance-based Remuneration	Self-Expression	Apply	Apply
Content on employees' work efforts and outcomes (WE)	0.569* (0.29)	0.207 (0.391)	1.911* (0.979)	1.782 (1.629)
Content on employees' personal interests and beliefs (PI)	-0.547* (0.315)	0.797* (0.426)	1.724* (0.997)	1.652 (2.016)
Performance-based Remuneration				1.727* (1.031)
Self-Expression				3.101*** (1.202)
Social Welfare				-0.186 (1.462)
Work-life Balance				0.324 (0.955)
Job Fit				-0.675 (0.782)
Future Growth Opportunities				0.706 (0.857)
Workplace Culture				0.332 (0.764)
Months at Current Job	-0.019 (0.02)	-0.047* (0.027)	0.017 (0.066)	0.169 (0.128)
Gender	0.545* (0.304)	-0.008 (0.055)	-0.196 (0.925)	-2.099 (2.13)
Age	-0.031 (0.041)	0.096 (0.41)	-0.101 (0.128)	-0.07 (0.234)
Current Employer Size	0.157 (0.219)	0.316 (0.296)	0.467 (0.661)	-0.673 (1.43)
Current Salary	-0.039 (0.048)	-0.061 (0.065)	-0.011 (0.157)	0.34 (0.304)
Time spent on Social media	0.143 (0.106)	0.187 (0.143)	0.363 (0.391)	0.902 (0.942)
N	47	47	47	47

Table D4: Junior Low Performers				
	Performance-based Remuneration	Self-Expression	Apply	Apply
Content on employees' work efforts and outcomes (WE)	0.534* (0.317)	0.467 (0.368)	-2.708* (1.406)	-9.457 (7.619)
Content on employees' personal interests and beliefs (PI)	-0.402* (0.227)	0.686** (0.264)	2.844** (1.345)	2.95 (3.322)
Performance-based Remuneration				-2.43* (1.42)
Self-Expression				4.865 (3.831)
Social Welfare				-1.601 (1.531)

Work-life Balance				0.813 (1.136)
Job Fit				3.453 (2.638)
Future Growth Opportunities				1.484 (1.309)
Workplace Culture				3.748 (3.082)
Months at Current Job	-0.005 (0.02)	0.033 (0.023)	0.122 (0.092)	0.542* (0.312)
Gender	0.061 (0.251)	0.033 (0.292)	-1.2 (1.319)	-4.212 (5.024)
Age	-0.08 (0.046)	-0.006 (0.053)	-0.05 (0.177)	0.252 (0.453)
Current Employer Size	0.093 (0.217)	0.068 (0.252)	-3.202** (1.611)	-6.248 (5.266)
Current Salary	-0.001 (0.05)	-0.072 (0.058)	-0.472* (0.273)	-1.033 (0.859)
Time spent on Social media	0.02 (0.086)	0.171* (0.099)	-0.233 (0.26)	-0.723 (0.767)
n	62	62	62	62

As we see from Table D5, the effects of WE for low-performers and high-performers are -1.334 and 2.168 (= -1.334 + 3.501) in the models without including the mediator variables. These effects after adding the mediator variables become -1.758 and 1.411 (= -1.758+3.169). Clearly, as expected with mediation, the effect for high-performers decreases after including the mediator Performance-based Remuneration. For the low performers, the magnitude of the effect increases from 1.334 to 1.758 after including the mediator variable. This happens when the direct effect and the indirect effect have opposite directions. As is the case here; the direct effect is negative (-1.334), but the indirect effect is positive (= -1.404 + 2.734), resulting in suppression mediation.

Similarly, the effect of PI for senior and junior candidates are -1.370 and 1.773 (= -1.370+3.143). After including the mediator variable, self-expression, the corresponding effects are -2.456 and 1.371 (= -2.456+3.827). As expected with mediation, the effect for junior candidates decreases from 1.773 to 1.371 after including the mediator. For the senior candidates, suppression mediation effects are observed as the magnitude of the effect of PI changes from 1.370 to 2.456.

Table D5:

	Without Mediators	With Mediators
Posts on employees' work efforts and outcomes (WE)	-1.334** (0.526)	-1.758** (0.715)
Posts on employees' personal interests and beliefs (PI)	-1.37** (0.629)	-2.456*** (0.803)
Junior Candidate	-1.854** (0.844)	-6.154*** (2.232)
PI * Junior Candidate	3.143*** (0.777)	3.827*** (0.980)
High Performer	-1.599*** (0.437)	-12.984*** (2.501)
WE * High Performer	3.501*** (0.732)	3.169*** (0.978)
Performance-based Remuneration		-1.404*** (0.374)
Performance-based Remuneration*High Performer		2.734*** (0.602)
Self-Expression		0.710* (0.406)
Self-Expression * Junior Candidate		0.932* (0.508)
Social Welfare	-0.325 (0.22)	-0.423 (0.269)
Work-life Balance	0.511*** (0.188)	0.561** (0.233)
Job Fit	0.178 (0.183)	0.280 (0.232)
Future Growth Opportunities	0.362** (0.181)	0.534** (0.226)
Workplace Culture	-0.071 (0.183)	0.200 (0.234)
Months at Current Job	0.046** (0.02)	0.065*** (0.023)
Gender	-0.003 (0.384)	-0.385 (0.474)
Age	-0.071 (0.075)	-0.130 (0.088)
Current Employer Size	-0.565 (0.349)	-0.644 (0.464)
Current Salary	-0.113* (0.068)	-0.102 (0.081)
Opened Social Media Page	0.405 (0.353)	0.117 (0.426)
Time Spent on Social Media	-0.04 (0.125)	-0.095 (0.152)
Direct Apply	-0.088 (0.563)	-0.211 (0.686)