**The role of self-efficacy and collective efficacy in climate change emotional and behavioral responses**

**Summary comments**

I have reviewed your ISF proposal and made many detailed comments/suggestions. I have also tried to simplify/reduce some of the text to free up some space.

Here are the ‘big picture’ issues that I think you need to work on in order to improve your ISF submission.

1. The theoretical framework. My suggestion is that you devote much more space to explaining this framework. Your arguments concerning the novelty and interdisciplinarity of your work hinge on the fact that your framework draws from both education and psychology. Although the framework is referred to throughout the proposal, and you say you will test it empirically, there is little description of what the framework actually \*is\*.

On page 2, you say: “we will empirically test a theoretical framework that explores the relations between CC emotions, behavioral responses, and efficacy beliefs (see Figure 1). Second, we will investigate the influence of action-based and knowledge-based interventions on the efficacy beliefs, behavioral intentions, and climate emotions (see Figure 2).”

I was expecting to read a description of the framework: how it was developed, why these specific concepts/variables were included, and what the relevant literature is.

I do understand that the rest of the ‘scientific background’ section \*is\* a review of the literature on the constructs you include in the model, but I think there needs to be a more explicit link made. The simplest way to achieve this would, I think, be to include a paragraph at the end of the introduction (i.e., just before “research objectives”) in which you bring all the information together and explain how it all fits into your framework (and then draw the reader’s attention to fig. 1 again).

It is also hard work to try to match figure 1 to figure 2 and understand how they are related. Climate anxiety, for example, is in the theoretical framework (fig. 1) but does not appear in fig. 2

1. Hypotheses. At present these lack detail. You could give more precise predictions, as well as a brief explanation of why you are making these particular predictions.
2. Preliminary results. I have noted in the main document that I think you should describe the current research you are conducting, even if you do not have the full results yet.
3. You also asked me to focus on the novelty and the significance of the research. I think you have adequately emphasized both novelty and importance throughout the proposal. However, I have tried to tighten up the language in places to make it clearer.
4. Presentation of time schedule. I have been thinking about how best to present the 4-year plan of study in a simple table. Here is a way to present the information, but you would need four tables, one for each study:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Lit review |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ethical approval |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conduct interviews |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analyze data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Or, and this is more complicated:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Month | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Lit review |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ethical approvaland preparation ofmaterials |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data collection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Presentation of results |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Study 1: Interview |
|  | Study 2: Survey |
|  | Study 3: Experiment |
|  | Study 4: Longitudinal  |