

《心理学报》审稿意见与作者回应

题目：摩梭走访制下的阿注关系：是亲属还是朋友？

作者：肖二平；张积家；王娟；和秀梅

第一轮

审稿人1意见1： This is an interesting and important study. The experiments are sound and the results are clear. However, more can be done to better organize the paper, making it a theory-driven hypothesis testing paper. To this end, I make two suggestions.

First, The fact that the authors deliberately sampled Mosuo minority group and compared them with Han Chinese suggests that such a cross cultural comparison is the main objective of the paper. By manipulating the independent variables in an experiment, as compared to doing a survey study, the authors should have a priori hypotheses. The authors, however, took the approach of not stating hypotheses and deliberately writing a vague introduction addressing issues not all centrally related to the experiments. Corresponding to some of the findings, the discussion of the paper provides detailed and lengthy discussion on three issues – the minority group is more tolerate of incest than Han Chinese; the minority group are more altruistic than Han Chinese; women are more altruistic than men. These three issues ought to be presented in the introduction which should end with clear hypotheses (corresponding to the main findings of the study). This is not cheating but is how scientific papers are written. In addition to these three hypotheses, that women should find incest more disgusting than men ought to be the fourth hypothesis, the rationale of which the authors already provided in their current introduction.

However, among the three or four hypotheses or issues, the authors ought to be careful about their claim that the minority group are more tolerant of incest. The single reference the authors used to build their argument is questionable and is not enough. Alternative explanations for this finding are possible. For example, being monogamous may make the Han Chinese less tolerant of having sex with anyone but not just relatives, whereas being promiscuous makes the minority people more tolerant of having sex with many people including genetically related individuals. The authors' claim is also not consistent with evolution. Normally the instinctive ways to detect kin and to avoid incest (such as those reviewed by Liberman and Blaustein) should be more acute

and sensitive among promiscuous species because they are more likely to accidentally commit incest. More acute incest avoidance sensitivity enables the practice of non-monogamous mating. As the authors argued, the Mosuo minority are fit or more fit than Han Chinese. So the minority group should find incest more rather than less disgusting.

Response: According to the constructive suggestion, we have revised the introduction to state the hypotheses clearly.

意见2: Second, among the different emotion words the authors used, disgust (on the negative side) and romance or eroticism ought to be the main focus of this study. The authors singled out disgust as a separate emotion but did not use the latter (romance and eroticism) as such. This is a mistake. I strongly suggest that authors take out romance/eroticism out of the positive emotion group and use it separately as a single emotion. So there will be four dependent variables – disgust, romance/eroticism, overall positive emotion, and overall negative emotion. The same kind of emphasis played on disgust should be given to romance.

Response: We have processed the data in experiment 1 again according to the reviewer's suggestion.

审稿人2意见1: 本文通过两个研究比较了摩梭人和汉族人在性吸引和利他行为上对亲属、阿注/情侣、朋友和陌生人的情绪反应和行为倾向,其最重要的发现在于通过比较研究,确定了摩梭人阿注关系的性质(即其本质上是一种朋友关系),并发现了汉族人和摩梭人在亲属关系方面的性别和重要的文化差异,研究结果对于理解人类亲属关系也有贡献。作者在问题提出当中对文献的引用比较全面,涉及古今、中外的研究成果,学科上也涉及到心理学、动物学和进化学等多学科领域,问题提出思路清晰,研究逻辑清晰,数据分析合理,结果能够支持作者的观点,讨论也是引经据典,是一篇较好的学术论文。建议作者在一些细节上进一步完善论文,建议和一些疑问如下:

第一,作者在样本介绍时进一步规范,比如对样本容量的形式不太符合心理学的规范,建议参考心理学报相关文章改进,此外,作者在报告被试年龄时,应该报告年龄的标准差。

回应: 已经在文中将样本的介绍规范化,报告了被试的平均年龄和标准差。

意见2: 第二,两个研究当中,研究1的汉族被试、研究2的摩梭族被试,性别比例差异较大,不

知道样本差异是否影响到作者在性别差异的结果？

回应：性别作为一个重要因素，性别比例没有得到很好地控制是本研究的不足。在招募被试的过程中，特别是招募摩梭被试时，女性被试很害羞，不愿意参与实验，所以没能找到预期数量的女性被试，造成性别比例差异较大。

意见3：第三，作者仔细检查文章，进一步规范 and 统一术语，否则会有概念不清的嫌疑，比如作者文章前半部分都用的是“情侣”一词，而到后面，比如作者建立的模型当中，又变成了“伴侣”以此，这两个概念还是有差异的，建议作者统一；

回应：作者已仔细检查全文，进一步规范 and 统一了术语。

意见4：第四，鉴于以上考虑，作者应该在讨论后适当展开对本研究不足的讨论，也对未来的研究进行合理的展望，以激发更多的同类研究，进一步支持作者研究的主题。

回应：感谢专家的建议。在论文结尾部分，展开对本研究不足的讨论，以及对未来研究展望。

第二轮

审稿人意见 1： The authors agreed to make the changes I suggested but did not quite understand my suggestion. My suggestion is Not simply to raise the three or four hypotheses but re-write the introduction to provide the theoretical rationales of each of the three or four hypotheses. As I said in my review, most of these “theoretical framework” material are already in the discussion. The authors need to take out of the discussion and put them in the introduction. Of course, it should not be direct cut and paste. Instead, re-write the introduction to provide a strong theoretical framework which is built around the main findings and which should be concluded with the hypotheses. This framework is very much already there in the discussion. The authors can use the current discussion to re-organize and re-write the introduction. Correspondingly, the authors also will need to re-write the discussion mainly by cutting it short and presenting and briefly discussing the main findings.

回应：将讨论的部分内容提到前言，为研究假设的提出提供理论背景。但由于整篇文章的重点是考察阿注关系的性质，不是证实四个假设，而是通过考察四个假设来确证阿注关系的性质，因此，修改幅度又不宜过大，而且如果分别为四个假设全部提供理论背景的话，前言又太长。综合考虑上述因素，就调整成目前状况。

审稿人意见 2: In addition to this main issue, the authors can spend more time to polish the writing. Just make sure the logic is best presented and organized so that it flows. Write succinctly. Get rid of the first three paragraphs which are not central to the issues under discussion. Start the paper somewhere from the fourth paragraph but re-write and re-organize as mentioned above.

回应: 由于内容调整和重写讨论, 改善了文章的逻辑性。

审稿人意见 3: Finally, do not cite numerous papers in one citation.

回应: 修改时做了调整, 避免了一处引用多篇文章的情况。

第三轮

审稿人意见: Please re-write the introduction to support the four hypotheses. The revised introduction is worse than before. Please get rid of the cultural and linguistic discussion which are not related to your hypotheses and, more importantly, which are not related to the two experiments. Write a "standard" introduction to provide theoretical rationales for each of the four hypotheses and GET RID of the irrelevant discussion and citations. This is your last chance. I copy below the four hypotheses to help you frame the introduction, as well as the irrelevant writings which please get rid of.

回应: 根据审稿人的意见, 重写了前言部分, 主要修改如下: 由介绍摩梭人的阿注关系开门见山地提出问题——阿注关系本质上是亲属关系还是朋友关系? 由此回顾了以往关于亲属关系和朋友关系的相关研究, 并提出了两个假设(将原来四个假设合并为两个假设), 对应于正文的两个实验。修改稿亦将与论文关系不大的文献进行了删除。

需要向审稿人说明的是: 本文主要目的是想确定摩梭走访制下阿注关系的性质, 想弄明白阿注关系究竟是一种什么性质的人际关系, 是亲属关系还是朋友关系, 并非是要考察乱伦禁忌与利他行为的文化差异与性别差异。关于乱伦禁忌与利他行为的文化差异与性别差异早有许多人研究过。本文的主要目的是通过考察汉族人和摩梭人在乱伦禁忌与利他行为上的差异为阿注关系定位, 因此, 对文化差异的考察只是手段不是目的, 至于两个民族在乱伦禁忌和利他行为上的性别差异只是研究的副产品而已。因此, 如果完全围绕着文化差异和性别差异来撰写论文, 一是背离了最初的研究与写作的目的, 二是降低了研究的理论价值。因此, 笔者觉得目前这样修改可能更合理一些, 希望审稿人能够体谅。

第四轮

审稿人意见: I already asked the authors to revise three times but it would be nice if the editor can give them some additional directions on making the introduction more closely tied to the two experiments.

回应: 本次修改，主要修改两部分：(1)前言部分：删除了与实验研究无关的文献综述，补充了与实验二密切相关的“利他行为”方面的文献综述。前言部分的逻辑是：首先开门见山地介绍摩梭人的阿注关系，提出问题：阿注关系本质上是亲属关系还是朋友关系？接着从亲属关系在乱伦禁忌和利他行为两种不同机制下的心理指标着手，分别介绍乱伦禁忌和利他行为的概念及理论。然后介绍朋友关系与亲属关系的相关研究：既有相似之处，又有不同之处。最后提出两个研究假设，分别对应实验一和实验二。经过修改后的前言部分，逻辑上更加紧密。(2)讨论部分，增加了 4.5，对阿注关系的性质做了总结，回应了前言提出的问题。

第五轮

编委意见: 请对中英文摘要再做加工，更好地反映出具体的研究内容。

回应: 感谢编委的意见，对论文的中英文摘要做了修改，使之能够更好地反映出具体的研究内容。同时，对文字作了进一步的修订。

第六轮

主编意见: Now 14900 words main content (not counting abstract and reference). There were 110+ references, reduce to 60 at most. The English abstract is basically very smooth. I have done minor editing, will let the authors to make final decision.

回应: 感谢主编的意见，对论文的参考文献进行了整理和删减，逐个检查并修改了文中引用参考文献的字母排序。需要说明的是，因本论文的参考文献有很大部分是中文文献，需要翻译成英文，因此从总量上看参考文献比较多。经过整理的参考文献为 64 条。

修改本文英文摘要的是英语母语学者 Dr. Daniel Eli Spector, 任职于台湾国立交通大学, 博士学位, 助理教授, Email: dspector@math.nctu.edu.tw. 他在中国大陆和台湾地区生活多年, 精通中文, 并对中国文化感兴趣。作者认为, 经过 Dr. Daniel 润色的英文摘要是合格的。

感谢审稿专家的评审意见与编委专家及编辑部的宝贵时间与精力!