Supplemental Material

This set of supplementary materials presents the materials used in our studies, additional analyses performed, and explanatory notes.

Supplementary Note S1

Free Listing Task (Study 1)

In this study, we are interested in the kinds of things that people have in mind when they think about certain concepts. For example, if you had to list some thoughts on "a lonely person", you might write: i) feels unloved and not cared for, ii) feels depressed, iii) avoids social contacts, etc.

It might be helpful to imagine you are explaining your thoughts to someone who has never heard of the concept. So, try to include your most obvious and immediate thoughts, but also ensure that they are understandable to someone else.

In the spaces below, please list your impression of **employees who cry at work** as much as possible. There are no right or wrong answers, so please freely provide your opinions.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____
11. _____
12. _____
13. _____
14. _____
15. _____
16. _____
17. _____
18. _____
19. _____
20. _____

Supplementary Note S2

Prototypicality Rating Task (Study 2)

In a previous study, we asked people to list down all their impressions of employees who cry at work. In this first section, you will be presented with impressions listed by some of the people from our previous study. Please read each of these impressions, and rate how representative you think they are of workplace criers.

Please rate each of the impressions below on a scale, where

1 = *Not at all representative of workplace criers* (meaning it is not typical of workplace criers at all)

9 = *Extremely representative of workplace criers* (meaning it is very typical of workplace criers)

Keep in mind that there are no right or wrong answers. We are simply interested your opinion of workplace criers.

Stressed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Emotional	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Overwhelmed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Needs assistance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Weak	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Lonely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Anxious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Has poor self-regulation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Sensitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Vulnerable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Unprofessional	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Introverted	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Empathetic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Unmotivated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Inexperienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Manipulative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Authentic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Female	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Young	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Anti-social	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Ignorant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Brave	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Not adaptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Pessimistic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Trusting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Emotionally intelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Spoilt	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Timid	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Unfocused	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Supplementary Note S3

Reaction Time Task (Study 3)

Note: Words in bold denote central features of workplace criers.

In this first section, you will see a series of statements about concepts such as "workplace criers" (i.e., employees who cry at work), "love", and others (e.g., cups, socks).

Each statement will be presented in the form "Is being X typical of Y?". For example, you might be asked, "Is being paranoid typical of a lonely person?"

If your answer is "yes", you would press the "F" key. If it is "no", you would press the "J" key.

To familiarize you with the task, let's begin with a few practice sentences.

Practice Trials

1. Is softness typical of pillows?
2. Is sharpness typical of knives?
3. Is sweetness typical of honey?
4. Is coldness typical of summer?
5. Is wetness typical of deserts?

Now, let's move on to the actual questions.

Remember, press "F" if your answer is "yes", and press "J" if your answer is "no".

Target Trials

1. Is being **stressed** typical of workplace criers?
2. Is being **overwhelmed** typical of workplace criers?
3. Is being **emotional** typical of workplace criers?
4. Is being **sensitive** typical of workplace criers?
5. Is being **vulnerable** typical of workplace criers?
6. Is being **female** typical of workplace criers?
7. Is being **empathetic** typical of workplace criers?
8. Is being **authentic** typical of workplace criers?
9. Is being **trusting** typical of workplace criers?
10. Is being **pessimistic** typical of workplace criers?
11. Is being brave typical of workplace criers?
12. Is being young typical of workplace criers?
13. Is being lonely typical of workplace criers?
14. Is being weak typical of workplace criers?
15. Is being spoilt typical of workplace criers?
16. Is being incompetent typical of workplace criers?
17. Is being unfocused typical of workplace criers?
18. Is being ignorant typical of workplace criers?
19. Is being unmotivated typical of workplace criers?
20. Is being anti-social typical of workplace criers?

False Target Trials

21. Is being **stressed** typical of socks?
22. Is being **overwhelmed** typical of napkins?
23. Is being **emotiona**l typical of apples?
24. Is being **sensitive** typical of pencils?
25. Is being **vulnerable** typical of plates?
26. Is being **female** typical of tables?
27. Is being **empathetic** typical of files?
28. Is being **authentic** typical of lemons?
29. Is being **trusting** typical of broccoli?
30. Is being **pessimistic** typical of stickers?
31. Is being brave typical of chairs?
32. Is being young typical of soil?
33. Is being lonely typical of paper?
34. Is being weak typical of bookmarks?
35. Is being spoilt typical of lettuce?
36. Is being incompetent typical of spinach?
37. Is being unfocused typical of pineapples?
38. Is being ignorant typical of bowls?
39. Is being unmotivated typical of pots?
40. Is being anti-social typical of flowers?

Supplementary Note S4

Exploratory Analyses to Assess Gender Differences

In addition to our primary analyses, we performed a series of exploratory analyses to assess potential gender differences in each study.

Study 1

Study 1. Analysis on Study 1's feature frequencies indicated that when comparing by gender, there was an 80% similarity in the top 10 listed features of workplace criers. The only differences were observed with "Pressured" and "Needs company" appearing in males' list (n = 61), and "Has poor self-regulation" and "Sensitive" appearing in females' list (n = 102) instead. All other top-listed features were identical across both genders.

Study 2

A side-by-side comparison of Study 2's prototypicality ratings indicated that when eyeballing the results by gender, there was no difference in the features that were rated as most representative of workplace criers. For example, within the list of 30 features, males (n = 30) and females (n = 67) assigned the highest prototypicality ratings to the same 10 features ("Overwhelmed", "Emotional", "Stressed", "Sensitive", "Anxious", "Needs assistance", "Female, "Vulnerable", "Authentic", "Empathetic"). Moreover, they assigned the lowest prototypicality ratings to the same 10 features ("Spoilt", "Incompetent", "Weak", "Introverted", "Unprofessional", "Ignorant", "Unfocused", "Manipulative", "Unmotivated", "Anti-social").

However, within the abovementioned set of highly prototypical features, there were slight variations in the sequences of males' and females' prototypicality ratings. For instance, males assigned the highest prototypicality rating to "Overwhelmed" (6.73) while females assigned the highest prototypicality rating to "Stressed" (6.94). As a follow-up, we tested for gender differences in ratings for each of these highly prototypical features, though the individual analyses yielded no significant differences, all ps > .05.

Finally, we ran a mixed ANOVA with gender (male vs. female) as the between-subjects factor and feature type (central vs. peripheral) as the within-subjects factor. There was a main effect of feature type, where central features (M = 5.42, SD = 1.23) were rated as more prototypical than peripheral features (M = 3.95, SD = 1.30), F(1, 95) = 148.64, p < .001, η_p^2 = .61. However, there was no main effect of gender and no gender x feature type interaction, all ps > .32, indicating that the effect of feature type was not modulated by participants' gender.

Study 3

To assess if there was any effect of participants' gender on the target trials, we conducted a two-way mixed ANOVA with gender (male vs. female) as the between-subjects factor, and feature type (central vs. peripheral) as the within-subjects factor. There was a main effect of feature type, where trials with central features (M = 3688.62, SD = 1272.97) were responded to faster than trials with peripheral features (M = 3924.74, SD = 1366.51), $F(1, 133) = 4.98$, $p = .027$, $\eta_p^2 = .036$. However, there was no main effect of gender and no gender x feature type interaction, all ps > .40, indicating that the effect of feature type was not modulated by participants' gender.

Supplementary Note S5

Exploratory Analysis with Filler Trials in Study 3

In Study 3, we also included 20 filler trials in the RT task. Although these trials were unrelated to our focal concept of workplace criers, we noted that Fehr and Sprecher had replicated findings from Fehr's (1988) prototype study on love and were similarly interested to assess this. The format of these filler trials was identical to that of the target trials and consisted of questions referencing central and peripheral features from Fehr's (1988) prototype analysis of love, as well as their false variations.

As with our target trials in Study 3, we hypothesized that central features would be verified more quickly than peripheral features, and this effect would be more pronounced for main filler trials than for false filler trials.

"Yes" responses to the main filler trials were first analysed, with both groups of trials being subjected to the same analysis as the target trials. Results indicated that participants responded faster to central features (M = 2791.75, SD = 1066.44) than peripheral features (M = 3055.09, SD = 1115.20) of love, $t(155) = 3.57$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.29$. We also analysed the 10 false filler trials and found no difference in response times between central (M = 4612.28, SD = 1665.60) and peripheral features (M = 4346.41, SD = 1314.31) presented in these trials, $t(43) = 1.03$, $p = .31$, $d = 0.16$. Taken together, results not only supported our hypothesis but successfully replicated the prototypical organisation for the concept of love reported by Fehr (1988).

In addition, we analysed the "No" responses for the filler trials. However, results from the main filler trials showed no difference in the speed of disconfirming statements containing peripheral features (M = 3832.96, SD = 1448.16) and central features (M = 3621.26, SD = 1794.35) of love, $t(36) = .65$, $p = .52$, $d = 0.11$. A similar pattern emerged for response latencies between the false filler trials containing peripheral features (M = 3040.73, SD = 1274.68) and central features (M = 2941.64, SD = 1221.63), $t(155) = 1.16$, $p = .25$, $d = 0.09$.

Filler Trials (Total of 20 Trials, with central features of love indicated in bold)

Main Filler Trials

1. Is being honest typical of love?
2. Is being respectful typical of love?
3. Is being loyal typical of love?
4. Is being intimate typical of love?
5. Is being devoted typical of love?
6. Is being contented typical of love?
7. Is being sacrificial typical of love?
8. Is being kind typical of love?
9. Is being protective typical of love?
10. Is being secure typical of love?

False Filler Trials

11. Is being **honest** typical of fruit?
12. Is being **respectful** typical of curtains?
13. Is being **loyal** typical of toys?
14. Is being **intimate** typical of staplers?
15. Is being **devoted** typical of paint?
16. Is being contented typical of clocks?
17. Is being sacrificial typical of bananas?
18. Is being kind typical of computers?
19. Is being protective typical of windows?
20. Is being secure typical of cups?

Supplementary Note S6

Explanatory Note on Data Processing for Study 3

To prepare our RT data for analysis, we trimmed it by applying upper and lower cutoffs. When determining the upper cutoff, we drew on prototype studies using RT tasks (e.g., Fehr & Sprecher, 2009; Kinsella et al., 2015; Le et al., 2008) and removed responses which were greater than 3 *SD*s above the global mean.

When determining the lower cutoff, researchers in previous studies have occasionally "eyeballed" the data to eliminate unusually short response latencies, which may introduce some subjectivity. Our lower boundary was thus determined after reviewing a few prototype studies where the RT trials had employed statements that were syntactically similar to the ones in our study (i.e., Fehr & Sprecher, 2009; Kito, 2016; Lim, 2012). For example, in Fehr and Sprecher's (2009) work, participants were presented statements in the form "Is X a characteristic of Y?", whereas in Study 3, our participants were presented statements in the form "Is X typical of Y?". Our rationale was that the exceptionally short response latencies which were cited for removal in these studies would likely be comparable with our participants' response latencies. Upon checking, we noted that the lower cutoffs stated in these studies tended to fall below 900 ms. Thus, 900 ms was determined as the lower boundary, and response latencies below this cutoff were also removed.

Based on the above cutoffs, we trimmed 2.93% of the data points, a value within the range of past prototype studies (e.g., 4.32% in Kito, 2016; 2.36% from Le et al., 2008; 3% in Kinsella et al., 2015). We also performed checks on the skewness and kurtosis of our RT distributions for "Yes" responses to target trials. The aggregated RT distribution for target trials showed healthy skewness (0.48) and kurtosis (0.12) values, indicating univariate normality based on an accepted range of -2 to +2 for both measures (Hair et al., 2022).