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Author’s response to reviews:

There are still some typing errors, copy editing is needed. =>Thank you for your recommendations. We got an editing service.

Authors should support their statements with reference on page 11 where stating: “ internal consistency as over 0.6 is acceptable in this study because a tentative social science instrument was included”. =>We added reference on page 11.

‘Internal consistency is usually calculated from the pairwise correlations between items and some social psychological instruments can have lower reliability [27]. Even though a commonly accepted rule of thumb for describing internal consistency is to deem it acceptable when it is between 0.7 and 0.8, an internal consistency over 0.6 is acceptable in this study because a tentative social science instrument was included [27].’

Appropriate statistical references could be included where evaluation of construct validity is described. Detailed description of this process should be given and supported by references (EFA? Using which rotation? Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test? Reference for cut-offs). =>We added detailed description for construct validity.

‘An exploratory factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed and items with component loadings greater than 0.3 were retained [25]. Factorability was examined using a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test. Kaiser’s measure of sampling adequacy requires a value of 0.6 or above [34]; our test gave a KMO of .91, indicating good factor analysis.’