

Peer Review Comments

Article: Levi, D. (2020). The California Missions: Public Attitudes Toward Perceived Authenticity, Sacredness, and Uses of Historic Religious Sites. *Collabra: Psychology*, 6(1): 27. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.302>

Article type: Original research report

Editor: Jeremy C. Wells

Article submitted: 6 November 2019

Editor decision: Revisions required

Revision submitted: 16 April 2020

Article accepted: 7 May 2020

Article published: 18 June 2020

Responses for Version 1

Reviewer A:

1) General comments and summary of recommendation

Describe your overall impressions and your recommendation, including changes or revisions. Please note that you should pay attention to scientific, methodological, and ethical soundness only, not novelty, topicality, or scope.

A checklist of things to you may want to consider is below:

- Are the methodologies used appropriate?
- Are any methodological weaknesses addressed?
- Is all statistical analysis sound?
- Does the conclusion (if present) reflect the argument, is it supported by data/facts?
- Is the article logically structured, succinct, and does the argument flow coherently?
- Are the references adequate and appropriate?:

I recommend publishing of the article with minor revisions, as follows:

(a) The author should clearly mention the research question investigated in this paper at the end of the introduction.

(b) This paper is an overview of the findings of previously published research. It would be useful if the author discusses how the overview was made - was there any specific methods used for such meta analysis?

(c) I assume that the author has given more information of the specific research methods in the published papers. However, it will be useful to give some more details of those methods in this paper as well.

(d) There is no operationalization of the concept of 'authenticity' given here. Also, the author neglects the attributes of authenticity developed by UNESCO World Heritage Center (post Nara Document on Authenticity 1994).

(e) The research results section of 'authenticity' discussion does not provide us a clear view of the conflicts between 'historical authenticity' and 'perceived authenticity'. There is no discussion of 'historic authenticity' of the Missions in the paper.

2) Figures/tables/data availability:

Please comment on the author's use of tables, charts, figures, if relevant. Please acknowledge that adequate underlying data is available to ensure reproducibility (see open data policies per discipline of Collabra here).: Some images of the three California Missions would have been helpful.

3) Ethical approval:

If humans or animals have been used as research subjects, and/or tissue or field sampling, are the necessary statements of ethical approval by a relevant authority present? Where humans have participated in research, informed consent should also be declared.

If not, please detail where you think a further ethics approval/statement/follow-up is required.:

I am not in a position to judge this. No information is given in the paper on the IRB approvals.

4) Language:

Is the text well written and jargon free? Please comment on the quality of English and any need for improvement beyond the scope of this process.: Yes.

Reviewer C:

1) General comments and summary of recommendation

Describe your overall impressions and your recommendation, including changes or revisions. Please note that you should pay attention to scientific, methodological, and ethical soundness only, not novelty, topicality, or scope. A checklist of things to you may want to consider is below:

- Are the methodologies used appropriate?
- Are any methodological weaknesses addressed?
- Is all statistical analysis sound?
- Does the conclusion (if present) reflect the argument, is it supported by data/facts?
- Is the article logically structured, succinct, and does the argument flow coherently?
- Are the references adequate and appropriate?:

This kind of work and the field are interesting and I am excited to see the broad samples and cases. The paper promises to be a review of series of studies, but does not detail enough of the study and presents more literature than method. The methods for this article are appropriate for the work, but are not presented in enough detail to support the data. It is difficult to understand which methods were used at which sites, which researchers were conducting the data collection (students or author), what the approaches were at each site given the variety of methods allowed. There is not a discussion of the basic data collection activities or characteristics including

sample sizes and types, demographics, location of view for observation, collection period/timeline, or qualitative approach. This research would be bolstered by a more thorough discussion of data collection strategies and instruments. The structure of the article is interesting in that it presents the literature and immediately follows with a results discussion. However, because there is not an explanation of the methods, the findings seem to be isolated or without methodological rigor as a backing. It seems that further up front discussion of the methods is warranted. The references are appropriate for this topic and cited well.

2) Figures/tables/data availability:

Please comment on the author's use of tables, charts, figures, if relevant.

Please acknowledge that adequate underlying data is available to ensure reproducibility (see open data policies per discipline of Collabra here).:

There are no figures or tables. These would be great additions to bolster the data and give context for the missions.

3) Ethical approval:

If humans or animals have been used as research subjects, and/or tissue or field sampling, are the necessary statements of ethical approval by a relevant authority present? Where humans have participated in research, informed consent should also be declared.

If not, please detail where you think a further ethics approval/statement/follow-up is required.:

There is no discussion of ethics or permissions. These should be added and include any IRB permission for observation.

4) Language:

Is the text well written and jargon free? Please comment on the quality of English and any need for improvement beyond the scope of this process.:

There are minor typographical errors. Some sentences need to be rearranged or have words added for clarity.

Editor Decision for Version 1

Editor: Jeremy Wells

Affiliation: University of Maryland

Editor decision: Revisions required

Decision date: 4 April 2020

Dear Dan,

We've received two referees' responses to your paper, which are included at the end of this email, and while they are recommending publication, both referees are consistent in requesting similar changes, especially in terms of exposing the methodology/methods used both in the meta analysis and the

individual studies. Please review their comments, and address their concerns, paying particularly close attention to the following items:

1. What was the main research question that guided the work that you've summarized in your meta analysis? How did you approach conducting the meta analysis?
2. Please explain more about the overall methodology and methods that you used in the studies that you site. It would be useful to explain how/why you chose these methods and how you implemented them, including data analysis.
3. Define "authenticity" in context with the research including differences between doctrinal authenticity (as defined by rules/regs/policy) and psychological concepts of authenticity.

To access your submission account, follow the below instructions:

- 1) login to the journal webpage with username and password
- 2) click on the submission title
- 3) click 'Review' menu option
- 4) download Reviewed file and make revisions based on review feedback
- 5) upload the edited file
- 6) Click the 'notify editor' icon and email the confirmation of re-submission and any relevant comments to the journal.

Please ensure that your revised files adhere to our author guidelines, and that the files are fully copyedited/proofed prior to upload. Please also ensure that all copyright permissions have been obtained. This is the last opportunity for major editing;, therefore please fully check your file prior to re-submission.

If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please do contact us.

Please could you have the revisions submitted by April 17, 2020. If you cannot make this deadline, please let us know as early as possible.

Kind regards,

Dr. Jeremy C. Wells
University of Maryland
jcwells@umd.edu

Author's Response to Review Comments for Version 1

Author: Daniel Levi

Affiliation: Psychology and Child Development Department, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA, US

Revision submitted: 16 April 2020

The author accepted the reviewers' comments and implemented the changes as suggested.

Editor Decision for Version 2

Editor: Jeremy Wells

Affiliation: University of Maryland

Editor decision: Accept submission

Decision date: 7 May 2020

Dear Daniel,

After review of your revised paper submission to Collabra: Psychology, "THE CALIFORNIA MISSIONS: PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD PERCEIVED AUTHENTICITY, SACREDNESS, AND USES OF HISTORIC RELIGIOUS SITES", we are happy to accept your submission for publication, pending the completion of copyediting and formatting processes.

As there are no further reviewer revisions to make, you do not have to complete any tasks at this point. The accepted submission will now undergo final copyediting. You will be contacted once this is complete to answer any queries that may have arisen during copyediting and to allow a final chance to edit the files prior to typesetting. If you wish to view your submission during this time, you can log in via the journal website.

The review information should be included in this email.

Kind regards,

Dr. Jeremy C. Wells
University of Maryland
jcwells@umd.edu