

# Asian Journal of Social Psychology

Home | **Author**

Corresponding Author Dashboard

**Corresponding Author Dashboard**

- 3 Manuscripts with Decisions >
- Start New Submission >
- Legacy Instructions >
- 5 Most Recent E-mails >
- Before You Submit >

## Manuscripts with Decisions

ACTION	STATUS	ID	TITLE	SUBMITTED	DECISIONED
	<a href="#">✉ Contact Journal</a> EO: Editorial Office, AJSP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accept (23-Nov-2023)</li> </ul>	AJSP-23-385-RA.R2	Climate Change Perception Scale: Adaptation And Psychometric Properties In The Indonesian Context <a href="#">View Submission</a>	11-Nov-2023	23-Nov-2023
	<a href="#">✉ Contact Journal</a> EO: Editorial Office, AJSP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minor Revision (27-Oct-2023)</li> <li>a revision has been submitted</li> </ul>	AJSP-23-385-RA.R1	Climate Change Perception Scale: Adaptation And Psychometric Properties In The Indonesian Context <a href="#">View Submission</a>	03-Oct-2023	27-Oct-2023



**Corresponding Author Dashboard**

- 3 Manuscripts with Decisions >
- Start New Submission >
- Legacy Instructions >
- 5 Most Recent E-mails >
- Before You Submit >

ACTION	STATUS	ID	TITLE	SUBMITTED	DECISIONED
	<a href="#">✉ Contact Journal</a> EO: Editorial Office, AJSP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accept (23-Nov-2023)</li> </ul> <a href="#">view decision letter</a>	AJSP-23-385-RA.R2	Climate Change Perception Scale: Adaptation And Psychometric Properties In The Indonesian Context <a href="#">View Submission</a>	11-Nov-2023	23-Nov-2023
a revision has been submitted (AJSP-23-385-RA.R2)	<a href="#">✉ Contact Journal</a> EO: Editorial Office, AJSP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minor Revision (27-Oct-2023)</li> <li>a revision has been submitted</li> </ul> <a href="#">view decision letter</a>	AJSP-23-385-RA.R1	Climate Change Perception Scale: Adaptation And Psychometric Properties In The Indonesian Context <a href="#">View Submission</a>	03-Oct-2023	27-Oct-2023
a revision has been submitted (AJSP-23-385-RA.R1)	<a href="#">✉ Contact Journal</a> EO: Editorial Office, AJSP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major Revision (07-Jul-2023)</li> <li>a revision has been submitted</li> </ul> <a href="#">view decision letter</a>	AJSP-23-385-RA	Climate Change Perception Scale: Adaptation And Psychometric Properties In The Indonesian Context <a href="#">View Submission</a>	12-Jun-2023	07-Jul-2023





**Decision Letter (AJSP-23-385-RA)****From:** kenichi.ito@uleth.ca**To:** adiwena@unika.ac.id**CC:****Subject:** Asian Journal of Social Psychology - Decision on Manuscript ID AJSP-23-385-RA**Body:** 07-Jul-2023

Dear Mr. Adiwena:

Manuscript ID AJSP-23-385-RA entitled "Climate Change Perception Scale: Adaptation And Psychometric Properties In The Indonesian Context" which you submitted to the Asian Journal of Social Psychology, has been reviewed. I feel fortunate that two experts in the field of social and environmental psychology agreed to review the manuscript. Their reviews are extensive, detailed, and constructive to improve the quality of manuscript. My independent reading of the manuscript before I assigned the reviewers were similar to many queries and suggestions the reviewers made. Therefore, I will not reiterate them further. The comments from the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

Both reviewers have suggested extensive revisions to your manuscript. I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript. Please keep in mind that this is a risky revision, because it require you to reconduct study by adding additional variables to improve the validity of the scale. Your revision does not guarantee the publication.

To submit your revision online with no need to enter log in details, please use the following link:

\*\*\* PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm.  
\*\*\*

[https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ajsp?URL\\_MASK=070c45dff1d14e0399bd6f200bd5ee42](https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ajsp?URL_MASK=070c45dff1d14e0399bd6f200bd5ee42)

Alternatively, log onto <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ajsp> and enter your Author Center, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer.

Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Center.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

Please note APA referencing style requires that a DOI be provided for all references where available. If you have not provided DOIs in your references please do so during this revision process.

**IMPORTANT:** Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the Asian Journal of Social Psychology, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

#### Wiley Editing Services Available to All Authors

Should you be interested, Wiley Editing Services offers expert help with manuscript, language, and format editing, along with other article preparation services. You can learn more about this service option at [www.wileyauthors.com/eoo/preparation](http://www.wileyauthors.com/eoo/preparation). You can also check out Wiley's collection of free article preparation resources for general guidance about writing and preparing your manuscript at [www.wileyauthors.com/eoo/prepresources](http://www.wileyauthors.com/eoo/prepresources).

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Asian Journal of Social Psychology and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,  
Dr. Kenichi Ito  
Associate Editor, Asian Journal of Social Psychology  
[kenichi.ito@uleth.ca](mailto:kenichi.ito@uleth.ca)

Reviewers Comments to Author:  
Reviewer: 1



## Reviewers Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

## Comments to the Corresponding Author

I appreciate this opportunity to review this paper. This paper aimed at adapting the Climate Change Perception Scale, initially designed by Dutch scholars, in the Indonesian Context. This study includes three sub-studies to offer internal consistency, convergent validity, and predictive validity evidence of CCPS; this study aims at outputting a valid CCPS for research in the Indonesian Context. I appreciate the goal of this research, yet I wish to raise some methodological concerns for the authors' consideration. Please find my comments on this study below.

\*I do not have expertise regarding the psychometric methodological details, the editor may need to consider other expert opinions on this issue.

## Introduction.

-This study aims at introducing CCPS into the Indonesia Context, which is a relatively underrepresented group in psychological science. I would encourage the authors to give a review of the real-world environmentalism progresses/challenges in Indonesia. This will help the world society to better understand Indonesia and better contextualize this study.

-Likewise, a brief comparison between the Netherlands and Indonesia in terms of environmentalism may better justify the need for adapting this scale.

## Methods.

-Study 1: Would recommend adding an English translation following each item in Table 2 so non-Indonesian readers can better follow this table.

-Study 2: Singly correlating CCSP with the NR scale seems inadequate for me to justify the validity of the CCSP scale. Its association pattern with other theoretically relevant/non-relevant constructs will be necessary for supporting this validity. Perhaps a new study is needed for addressing this issue.

-Study 3: Again, singly using the Plastic bag attitude questionnaire to justify CCSP's validity seems inadequate to me. Its association pattern with more related constructs should be built. Perhaps a new study is needed for addressing this issue. In terms of predictive validity, rather than following Western academic discourses, I would encourage the authors to think about the unique context of Indonesia more and find more indicators with social implications.

## Discussion.

-The general discussion focuses solely on methodological issues, thereby the academic and practical implication of this study is underdeveloped.

-Also, the limitation of this study should be discussed

Minor concerns:

-The results report needs careful editing by following APA styles (e.g., using italics when necessary).

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Corresponding Author

The manuscript addresses the crucial need for multilanguage versions of measures validated across diverse cultures, contributing to the translation of research for non-Western settings. It is particularly relevant to AJSP as it focuses on adapting and validating a measure in an Asian culture. The authors conducted three studies to assess and establish the psychometric properties of the Indonesian version of the Climate Change Perception Scale (CCPS). I appreciate the opportunity to review this research and would like to thank the authors. Below, I provide comments aimed at improving the work.

First, the manuscript could emphasise the impetus and importance of this work by highlighting the significance of cross-culturally validated research tools. In the introduction, it would be beneficial to elaborate on or provide citations for research highlighting the limitations of using research tools that have been devised and validated solely using Western samples. This could address the importance of considering the relevance and potential application of such tools in non-Western Asian cultures. It could also include concerns regarding the use of scales that have not been properly validated or adapted to specific cultural contexts across different countries.

Second, the manuscript should provide clearer justifications for certain methodological choices and interpretations. Regarding methodological choices, it is unclear why Nature Relatedness (NR) was specifically selected as a construct for demonstrating convergent validity in Study 2. Considering that NR includes self, perspective, and experience dimensions (p. 3-4), it does not seem that NR would predict two of the five CCPS dimensions: Spatial distance perception and temporal distance perception. If the rationale for using NR is because it has been adapted and validated using Indonesian samples (p. 7), that justification should be more explicitly stated, along with its potentially stronger conceptual overlap with some CCPS dimensions.

Sample size considerations should also be addressed, given the discrepant sample sizes across the studies. The manuscript notes that procedures from Beaton et al. (2000) were followed for adapting and validating the measure. However, Beaton et al. (2000) recommends first pre-testing the scale on a small sample, yet Study 1 recruited a larger number of participants (n=300+), which contrasts starkly with the smaller sample size of Study 3 (almost n=80). It is important to discuss whether Study 3 is adequately powered and provide a rationale for the sizeable difference in sample sizes across the studies.

The lack of consistency in the validation procedures is also noteworthy. The manuscript should clarify how climate change skepticism was addressed in this research, as the original researchers excluded climate change deniers'



The lack of consistency in the validation procedures is also noteworthy. The manuscript should clarify how climate change skepticism was addressed in this research, as the original researchers excluded climate change deniers' responses on certain subscales. For example, individuals who do not believe in the occurrence of climate change ("Reality" Dimension) would not provide valid or appropriate responses for items on the other dimensions such as the perceived causes and consequences of climate change. It would be beneficial to explain whether a similar approach was taken in this study and how the issue of climate change skepticism was handled.

Related to this, the manuscript should provide clearer descriptions of the materials used and present the findings in a more organized manner. It appears that Study 1 administered all the initial CCPS items devised by the original authors, rather than only the finalized CCPS items. The Methods section for Study 1 should clearly state whether all items were included and provide a rationale for this decision.

Furthermore, several interpretations in the manuscript seem unsound and should be revisited. For example, on page 3, it is stated that "... almost all aspects were correlated with each other, except for the temporal aspect." However, Table 3 shows that the temporal dimension is significantly correlated with all dimensions and the total score, except for the "Causes" dimension.

Another concerning interpretation can be found on page 8, which states, "The results of Study 2 demonstrate that CCPS has good convergent validity. This is indicated by the significant correlation between CCPS and NRS ( $r = 0.303$ ,  $p < 0.01$ )." The strength of this correlation seems rather weak, suggesting divergent rather than convergent validity. According to van Valkengoed et al. (2021), the original CCPS researchers, correlations above 0.5 were considered evidence for convergent validity. This interpretation should be revisited and clarified.

One final unclear interpretation relates to the consistently poor findings for the "Temporal" dimension. On page 6, the manuscript speculates that the item "It takes a long time to feel the impacts of climate change" may have been interpreted negatively because the impacts would only be felt in the distant future, without concern. However, this explanation for the item's poor factor loading and internal consistency does not read clearly and make much theoretical sense, as this item seems to read similarly to the other two retained items: "Only future generations will experience the impacts of climate change" (anya generasi-generasi masa depan yang akan mengalami dampak-dampak perubahan iklim) and "The impacts of climate change will only be experienced in the distant future." (Dampak-dampak perubahan iklim hanya akan dialami jauh di masa depan). The manuscript should clarify why this speculation was not addressed in the follow-up studies and consider incorporating relevant research on cross-cultural differences in temporal attention to the future, particularly in the pro-environmental literature.

Relatedly, the supposed item of contention "It takes a long time to feel the impacts of climate change" also reads differently from the original CCPS item "It will be a long time before the consequences of climate change are felt". The manuscript should clarify if the difference in wording is due to the translation from English to Indonesian and back to



The manuscript should also provide more details on the analytical procedures employed. It does not specify the rotation method for the CFA or whether self-correlations were corrected for in the analyses. Since only Model 2 results for Study 1 were reported (p. 5), it is important to explain the criteria for retaining and dropping items. This should include the cutoffs for removing items with cross-loadings and weak factor loadings, as well as the cutoffs (e.g., SRMR, AIC) for determining acceptable model fit. The benchmarks for CR and AVE could be reported earlier in the manuscript, on page 5 instead of page 10.

Furthermore, the results should be reported consistently and thoroughly across the studies. While the demographic breakdown for Study 1's sample was provided in Table 1, there was no similar breakdown for Studies 2 and 3. Reliability and regression results were also not consistently reported for Study 3. Referring to the original CCPS research may help improve the way the procedure and results are reported.

Third, the manuscript lacks sufficient detail in several sections. For example, given that the studies seemingly recruited convenience samples for completing an online survey, it is unclear what steps, if any, were taken to ensure data quality. The manuscript should provide more clarity on how the online survey was advertised and whether any efforts were made to mitigate self-selection bias. Additionally, it should specify whether the CCPS subscales and materials were presented randomly to participants.

The manuscript should also provide more information about the analytical procedure. Specifically, it should clarify whether the CCPS items were reverse-scored prior to the analyses, as factor loadings and correlations between dimensions are expected to be negative. The rotation method for the CFA should be explicitly stated, and it should be clarified whether self-correlations were corrected for in the analyses.

Additionally, it is unclear whether the CCPS items were reverse-scored prior to the analyses, as the factor loading for some items/subscales and the correlations between certain dimensions are expected to be negative. For example, in van Valkengoed et al., (2021)'s work, the "Causes" dimension was negatively correlated with "Spatial" and "Temporal" dimensions (see Table 5). The manuscript should explicitly state whether reverse-scoring was conducted.

Fourth, the manuscript should acknowledge the potential limitations of the research. One notable limitation is the reliance on nonrepresentative samples, as the samples were relatively young, female-centric, and student-focused. Comparing the demographic representativeness of each study's sample with the general population and acknowledging the limitations associated with sample characteristics would be valuable. Another limitation would be the sampling method (convenience sampling) and small sample sizes (e.g., Study 3's n of 78).

Finally, I would like to conclude with some minor comments. This includes addressing formatting errors, such as the missing space between "consequences" and the citation for Cianconi (p. 2). Additionally, there are instances of single



Finally, I would like to conclude with some minor comments. This includes addressing formatting errors, such as the missing space between "consequences" and the citation for Cianconi (p. 2). Additionally, there are instances of single spacing instead of double spacing in several paragraphs (p. 3-4 and p. 8-9). It is important to double-check the formatting for tables, statistics, and headers. For example, "study" should be capitalized consistently in the table headers. The p-values should be italicized, and the subheader (p. 4) should read "Participants" instead of "Participant." Furthermore, the cutoffs for CR and AVE (p. 5) should include a leading zero, so they would be presented as 0.7 and 0.4, not 7 and 4. Lastly, it is important to use consistent spelling for "skepticism" or "scepticism" throughout the manuscript (p. 2 and p. 3).

Another minor comment relates to improving readability for non-Indonesian readers. The tables can be enhanced by including the English equivalents for the Indonesian-worded items and statistical constructs or concepts, such as "Muatan" (Loadings), "Butir" (Items), "Variabel" (Variables), "Dimensi" (Dimensions), "Rentang Muatan faktor" (Factor Loadings Range), and "CCPS-Consequenses" (CCPS-Consequences).

Additionally, the clarity of writing can be improved. For instance, on page 2, the sentence "This variable represents an individual's beliefs about the factors driving climate change caused by human behavior or natural causes" should be revised to accurately refer to the dimension (not variable) as "perception of climate change causes" for clarity. Another example is on page 3, where the sentence "This study consists of three different analyses with varying samples" can be revised to clarify that there are three separate studies instead of one study with three types of analyses.

As a whole, I recognize the value of this research and its contributions. While there is still work to be done to enhance clarity, readability, consistency, and validity of the arguments and conclusions, I have confidence that these efforts will be worthwhile. I want to reiterate my gratitude to the authors for providing me with the opportunity to review this research, and I wish them the best of luck moving forward!

**Date Sent:** 07-Jul-2023

 Close Window

**Decision Letter (AJSP-23-385-RA.R1)**

**From:** kenichi.ito@uleth.ca

**To:** adiwena@unika.ac.id

**CC:** adiwena@unika.ac.id, mariabraman@unika.ac.id

**Subject:** Asian Journal of Social Psychology - Decision on Manuscript ID AJSP-23-385-RA.R1

**Body:** 27-Oct-2023

Dear Mr. Adiwena:

Manuscript ID AJSP-23-385-RA.R1 entitled "Climate Change Perception Scale: Adaptation And Psychometric Properties In The Indonesian Context" which you submitted to the Asian Journal of Social Psychology, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

Both reviewers recommended minor revision for your manuscript. please closely follow their queries and clearly indicate where you revised to improve your manuscript.

To submit your revision online with no need to enter log in details, please use the following link:

\*\*\* PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. \*\*\*

[https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ajsp?URL\\_MASK=775f373a60ed42598de7172e5741f05f](https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ajsp?URL_MASK=775f373a60ed42598de7172e5741f05f)

Alternatively, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ajsp> and enter your Author Center, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer.

Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Center.



When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

Please note APA referencing style requires that a DOI be provided for all references where available. If you have not provided DOIs in your references please do so during this revision process.

**IMPORTANT:** Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the Asian Journal of Social Psychology, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

This journal offers a number of license options for published papers; information about this is available here: <https://authorservices.wiley.com/author-resources/Journal-Authors/licensing/index.html>. The submitting author has confirmed that all co-authors have the necessary rights to grant in the submission, including in light of each co-author's funder policies. If any author's funder has a policy that restricts which kinds of license they can sign, for example if the funder is a member of Coalition S, please make sure the submitting author is aware.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Asian Journal of Social Psychology and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,  
Dr. Kenichi Ito  
Associate Editor, Asian Journal of Social Psychology  
[kenichi.ito@uleth.ca](mailto:kenichi.ito@uleth.ca)

Reviewers Comments to Author:  
Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Corresponding Author

I extend my appreciation for the authors' thorough revisions to this manuscript, incorporating valuable contributions and addressing the feedback provided by the reviewers and the editor. The improvements have notably enhanced the quality and clarity of the paper. However, there remain specific areas that require attention and refinement. Below are

## Reviewers Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

## Comments to the Corresponding Author

I extend my appreciation for the authors' thorough revisions to this manuscript, incorporating valuable contributions and addressing the feedback provided by the reviewers and the editor. The improvements have notably enhanced the quality and clarity of the paper. However, there remain specific areas that require attention and refinement. Below are detailed comments and suggestions for the authors' consideration.

Firstly, I recommend describing the analytic procedures in greater detail. The type of CFA used in the two studies (e.g., oblique that corrects for self-correlation) and benchmarks for model fit for the different indices, in addition to the reliability indices (CR and AVE), should be stated in the manuscript.

A more prominent example would be the criteria employed for dropping 10 items from the original 25-item CPPS in Study 1. Providing the threshold of what constituted a "bad loading" would greatly enhance the clarity of the revision. This would help readers make sense of why the authors retained the first item for the temporal aspect, despite its poor loading and high measurement error (low AVE, below .5) (p. 10-11). Addressing why this item was not dropped, despite the suboptimal loading, is crucial and should be acknowledged earlier on and not only presented in the general discussion on p. 16. The authors may consider excluding this item and including this as a supplementary analysis to visualize the results and potentially further reinforce their argument.

Secondly, greater elaboration on the rationale for drawing inferences would improve the quality of the manuscript. Study 1 showed that CCPS-temporal was not significantly correlated with CPPS-causes and the manuscript noted that this "was consistent with CFA results, where the validity and reliability of the temporal aspect were not sufficiently good" (p. 10). However, it is not clear how Study 1 tested for validity. Also, the relatively poor reliability of the temporal dimension indicates weak consistency among the items but this does not explain why the temporal dimension was not associated with the causes dimension (but associated with the other dimensions).

Another example of a gap in the presented findings and conclusions is the conclusion that the Model 2 fit is better than the Model 1 fit in Study 1. In addition to the improved model fit indices, the authors should conduct and report the corresponding analyses such as the chi-squared difference test between the two models.

One other illustration of this gap can be found in the comparisons drawn between Study 1's and Study 2's results. On p. 13, it read that "As the inconsistency in Study 1, only the temporal dimensions did not correlate with NR dimensions and Biospheric Value.". However, the supposed "inconsistency" concerned the lack of a significant correlation between the temporal dimension with the causes dimension. The temporal dimension was significantly associated with the remaining CPPS dimensions in Study 1. The inference that this lack of correlation for one pair in



associated with the remaining CPPS dimensions in Study 1. The inference that this lack of correlation for one pair in Study 1 draws similarity to Study 2's finding that the temporal dimension did not correlate with the other related constructs does not seem clear. Furthermore, Study 2 found that the temporal dimension was not correlated with the consequences dimension unlike in Study 1, in which it was correlated with the causes dimension. This discrepant finding is worth mentioning and elaborating upon.

Thirdly, I suggest providing sufficient details on the decision for reverse-scoring the CPPS items. The overall CPPS score and its constituents should reflect greater climate change perception. As displayed in Table 1, greater scores should capture a stronger belief that climate change is occurring (reality) and that climate change is caused by humans (causes) and has negative consequences (consequences). However, the spatial items are coded, such that higher levels represent weaker climate change perception. Specifically, spatial and temporal items are scored with greater scores reflecting beliefs that climate change is spatially and temporally distant (instead of proximate). This is important for future investigations and for evaluating the result that "all aspects of CCPS were positively correlated with the total CCPS score" (p. 9).

Fourthly, offering sample items and detailed information about the Study 2 measures (e.g., EPVQ), such as the reliabilities and descriptives, along with clarifying if items were presented in a randomized manner (p. 14), is highly recommended. This would help readers make a more informed assessment of the reported findings.

Fifthly, I recommend the authors consider tempering claims regarding reliability to accurately reflect the findings, including acknowledging poor findings for specific CPPS dimensions, such as in the abstract. In addition to the results for the temporal dimension, Study 2 findings (p. 13) suggested that the consequences dimension seems to be tapping more on measurement error (AVE = .471). This and its implications should be acknowledged along with the poor factor loading of the consequences item (minimum loading of .422 in Table 5).

Lastly, I suggest careful attention to consistent formatting, including the appropriate use of italics and symbols (e.g., "Beta" usage) throughout the manuscript. Another example would be the single-line versus double-line paragraphing, such as on p. 4-5. Also, language and clarity are fundamental aspects requiring attention, particularly in correcting spelling errors such as "consequenses" (should be "consequences"), such as on p.8-9. The specified thresholds for CR and AVE need to be corrected since they should be "greater than .7 and .4" rather than "greater than 7 and 4" on p.8. Attention to grammar and phrasing is necessary. Correct grammatical errors and awkward phrasing, ensuring consistency in capitalization and presentation (e.g., "adapted to the Indonesian by" to "adapted into the Indonesian language by") (p. 12, p. 13). It is also important to ensure the tables are appropriately referenced. On p. 12, it read: "The factor loading values, validity, and reliability can be seen in Table 4" but Table 5 reflects this, and Table 4 shows all the demographics for the Study 2 sample. The tables are also repeated, shown once in the main text and at the end of the main text. The manuscript should be reviewed again to ensure consistency, accuracy, and readability.

In conclusion, while the manuscript has made significant strides in improvement, addressing the aforementioned points will further enhance the clarity, rigor, and coherence of the paper. I would also like to thank the authors for the opportunity to review this revised manuscript and wish them all the best.

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Corresponding Author

#Acknowledgement: I am not an expert in assessing methodological rigorousness in psychometrics research. The editors may need other reviewer inputs for this issue.#

The authors made clear efforts in addressing the major concerns proposed in the last round of review.


In my opinion, the contribution of this study will be very important to facilitate future climate change psychology studies in Indonesia. I will encourage the authors to discuss some possibilities regarding how their validated scales can be used by other psychologists to address pressing research issues in Indonesia and why these psychology research will be of great importance.

I will encourage the authors to better follow the norms of results presentation (e.g., key tables and figures) by analyzing former AJSP publications that also focus on scale validation. (e.g., <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ajsp.12127>; <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ajsp.12366>; <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ajsp.12217> ). That will help readers better follow and digest their key findings.

The authors will also need to calibrate their formats according to APA rules (or other formatting rules).

By the way, it will be a good practice to submit a response letter in their future revisions.

**Date Sent:** 27-Oct-2023

 Close Window



**From:** kenichi.ito@uleth.ca

**To:** adiwena@unika.ac.id

**CC:** adiwena@unika.ac.id, mariabraman@unika.ac.id

**Subject:** Asian Journal of Social Psychology - Decision on Manuscript ID AJSP-23-385-RA.R2

**Body:** 23-Nov-2023

Dear Mr. Adiwena:

It is a pleasure to accept your manuscript entitled "Climate Change Perception Scale: Adaptation And Psychometric Properties In The Indonesian Context" in its current form for publication in the Asian Journal of Social Psychology. The comments of the reviewer(s) who reviewed your manuscript are included at the foot of this letter.

First Look NEW: Please note although the manuscript is accepted the files will now be checked to ensure that everything is ready for publication, and you may be contacted if final versions of files for publication are required.

This journal offers a number of license options for published papers; information about this is available here: <https://authorservices.wiley.com/author-resources/Journal-Authors/licensing/index.html>. The submitting author has confirmed that all co-authors have the necessary rights to grant in the submission, including in light of each co-author's funder policies. If any author's funder has a policy that restricts which kinds of license they can sign, for example if the funder is a member of Coalition S, please make sure the submitting author is aware.

Thank you for your fine contribution. On behalf of the Editors of the Asian Journal of Social Psychology, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.

Sincerely,  
Dr. Kenichi Ito  
Associate Editor, Asian Journal of Social Psychology  
kenichi.ito@uleth.ca

P.S. – You can help your research get the attention it deserves! Wiley Editing Services offers professional video abstract and infographic creation to help you promote your research at [www.wileyauthors.com/eop/promotion](http://www.wileyauthors.com/eop/promotion). And, check out Wiley's free Promotion Guide for best-practice recommendations for promoting your work at [www.wileyauthors.com/eop/guide](http://www.wileyauthors.com/eop/guide).