REPLY TO KOMATSU ET AL.: From local social mindfulness to global sustainability efforts?

Niels J. Van Doesum^{a,b,1,2}, Ryan O. Murphy^{c,d,2}, Marcello Gallucci^{e,2}, Efrat Aharonov-Majar^f, Ursula Athenstaedt⁹, Wing Tung Au^h, Liying Bai¹, Robert Böhm^{i,k,1}, Inna Bovina^m, Nancy R. Buchanⁿ, Xiao-Ping Chen^o, Kitty B. Dumont^p, Jan B. Engelmann^{q,r}, Kimmo Eriksson^s, Hyun Euh¹, Susann Fiedler^u, Justin Friesen^v, Simon Gächter^w, Camilo Garcia^x, Roberto González^y, Sylvie Graf², Katarzyna Growiec^{aa}, Serge Guimond^{bb}, Martina Hřebíčková^z, Elizabeth Immer-Bernold^{cc}, Jeff Joireman^{dd}, Gokhan Karagonlar^{ee}, Kerry Kawakami^{ff}, Toko Kiyonari⁹⁹, Yu Kou^{hh}, Alexandros-Andreas Kyrtsisⁱⁱ, Siugmin Layⁱⁱ, Geoffrey J. Leonardelli^{kk,II}, Norman P. Li^{mm}, Yang Liⁿⁿ, Boris Maciejovsky^{oo}, Zoi Manesi^{pp}, Ali Mashuri^{qq,rr}, Aurelia Mok^{ss}, Karin S. Moser^{tt,uu}, Ladislav Moták^{vv}, Adrian Netedu^{ww}, Michael J. Platow^{xx}, Karolina Raczka-Winkler^{xy}, Christopher P. Reinders Folmer^{zz,aaa}, Cecilia Reyna^{bbb}, Angelo Romano^a, Sonja Utz^{fff,ggg}, Leander van der Meij^{hhh}, Sven Waldzusⁱⁱⁱ, Yiwen Wang^{iji}, Bernd Weber^{yy}, Ori Weisel^{kkk}, Kari, Tim Wildschut^{III}, Fabian Winter^{mmm}, Junhui Wu^{nnn,ooo}, Jose C. Yong^{ppp}, and Paul A. M. Van Lange^{pp,2}

Komatsu et al. (1) argue that Van Doesum et al. (2) may have overlooked the role of GDP in reporting a positive association between social mindfulness (SoMi) and the Environmental Performance Index (EPI) at country level. Although the relationship between EPI and SoMi is relatively weaker for countries with higher GDP, that does not imply that the overall observed relationship is a statistical artifact. Rather, it implies that GDP may be a moderator of the relationship between EPI and SoMi. The observed correlation is a valid result on average across countries, and the actual effect size would, at least to some degree, depend on GDP.

However, it would not be valid to select a subsample of countries with high GDP to test this, as such would create a restriction of range that artificially attenuates the correlation. The correct strategy is to test the degree to which GDP moderates the effect of EPI on SoMi. Unfortunately, the substantial collinearity between GDP and EPI (the Pearson correlation is 0.64 for raw GDP and 0.78 for logtransformed GDP) and the small sample size of countries prevent an effective test of the interaction term. If one still estimates the interaction, it turns out to be nonsignificant: $\beta = -0.235$, t(26) = -1.041, and P = 0.308 for raw GDP; and $\beta = -0.045$, t(26) = -0.343, and P = 0.734 for log-transformed GDP. This result does not mean that, with a larger sample of countries, a statistically significant interaction would not be found, and, in any case, the average effect still remains valid. Moreover, the complexities of the world make it likely that alternative moderating variables will be discovered that relate to both EPI and SoMi; this makes future research even more important.

In that vein, it is encouraging to read that the EPI as updated in 2020 with some established drivers of climate change (e.g., waste management, CO₂ emissions from land cover change, and black carbon emissions) (3) still shows a positive association with SoMi as assessed in 2015 (1). Indeed, this may invite a shift from a relatively local to a more encompassing global focus. In many ways, people live their lives in the local environment, even though the outcomes may be experienced at the global level. Climate change is a strong case in point. While tentative, Komatsu et al. provide intriguing indications that SoMi can be associated with global sustainability, especially in their analysis of the ecological footprint of consumption-an interesting illustration that consumption is often local, while consequences are often global. We

Author contributions: M.G. analyzed data; N.J.V.D., R.O.M., M.G., and P.A.M.V.L. wrote the paper; and E.A.-M., U.A., W.T.A., L.B., R.B., I.B., N.R.B., X.-P.C., K.B.D., J.B.E., K.E., H.E., S.F., J.F., S. Gächter, C.G., R.G., S. Graf, K.G., S. Guimond, M.H., E.I.-B., J.J., G.K., K.K., T.K., Y.K., A.-A.K., S.L., G.J.L., N.P.L., Y.L., B.M., Z.M., A. Mashuri, A. Mok, K.S.M., L.M., A.N., M.J.P., K.R.-W., C.P.R.F., C.R., A.R., S.S., C.S., A.W.S., P.S., Y.T., S.U., L.v.d.M., S.W., Y.W., B.W., O.W., T.W., F.W., J.W., and J.C.Y. revised the paper.

The authors declare no competing interest.

This article is distributed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License 4.0 (CC BY-NC-ND).

¹To whom correspondence may be addressed. Email: n.j.van.doesum@fsw.leidenuniv.nl.

²N.J.V.D., R.O.M., M.G., and P.A.M.V.L. contributed equally to this work.

Published January 19, 2022.

thank the authors for their extension of our work, and we agree that the distinction between global and local sustainability efforts may be fruitful as a variable for future research efforts. After all, this supports the idea that social mindfulness "may promote a social and political climate that helps recognize, address, and reduce climate change" (ref. 2, p. 6).

 ⁵Social, Economic and Organisational Psychology, Institute of Psychology, Leiden University 2300 RB Leiden, The Netherlands, "Department of Economics, University of Carch 8006 Zurich, Switzerland, "Moningetar Investment Kanagement, Chicago, LE 6006, "Faculty of Psychology, Investity of Mlano-Abccc. 2012 & Mlan, Taly," Department of Psychology, Ber Gurion University of Mlano-Bures, Jurie 19, 2014,

- 1 H. Komatsu, J. Rappleye, I. Silova, Social mindfulness for global environmental sustainability? Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., 10.1073/pnas.2118710118 (2021).
- 2 N. J. Van Doesum et al., Social mindfulness and prosociality vary across the globe. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 118, e2023846118 (2021).
- 3 Environmental Performance Index, 2020 EPI results. https://epi.yale.edu/epi-results/2020/component/epi. Accessed 22 October 2021.