Reviewer comments-1

Article is excellent, and I strongly recommend publishing it with minor revisions. The article needs a distinct Results section with the specific results organized as topics within the results. The purpose section is misplaced. The purpose should come at the end of the introduction, including a much briefer summary of the theoretical information the author(s) review. The specific theoretical topics need not be introduced as separate headings, and the author(s) can merely begin with a new paragraph mentioning the theory.

Again, the author(s) give extensive theoretical information appropriate for a dissertation but overdone for an empirical peer-reviewed article. The task in a peer-reviewed empirical article is to present enough theoretical information and literature review to give the reader an understanding of how it ties into the paper's purpose. In essence, the paper would benefit by summarizing the key points of the theory that directly relate to the exploration of data, whether subjective or objective. This may be good news for the author(s) should they decide to write a review article using the more extensive theoretical information.

To be fair, the extensive discussion of theory is a typical 'mistake' made by young researchers who submit parts of their dissertations for publication. One can frame this difference as showing how much one knows about a theory versus showing the reader how key or summarized aspects of a theory directly relate to the material under examination. In general, I suggest that dissertation writers refer to a topic's classic or recent theoretical reviews rather than trying to 'regurgitate' it for an audience with minimal time and who want the author to 'get to the point.'