《心理学报》审稿意见与作者回应

题目：社会知觉视角下道德诉求方式如何提升劝捐效果
作者：陈斯允　卫海英　孟陆

_____

第一轮

审稿人 1 意见：

　　本文将研究重心放在引导消费者捐助行为上。四个实验考察了社会知觉中的温暖/能力双维度与个体/集体诉求匹配对于消费者捐助意愿的影响。研究者考察的问题具有一定社会意义，从诉求类型与社会知觉双维度入手也为这一问题的研究提供了全新的视角。而作者提出的反应效能和自我效能的双中介因素，也有助于进一步了解捐助行为背后的心理机制。在研究设计上，研究者采用了大样本的实验设计，也符合近年来社会心理学与决策心理学研究的要求。但是这篇文章在概念，实验操纵，乃至统计方法和写作上还有一定的修改空间。

回应：非常感谢评审专家对本文研究意义和研究新视角的认可与肯定！您具体而富有建设性的评审意见促进了我们对本研究更深层次的思考，并为文章的修改与完善指明了方向。以下是我们针对修改意见所作的详细说明。为方便专家查找与审阅，在每条回复结尾，我们标注了修改内容在正文中的具体位置，其中 P 为页码，L 为行数(采用每页重编行号)。

意见 1　诉求类型与"能力/温暖"之间的匹配。在问题提出部分，作者花了一定的篇幅来解释为什么个体性诉求和爱心对应，集体性诉求与能力匹配。然而这一对应模式和过去文献中温暖/能力的定义似乎有所不同。根据 Fiske et al 等人的研究，温暖（warmth）是更加与人际关系，集体行为或者亲社会行为对应，而能力（competence）则更多是和个体性的独立性的行为对应。但是在这篇文章中，作者认为温暖更应该和个体诉求对应，能力更应该和集体诉求对应。作者需要提供更多的理论支持来分析这一推断。同样的混淆出现在第一页的论述中，作者认为"群体性诉求主张集群之力，强调群体的力量，倾向于将捐赠看作"履行责任"，而责任的履行通常需要一定的能力才能实现"，在这里作者将群体诉求对应了群体力量，责任，以及能力。而在个体性诉求中，作者认为其强调"尽己所能" 强调个体的作用，倾向于将捐赠视为奉献爱心。但在这一推断中，其实个体性诉求依然是和"能力（尽己所能）"在对应。在这一情况下，相对于强调温暖/能力与诉求类型的匹配，也许更合适的办法是强调不同的能力维度与诉求类型的匹配。

回应：感谢专家的细致审阅。受您意见的启示，我们在修改稿中对"问题提出"部分的逻辑和内容进行了重新梳理与撰写。修缮工作主要围绕以下三方面展开：

　　首先，更清晰地界定两种道德诉求方式及提炼其本质区别。我们从理论来源与基本内涵、类型划分以及它们的本质差异来逐步剖析本研究的核心变量——道德诉求方式。

　　(1) 理论来源与基本内涵。道德基础理论(moral foundation theory, MFT)是本研究的理论基础，也是个体性诉求与群体性诉求的划分依据。MFT 明确了人们主要通过五大方面来构建道德价值体系，分别是关怀/伤害(care/harm)、公平/欺骗(fairness/cheating)、忠诚/背叛(loyalty/betrayal)、权威/破坏(authority/subversion)以及纯洁/堕落(purity/degradation) (Graham et al., 2011; Haidt & Graham, 2007; Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013)。由于对上述五大方面道德判断内容的侧重有所差异，人们会形成不同的道德基础(moral foundations)，即个体性基础(individualizing foundation)与群体性基础(binding foundation)，前者侧重道德判断中的关怀

/伤害、公平/欺骗维度，而后者更关注道德判断中的忠诚/背叛、权威/破坏和纯洁/堕落维度的内容(Graham, Haidt, & Nosek, 2009; Mooijman et al., 2017; Smith et al., 2014)。

(2) 道德诉求方式的划分。个体性诉求(individualizing appeal 或 individual-based appeal)与群体性诉求(binding appeal 或 group-based appeal)是基于道德基础的诉求分类，强调通过唤醒不同身份(个体身份 vs. 群体身份)而影响人们对道德的判断(Winterich, Zhang, & Mittal, 2012; Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013)。具体而言，个体性诉求凸显个体身份(如"一个人应该怎么做才是道德的")，引起人们对道德判断中的关怀/伤害、公平/欺骗维度的关注；群体性诉求则凸显群体身份(如"一群人应该怎么做才是道德的")，导致人们更关注道德判断中的忠诚/背叛、权威/破坏和纯洁/堕落维度的内容(Mooijman et al., 2017; Smith et al., 2014)。

(3) 两种诉求的本质差异。两者最本质的区别在于，人们的道德驱动力是来自于个体身份(内在驱动)还是群体身份(外在驱动)。Critcher 和 Dunning(2013)的研究发现，当预测一个人的善行时，人们会更看重个体层面的行为驱动力，如道德意识(moral conscience)，而当预测一群人的善行时，人们会更看重群体层面的驱动力，如社会规范和社会压力 (social norms and pressures)。对应地，个体性诉求更强调道德中的关怀/伤害和公平/欺骗信息(倾向于个体"内在"的道德本质)，而群体性诉求更突出忠诚/背叛、权威/破坏和纯洁/堕落信息(倾向于群体"外在"的道德规范)。由上可见，个体性诉求与群体性诉求并非简单的"我" vs."我们"的区别，而是分别指"基于个体层面的道德诉求"与"基于群体层面的道德诉求"，是通过唤醒人们对自己的不同身份定位(个体身份 vs.群体身份)而引起对应的道德驱动的方式。

其次，纠正标题与理论阐述中的欠严谨表述。本文的原标题为《"集群之力"还是"尽己所能"——社会知觉视角下道德诉求方式如何提升劝捐效果》，经专家的指点以及对理论的重新梳理后，我们认为原稿件中"集群之力"和"尽己所能"的措辞并不能准确地表达本研究的观点，还可能会引起读者误解(如理解为"集体行动" vs."独立行动")。为保证严谨性和准确性，我们对它们予以删除处理，即修改稿的标题改为《社会知觉视角下道德诉求方式如何提升劝捐效果》。对于正文中其他类似的论述(如原文"群体性诉求主张集群之力"、"个体性诉求强调尽己所能"等)，我们也已在修改稿中更正了相关论述。

最后，增强"个体性诉求-温暖 vs. 群体性诉求-能力"这一对应模式的理论支持。专家提到"……这一对应模式与以往文献似乎不同……温暖是更加与人际关系，集体行为或者亲社会行为对应，而能力则更多是和个体性的独立性的行为对应，作者需要提供更多的理论支持来分析这一推断"，对此，我们从相近概念区分与研究假设推演这两点来说明：

从概念上来看，个体性诉求和群体性诉求不同于以往研究中"个体"(或独立行动) 和"群体"(或集体行动) 的含义(更准确点说应该分别是"基于个体层面的道德诉求"与"基于群体层面的道德诉求")。举例而言，自我建构理论(Self-construal Theory)中的独立型(independent) vs. 互依型(interdependent)诉求就与道德基础理论中的个体性 vs. 群体性诉求不同。一方面，前者强调的是诉求中个体与捐赠对象的关系，而后者凸显诉求的道德驱动力源于内在(如道德意识)还是外在(如道德规范)；另一方面，前者通常采用简单的"我"vs."我们"进行信息操纵，而后者是一种综合知觉，通常通过表达道德基础中的内容(如关怀、服从)来操纵(Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013; Simpson, White, & Laran, 2018)。

如前所述，个体性诉求和群体性诉求实际上是通过唤醒不同身份(个体身份 vs. 群体身份)而影响人们对道德的判断(Winterich, Zhang, & Mittal, 2012; Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013)。在增加引用相关文献(如 Gershon & Cryder, 2018; Critcher & Dunning, 2013 等)的基础上，我们重新组织了"个体性诉求-温暖 vs. 群体性诉求-能力"匹配范式的推导思路：

(1) 关于个体性诉求与温暖型劝捐主体的匹配。个体性诉求唤醒了"个体身份"，导致人们更看重个体层面的行为驱动力(如道德意识)，此时他们更关注的是"做自己认为对的事情"，包括给予他人关怀、避免他人受到伤害等道德行为(Critcher & Dunning, 2013; Kidwell,

Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013)。温暖型的劝捐主体在形象上符合善意、热情、慷慨、富有同情心等特点(Aaker, Vohs, & Mogilner, 2010)，这些特点正是人们内在的道德本质所认同的。同时，人们认为高温暖的企业通常具有更高的公共意图(communal intent)，会更"自发地将受赠人的福利放在心上"(Gershon & Cryder, 2018)。据此推测，温暖型劝捐主体(如慈善机构)更有可能在关怀、互惠、公平等道德领域表现突出，与个体性诉求的道德关注较为一致(Winterich, Zhang, & Mittal, 2012)。因此我们认为，当消费者知觉劝捐主体为温暖型时，采取个体性诉求方式对提升劝捐效果更为有效(即本文假设 H1a)。

（2）关于群体性诉求与能力型劝捐主体的匹配。群体性诉求唤醒了"群体身份"，导致人们更看重群体层面的驱动力(如道德规范)(Critcher & Dunning, 2013)，此时他们更倾向做"群体认可的事情"，例如担当责任、服从领导者等行为(Critcher & Dunning, 2013; Smith et al., 2014; Winterich, Zhang, & Mittal, 2012)。能力型劝捐主体具有权力、技能、效率等属性，与群体性诉求信息中的履行责任、服从权威(如领导者)等主张具有密切关系(Hoegg & Lewis, 2011; Kervyn, Fiske, & Malone, 2012)。例如，由于履行企业社会责任需要财力、物力的投入(Gershon & Cryder, 2018; 赵芬芬, 杜兰英, 侯俊东, 2018)，高能力的企业能更好地履行社会责任。另外，能力是选举领导者(如政客等)时投票人主要侧重的素质，也是人们愿意服从的必备条件(Castelli et al., 2009; Hoegg & Lewis, 2011)，而非温暖(所谓"慈不掌兵")。能力型劝捐主体(如慈善机构)更有可能在履行责任、树立权威等道德领域表现突出，与群体性诉求的道德主张较为契合(Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013; Smith et al., 2014)。因此，当消费者知觉劝捐主体为能力型时，采取群体性诉求方式对提升劝捐效果更为有效(即本文假设 H1b)。

*涉及的参考文献：

Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt J., Iyer R., Koleva S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011), "Mapping the Moral Domain" Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101(2), 366–385.

Haidt, J., & Graham, J. (2007). When morality opposes justice: Conservatives have moral intuitions that liberals may not recognize. Social Justice Research, 20, 98–116.

Kidwell, B., Farmer, A., & Hardesty, D. M. (2013). Getting liberals and conservatives to go green: political ideology and congruent appeals. Journal of Consumer Research, 40(2), 350-367.

Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 96(5), 1029-1046.

Mooijman, M., Meindl, P., Oyserman, D., Monterosso, J., Dehghani, M., & Doris, J. M., et al. (2017). Resisting temptation for the good of the group: Binding moral values and the moralization of self-control. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, doi: 10.1037/pspp0000149

Smith, I. H., Aquino, K., Koleva, S., & Graham, J. (2014). The moral ties that bind...even to out-groups: the interactive effect of moral identity and the binding moral foundations. Psychological Science, 25(8), 1554-1562.

Critcher, C. R., & Dunning, D. (2013). Predicting persons' versus a person's goodness: behavioral forecasts diverge for individuals versus populations. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 104(1), 28-44.

Simpson, B., White, K., & Laran, J. (2018). When public recognition for charitable giving backfires: the role of independent self-construal. Journal of Consumer Research, 44(6), 1257-1273.

Winterich, K. P., Zhang, Y., & Mittal, V. (2012). How political identity and charity positioning increase donations: insights from moral foundations theory. International Journal of Research in Marketing, 29(4), 346-354.

Gershon, R., Cryder, C. (2018). Goods Donations Increase Charitable Credit for Low-Warmth Donors. Journal of Consumer Research, 45(2): 451–469.

Aaker, J., Vohs, K. D., & Mogilner, C. (2010). Nonprofits are seen as warm and for-profits as competent: Firm

stereotypes matter. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37(2), 224-237.

Hoegg, J., & Lewis, M. V. (2011). The impact of candidate appearance and advertising strategies on election results. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 48(5), 895-909.

Kervyn, N., Fiske, S. T., & Malone, C. (2012). Brands as intentional agents framework: How perceived intentions and ability can map brand perception. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 22(2), 166-176.

赵芬芬, 杜兰英, 侯俊东. (2018). 组织募捐方式对员工捐赠数额的影响研究——面子倾向和权力距离的调节作用. 管理评论, 30(3), 114-127.

Castelli, L., Carraro, L., Ghitti, C., & Pastore, M. (2009). The effects of perceived competence and sociability on electoral outcomes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(5), 1152-1155.

相应的修改内容参见正文 P1【L18~29】；P2【L5~11】；P3【L1~26】。

意见 2 诉求类型的操纵问题。作者在具体研究中对诉求类型的操纵也存在类似的含义不清的问题。在实验 1A 中，群体性诉求的操纵为"现在就让我们携手行动起来，为孩子们尽一份公民应有的责任，" 实际上这一操纵包含了两个不同的成分，一个是携手，而另一个是责任。在个体性诉求中，作者同样强调了两个成分，一个是个体的行动，一个是爱心。这也为研究结果带来了混淆因素，究竟是群体或者个体诉求的作用？还是因为作者直接激发了"责任" vs"爱心"的目标？ 如果我们交换这两种操纵的信息，例如呈现"现在就让我们携手行动起来，为孩子们献出爱心" vs "现在您就可以行动起来，为孩子们尽一份公民应有的责任，" 结果是否又会有所不同？ 如果是因为直接激活责任 vs 爱心，那么整个研究的本质也就是责任-能力匹配，爱心-温暖匹配，也就和群体性诉求 vs 个体性诉求无关了。在实验 1A 中，这一问题也比较突出，作者希望在实验 1A 中突出个体型诉求与集体型诉求会引发温暖知觉与能力知觉，但是因为在个体型诉求与集体型诉求的操纵中作者直接用了爱心和责任，这也使得这种连接变成了 demanding effect。

回应：感谢专家的细致审阅和宝贵意见。专家的这一点疑虑是合理的，我们认为完善道德诉求的操纵方法应该从界定道德诉求的概念入手，我们已经在对您的意见 1 的回复中详细说明(包括理论来源、分类含义及两者区别等)。在"溯源"的基础之上，我们重新设计了实验材料，并按照严格的程序再次实施实验、收集数据及汇报结果。

在陈述新的实验材料之前，我们先解释下专家提出的疑惑，即诉求中的成分混淆问题。道德诉求方式(个体性诉求和群体性诉求)实际上是通过唤醒不同身份(个体身份 vs. 群体身份)而影响人们对道德的判断(Critcher & Dunning, 2013; Winterich, Zhang, & Mittal, 2012; Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013)。也就是说，区分两者的并非呼吁对象称谓的不同，本质的区别在于到底是激发消费者"基于个体层面"的道德关注(如关怀)还是激发消费者"基于群体层面"的道德关注(如服从)，因此改正后的操纵材料里将不存在"我们/您"这一成分的不同。这一做法与前人的研究也是一致的，例如，Kidwell 等(2013)在呼吁人们参与环保行为的材料中，个体性诉求使用的是"You can make a difference!"，群体性诉求使用的"You can join the fight!"，呼吁对象的称谓是保持相同的。更正后的实验材料将可以避免原先的成分混淆问题给实验结果带来的影响。

在慈善捐赠情境中，道德诉求方式也可以理解为"慈善道德侧重点"(moral emphasis of the charity，Winterich, Zhang, & Mittal, 2012)。Kidwell 等(2013)指出，个体性诉求应该突出"sense of doing what they alone feel is best"、"sense of reducing harm and suffering of others"等信息，而群体性诉求应该强调"sense of in-group affiliation"、"sense of duty"和"sense of authority"等信息。据此，我们在修改稿中置换了实验 1、2 和 3 道德诉求的刺激物。

下面，我们以实验 1 的刺激材料为例，说明我们的材料如何体现上述要素(刺激材料用斜体表示)。【实验 1 共同背景】目前，许多贫困山区的儿童仍无法接受学校教育，无法学习

所需知识。在此，本公益项目所筹款项将捐给贫困山区的学校。

【个体性诉求】心系贫困山区的孩子们，就行动起来吧！您从心底里知道，您的在乎和行动是对的选择。正因为有像您一样的人，我们可以减少贫困对这些孩子的伤害，促进贫困山区儿童教育的发展。体现"sense of doing what they alone feel is best"如"心系、您从心底里知道，您的在乎和行动是对的选择"；体现"sense of reducing harm and suffering of others"如"减少贫困对这些孩子的伤害"。

【群体性诉求】担起公民的责任，跟大家一起行动起来吧！帮助贫困山区的孩子是体现您责任感的行为。正因为有像您一样的人，我们能更好地追随公益领导者的步伐，促进贫困山区儿童教育的发展。体现"sense of in-group affiliation"如"跟大家一起行动起来吧"；体现"sense of duty"如"担起公民的责任、是体现您责任感的行为"；体现"sense of authority"如"更好地追随公益领导者的步伐"。另两个实验的道德诉求刺激材料可见附录 B 和 D。

*涉及的参考文献：

Critcher, C. R. , & Dunning, D. . (2013). Predicting persons' versus a person's goodness: behavioral forecasts diverge for individuals versus populations. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 104(1), 28-44.

Winterich, K. P., Zhang, Y., & Mittal, V.. (2012). How political identity and charity positioning increase donations: insights from moral foundations theory. International Journal of Research in Marketing, 29(4), 346-354.

Kidwell, B., Farmer, A., & Hardesty, D. M. (2013). Getting liberals and conservatives to go green: political ideology and congruent appeals. Journal of Consumer Research, 40(2), 350-367.

相应的修改内容参见正文 P5【L1~7】；P7【L24~29】；P11【L1~5】。

意见 3 反应效能/自我效能的中介作用。作者用数据证明了这两种效能的中介作用。但是在实验 2 中作者并没有提供两种效能的测量步骤和测量方法，只在实验 3 中简要提到。而纵观整个文章的逻辑结构，结合我的第一个问题，我建议作者更应该考虑把这两种效能变成调节变量而不是中介变量。这样一来，研究设计将简化为 2（诉求类型：集体型 vs 个人型）x 2（效能：自我 vs 反应）对于劝捐效果的影响，这样会使得整个研究模型更加清晰。

回应：感谢专家细致的审阅和宝贵的建议。非常抱歉原稿件中实验 2 关于两种效能感的测量步骤与方法的汇报有所疏漏，我们在修改稿中已补充了相关的描述。借此机会，我们还希望能向您解释两个问题，一是为何我们要通过实验 2 和 3 来共同探讨效能感的中介作用，二是为何我们选择将两种类型的效能感作为中介变量而不是调节变量。

针对第一个问题。整体上，实验 2 和 3 虽都服务于揭示潜在的解释机制，实验 3 是对前一个实验的稳健性检验，但两者扮演的角色有所不同。(1)从实验手段来看，实验 2 是通过直接测量中介变量的方式验证反应效能/自我效能的中介作用，而实验 3 是通过调节检验的方法再次验证了基于反应效能和自我效能的内在机制，即操纵两种不同类型的效能感(Keller, 2006; Han, Duhachek, & Agrawal, 2016)。Spencer, Zanna 和 Fong(2005)认为，对中介变量进行操纵和调节检验是对直接测量和验证中介方法的有效补充。(2)从实验情境来看，实验 2 独立于捐赠情境对自我效能和反应效能进行了直接测量，其中自我效能的条目为"我对自己完成目标很有信心"和"我总是能想方设法地处理要面对的事情"(1 = 非常不同意, 7 = 非常同意; r = 0.81, p < 0.001)；反应效能的条目为"行动的结果总能产生影响"和"启动一个项目，其结果往往是有效的"(1 = 非常不认同, 7 = 非常认同; r = 0.72, p < 0.001)，而实验 3 对两种效能的操纵和测量均依赖于捐赠情境(Keller, 2006; Sharma & Morwitz, 2016)。

针对第二个问题。前人的研究大多考察了情感共情(emotional empathy)、内疚感(perceived guilt)对慈善捐赠行为的影响(Cryder, Springer, & Morewedge, 2012; Lee, Winterich, & Ross, 2014)。不同于以往研究，本文希望可以通过从两种不同的效能感——自我效能和反

应效能入手来探讨影响捐助行为的内在机制,为道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型对慈善劝捐效果提供新的解释视角。之所以选择效能感,是考虑到当个体决定执行某种行为时,对自身执行力的评估与对目标实现有效性的评估影响着后续的行动(Bandura, 1982; Block & Keller, 1997; Keller, 2006)。在大量的心理学研究中,自我效能(self-efficacy)指的是个体相信自己有能力实现既定目标的信念,而反应效能(response efficacy)则指的是个体对预期结果有效性的评估(Han, Duhachek, & Agrawal, 2016)。在慈善捐赠情境下,自我效能指的是捐赠者对自身能力对实现某一目标(如促进慈善事业发展)的影响力评估,而反应效能是捐赠者对执行结果(如帮助到所需之人)的有效性的预期(Sharma & Morwitz, 2016)。Choi 等(2013)指出,自我效能和反应效能均可以显著提升信息劝说的有效性,促进健康行为采纳。综上,我们希望能够将两种类型的效能感作为中介变量,以此来解释道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型对慈善劝捐效果的影响。我们已经在实验 2 中补充了专家所提的关于两种效能感测量步骤与方法的内容。

*涉及的参考文献:

Keller, P. A. (2006). Regulatory focus and efficacy of health messages. Journal of Consumer Research, 33(1), 109-114.

Han, D. H., Duhachek, A., & Agrawal, N. (2016). Coping and construal level matching drives health message effectiveness via response efficacy or self-efficacy enhancement. Journal of Consumer Research, 43(3): 429-447.

Spencer, S. J., Zanna, M. P., & Fong, G. T. (2005). Establishing a causal chain: why experiments are often more effective than mediational analyses in examining psychological processes. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 89(6), 845-851.

Sharma, E., & Morwitz, V.. (2016). Saving the masses: The impact of perceived efficacy on charitable giving to single vs. multiple beneficiaries. Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 135, 45-54.

Cryder, C. E. , Springer, S. , & Morewedge, C. K. . (2012). Guilty feelings, targeted actions. Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 38(5), 607.

Lee, S., Winterich, K. P., & Ross, W. T. (2014). I'm moral, but I won't help you: The distinct roles of empathy and justice in donations. Journal of Consumer Research, 41(3), 678-696.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. American Psychologist, 37(2), 122-147.

Block, L. G., & Keller, P. A. (1997). Effects of self-efficacy and vividness on the persuasiveness of health communications. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 6(1), 31-54.

Choi, H. J., Krieger, J. L., & Hecht, M. L. (2013). Reconceptualizing efficacy in substance use prevention research: Refusal response efficacy and drug resistance self-efficacy in adolescent substance use. Health Communication, 28(1), 40-52.

相应的修改内容参见正文 P8【L19~23】。

意见 4 在写作逻辑上,实验 1A 和实验 1B 的组合也略显不妥,一个更好的设置应该是把实验 1A 变成 Pilot Study,而实验 1B 也就变成实验 1。

回应: 非常感谢专家给予我们在写作逻辑中的此条建议!采用您的建议,"实验 1B"改为"实验 1"。另外还有一个变动是我们去掉了原稿中的实验 1A,在本文的实验 1 中着手探讨道德诉求方式和劝捐主体类型的交互影响。修改稿总共有三个实验。其中,实验 1 旨在验证道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型的匹配效应;实验 2 旨在揭示该效应背后的解释机制(自我效能与反应效能);实验 3 则是通过调节检验的方法再次验证了基于自我效能和反应效能的内在机制。希望如此修改能使得文章的结构安排更为合理,感谢您在写作方面的指导意见!

意见 5 实验 2 在温暖与能力的操纵上也存在较多的混淆，尽管作者为了增强操纵效果选用女性代言人来强调温暖维度，选择男性代言人来强调能力维度。但是性别差异本身也可能激发其他的解释，而且作者还用了不同的职务等来操纵，也引入了更多的混淆因素。比如职务和工作时间差异可能会让作者推断出不同的机构文化、历史、资源，尽管这些本身也会和温暖知觉或者能力知觉存在联系，但是也都是接下来需要控制的因素。

回应：接受专家中肯的建议。为解决这一问题，我们摒弃之前"图片+文字"同时出现、性别不同、职务差异等做法，统一采用图片（同一人物的笑容大小不同）对温暖/能力知觉进行操控，使实验环境更为干净。根据前人的研究结论，笑容较大更容易引起被试对感知对象的温暖知觉，而笑容较小倾向于引起被试的感知对象的能力知觉(Wang et al., 2017)。对本研究而言，笑容较大者代表温暖型劝捐主体，笑容较小者代表能力型劝捐主体。我们使用 Photoshop CS6(图像处理软件)对同一个人的笑容进行编辑，形成两个笑容大小不同的慈善机构代表人物。为确保该操纵方法的有效性，我们对两组人物的吸引力、感知可靠性均进行了小样本(n = 43)的独立前测(t 检验结果表明无显著性差异, p > 0.10)。用于劝捐主体类型(即社会知觉)进行实验操纵的图片可见附录 C。

*涉及的参考文献：

Wang, Z., Mao, H., Li, Y. J., & Liu, F. (2017). Smile big or not? Effects of smile intensity on perceptions of warmth and competence. Journal of Consumer Research, 43(5), 787-805.

　　　　相应的修改内容参见正文 P8【L2~7】。

意见 6 实验 1B 的简单主效应分析存在缺失。当劝捐主体为温暖型或者能力型时，作者仅仅比较了三个诉求类型的差异，但是没有在温暖型或者能力型组中进行三种诉求类型的两两比较。实验 2 中也存在类似问题。祝好运！

回应：非常感谢专家细致的审阅和宝贵的建议。关于简单效应分析缺失的问题，我们已在修改稿中补充了相应的汇报。限于篇幅，在此以实验 1 为例：道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型的交互作用显著, $F(2, 245) = 12.31, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.09$。具体而言，当采取个体性诉求时，相比于能力组($M = 4.59$)，温暖组被试具有更高的捐赠金额($M = 5.79, F(1, 245) = 22.43, p = 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.08$)；当采取群体性诉求时，相比于温暖组($M = 5.00$)，能力组被试具有更高的捐赠金额($M = 5.60, F(1, 245) = 4.93, p = 0.027, \eta^2 = 0.02$)；当采取中性诉求时，温暖组与能力组被试的捐赠金额无显著差异($M = 4.95$ vs. $M = 4.91, p = 0.88$)。同时，对于温暖型劝捐主体($F(2, 245) = 6.89, p = 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.05$)，采取个体性诉求的劝捐效果(捐赠金额)优于群体性诉求($p = 0.003$)与中性诉求($p = 0.001$)，群体性诉求与中性诉求劝捐效果无显著性差异($p = 0.86$)；对于能力型劝捐主体($F(2, 245) = 7.69, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.06$)，采取群体性诉求的劝捐效果优于个体性诉求($p < 0.001$)与中性诉求($p = 0.01$)，个体性诉求与中性诉求劝捐效果无显著性差异($p = 0.23$)。实验 2 的简单效应分析也已进行完善。

　　　　相应的修改内容参见正文 P6【L20~29】；P9【L6~14】。
....

审稿人 2 意见：

　　The authors examine how the compatibility between donation appeals and charity perceptions influences donors' charitable responses. They have conducted well-designed experiments and competent data analyses. I also appreciate the authors' efforts in generalizing the proposed effects into different donation contexts, counter-balancing the order of donation appeal and charity perception manipulations across different experiments, and, more importantly,

providing process evidence through both mediation and moderation approaches. I believe that with a further revision to address several theoretical and methodological issues, the paper will contribute to the charitable giving literature.

回应：感谢评审专家对本文研究方法和理论贡献所给予的正面评价！我们也非常珍惜此次修改机会，在认真消化、理解修改意见的基础上，我们对原稿件进行了改进，以下是回复详情。为方便专家查找与审阅，在每条回复结尾，我们标注了修改内容在正文中的具体位置，其中P为页码，L为行数(采用每页重编行号)。

意见 1　My major concern is about the way the authors conceptualize donation appeals. Specifically, authors distinguish between two types of donation appeal based on Moral Foundation Theory and term the two appeal types as "个体性诉求" and "群体性诉求." They further argue in the conceptual framework that "个体性诉求" is associated with "奉献爱心," whereas "群体性诉求" is associated with "履行责任." However, "个体性诉求/群体性诉求" and "履行责任/奉献爱心" can be totally orthogonal. That is, "个体性诉求" can also go nicely with "履行责任" (e.g., it is natural to say "现在您就可以行动起来，尽一份公民的责任"), and "群体性诉求" can also work well with "奉献爱心" (e.g., it is natural to say "现在就让我们携手行动起来，为孩子奉献一片爱心"). To me, it is the "履行责任/奉献爱心" part of the donation appeal that drives the demonstrated effects. I suggest the authors to re-conceptualize the donation appeal construct and focus on the component "履行责任/奉献爱心" while keeping the aspect "个体性诉求/群体性诉求(we/you)" constant in both the theory section and the study section. In the current four experiments, the donation appeal manipulation was confounded with the two aforementioned components.

回应：非常感谢专家的细致审阅和宝贵建议。参照您的建议，我们下面将从"理论"和"实验"两方面进行修正，提炼道德诉求的本质，明确其操作化定义，以解决专家的疑虑。

一方面，完善理论阐述。我们希望以此说清楚三个问题：(a)什么是个体性诉求和群体性诉求？(b)两者的区别是什么？(c)个体性诉求 vs.群体性诉求≠个体 vs.群体。具体如下：

道德基础理论(moral foundation theory, MFT)是本研究的理论基础，也是个体性诉求与群体性诉求的划分依据。个体性诉求(individualizing appeal 或 individual-based appeal)与群体性诉求(binding appeal 或 group-based appeal)是基于该理论的诉求分类，强调通过唤醒不同身份(个体身份 vs. 群体身份)而影响人们对道德的判断(Winterich, Zhang, & Mittal, 2012; Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013)。Critcher 和 Dunning(2013)的研究发现，当预测一个人的善行时，人们会更看重个体层面的行为驱动力，即道德意识(moral conscience)，而当预测一群人的善行时，人们会更看重群体层面的驱动力，即社会规范和社会压力 (social norms and pressures)。

对应到道德诉求方式，个体性诉求凸显个体身份(如"一个人应该怎么做才是道德的")，引起人们对道德判断中的关怀/伤害、公平/欺骗维度的关注；群体性诉求则凸显群体身份(如"一群人应该怎么做才是道德的")，导致人们更关注道德判断中的忠诚/背叛、权威/破坏和纯洁/堕落维度的内容(Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013; Mooijman et al., 2017; Smith et al., 2014)。可见，个体性诉求和群体性诉求的本质区别就是通过唤醒人们对自己的不同身份定位(个体身份 vs. 群体身份)而引起对应的道德驱动力。

另外，值得说明的是，自我建构理论(Self-construal Theory)中的独立型(independent) vs. 互依型(interdependent)诉求与本研究中的个体性 vs. 群体性诉求并不相同。一方面，前者强调的是诉求中个体与捐赠对象的关系，而后者凸显诉求的道德驱动力源于内在(如道德意识)还是外在(如道德规范)；另一方面，前者通常采用简单的"我"vs."我们"进行信息操纵，而后者是一种综合知觉，通常通过表达道德基础中的内容(如关怀、服从)来操纵(Kidwell,

Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013; Simpson, White, & Laran, 2018)。在诉求的命名上，基于个体层面的道德诉求(i.e., 个体性诉求)与基于群体层面的道德诉求(i.e., 群体性诉求)在命名上应该这样去理解：个体性诉求并非指呼吁对象是"个体/你"，而是这种诉求更关注"treatments of individuals"，强调从个体的角度出发来看待"什么是道德"的问题；群体性诉求也并不是说呼吁对象是"群体/我们"，而是这种诉求更关注如何能够"binding people together"，强调从群体的角度出发来看待"什么是道德"的问题(Winterich, Zhang, & Mittal, 2012)。

另一方面，改进实验方案。在完善理论阐述的基础上，我们改进了原来的实验。与专家所提的具体建议("Manipulating the donation appeal construct by varying the "履行责任/奉献爱心" component and keeping the "we/you" component constant across different donation appeal cells")一致，道德诉求方式操纵材料中呼吁对象的称谓保持相同(i.e., 您)，不同的是，个体性诉求凸显"sense of doing what they alone feel is best"、"sense of reducing harm and suffering of others"等信息(强调从个体层面考虑)，而群体性诉求凸显"sense of in-group affiliation"、"sense of duty"和"sense of authority"等信息(强调从群体层面考虑)(Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013)。我们据此在修改稿中置换了实验1、2和3道德诉求方式的刺激物(可见附录)。综上，我们在修改稿中厘清了道德诉求的概念与本质要义，修缮了相应的文献论述部分，并重新实施实验以及汇报相应的数据结果与结论。

*涉及的参考文献：

Winterich, K. P., Zhang, Y., & Mittal, V.. (2012). How political identity and charity positioning increase donations: insights from moral foundations theory. International Journal of Research in Marketing, 29(4), 346-354.

Kidwell, B., Farmer, A., & Hardesty, D. M. (2013). Getting liberals and conservatives to go green: political ideology and congruent appeals. Journal of Consumer Research, 40(2), 350-367.

Critcher, C. R. , & Dunning, D. . (2013). Predicting persons' versus a person's goodness: behavioral forecasts diverge for individuals versus populations. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 104(1), 28-44.

Mooijman, M., Meindl, P., Oyserman, D., Monterosso, J., Dehghani, M., & Doris, J. M., et al. (2017). Resisting temptation for the good of the group: Binding moral values and the moralization of self-control. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, doi: 10.1037/pspp0000149

Smith, I. H., Aquino, K., Koleva, S., & Graham, J.. (2014). The moral ties that bind...even to out-groups: the interactive effect of moral identity and the binding moral foundations. Psychological Science, 25(8), 1554-1562.

Simpson, B., White, K., & Laran, J. (2018). When public recognition for charitable giving backfires: the role of independent self-construal. Journal of Consumer Research, 44(6), 1257-1273.

关于理论部分的修改内容见正文 P1【L18~29】；P2【L5~11】；P3【L1~26】。
关于实验部分的修改内容见正文 P5【L1~7】；P7【L24~29】；P11【L1~5】。

意见2 Below are some specific comments about the empirics. In all the experiments, the authors measured manipulation checks before asking participants questions about the main dependent variables. Such a measurement order may produce a demand effect.
回应：接受专家富有建设性的意见。为解决专家的此点疑虑(i.e., demand effect)，在本研究的实验中，我们调整了变量测量的顺序。具体而言，在分别呈现道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型的刺激材料之后，便直接对我们的因变量(捐赠意愿)进行测量，将步骤"操控检验题项的测量"放在测量因变量后面。这一点修改实际上就是采纳了您提出的具体建议"Measuring the key dependent variable right after the donation appeal and charity perception manipulations,

without being possibly contaminated by other measures"，主要改动的是实验程序部分。

相应的修改内容参见正文 P5【L27~31】。

意见 3　When decomposing interaction effects, the authors only conducted simple contrasts. However, there were no pair-wised planned contrasts among different cells within the donation appeal factor. I noticed that the means of the neutral appeal cells were generally high, especially for the manipulation checks. In the revision, the authors should report all the planned contrasts for each pair among the three donation appeal cells.

回应：感谢专家细致的审阅和宝贵的建议，在修改稿中，我们提供了 2(道德诉求方式：个体性诉求 vs.群体性诉求)*2(劝捐主体类型：温暖型 vs.能力型)交互作用后完整的成对比较。

以实验 2 为例：道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型的交互作用显著，$F(2, 288) = 13.45$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta 2 = 0.09$。具体而言，当采取个体性诉求时，相比于能力组($M = 10.46$)，温暖组被试具有更高的捐赠金额($M = 14.55$, $F(1, 288) = 10.74$, $p = 0.001$, $\eta 2 = 0.04$)；当采取群体性诉求时，相比于温暖组($M = 9.69$)，能力组被试具有更高的捐赠金额($M = 14.75$, $F(1, 288) = 16.23$, $p = 0.001$, $\eta 2 = 0.05$)；当采取中性诉求时，温暖组与能力组被试的捐赠金额无显著差异($M = 11.54$ vs. $M = 11.30$, $p = 0.84$)。同时，对于温暖型劝捐主体($F(2, 288) = 7.79$, $p = 0.001$, $\eta 2 = 0.05$)，采取个体性诉求的劝捐效果(捐赠金额)优于群体性诉求($p < 0.001$)与中性诉求($p = 0.016$)，群体性诉求与中性诉求劝捐效果无显著差异($p = 0.13$)；对于能力型劝捐主体($F(2, 288) = 6.38$, $p = 0.002$, $\eta 2 = 0.04$)，采取群体性诉求的劝捐效果优于个体性诉求($p = 0.001$)与中性诉求($p = 0.008$)，个体性诉求与中性诉求劝捐效果无显著差异($p = 0.51$)。 其余两个实验相关的汇报，我们也已进行了相应的补充，在此不赘述。

相应的修改内容参见正文 P6【L20~29】；P9【L6~14】。

意见 4　In Study 2, it is not clear how the authors conducted mediated moderation analyses. The donation appeal variable is a categorical variable with three levels rather than a continuous variable. However, the Process macro can only deal with categorical IVs that have two levels. The correct way to use regression analyses to conduct mediation/moderation analyse under this circumstance is to further dummy code the three-level categorical donation appeal variable into two dummy variables and then conduct two separate analyses with each dummy variable as the IV and the other dummy variable as a covariate. Also, before reporting the indirect effect analyses, in the text the authors should describe the donation appeal X charity perception interactions on the two mediators first. I noticed that in Figure 2, the donation appeal X charity perception interaction on response efficacy is shown as significant in the regression model. However, according to Table 1, the competent charity seemed to result in a higher response efficacy in all three donation appeal cells with the magnitude being larger in the "individualistic appeal" cell. It would be very difficult for such a result pattern to produce a significant donation appeal X charity perception interaction (suppose we run a donation appeal X charity perception ANOVA). I doubt whether the reported significant interaction is due to the mis-specification of the regression model I mentioned earlier. Please check your analyses and correct/clarify these issues in your revision.

回应：非常感谢专家的宝贵意见，我们在修改稿中已对此进行完善。将中性诉求组作为参照组，设置两个哑变量 d1(个体性诉求组编码为 1，其他编码为 0)和 d2(群体性诉求组编码为 1，其他编码为 0)。将 d1 作为自变量，自我效能与反应效能作为中介变量，捐赠金额作为因变量，运用 Bootstrap 程序(Model 8，选择重复抽取样本量为 5000，偏差校正的非参数百分位法)进行中介检验。结果显示，自我效能的中介作用显著(间接路径效应=-1.81, 95% CI

[-3.1636, -0.7763])。道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型的交互项对自我效能产生影响(β = -1.06, t =-3.36, p = 0.009; 95% CI [-1.6846, -0.4392])。在温暖型组中自我效能的中介效应显著(间接路径效应=2.07, 95% CI [1.1901, 3.1386])，而在能力型组中自我效能的中介效应不显著(间接路径效应=0.26, 95% CI [-0.5326, 1.1612])，因此，自我效能是温暖型劝捐主体采用个体性诉求(相比于中性诉求)提升劝捐效果的中间机制。最后，我们将 d2 作为自变量进行中介检验分析，结果显示，反应效能的中介作用显著(间接路径效应=3.17, 95% CI [1.7599, 4.8134])。道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型的交互项对反应效能产生影响(β = 1.14, t =4.28, p < 0.001; 95% CI [0.6217, 1.6574])。在能力型组中反应效能的中介效应显著(间接路径效应=2.84, 95% CI [1.6929, 4.2037])，而在温暖型组中反应效能的中介效应不显著(间接路径效应=-0.33, 95% CI [-1.4134, 0.7505])，因此，反应效能是能力型劝捐主体采用群体性诉求(相比于中性诉求)提升劝捐效果的中间机制。上述结果给假设 H2a 与 H2b 提供了数据支持。

相应的修改内容见正文 P9【L16~31】。

意见 5 In Study 3, the authors mentioned that "实验 3 通过调节检验的方法再次验证了反应效能和自我效能的中介效应." I would suggest the authors to re-frame it to be "实验 3 通过调节检验的方法再次验证了基于反应效能和自我效能的内在机制." The purpose of a moderation analysis is not to support a mediating effect; instead, both the moderation approach and the mediation approach serve as methods to support the underlying mechanism/process.

回应: 非常感谢专家的指正。诚如专家所言，无论是调节检验还是中介检验的方法，目的都是揭示效应潜在的解释机制，这也是我们在原稿件中设置实验 3 的初衷。为提高文章表述的严谨性和准确性，在修改稿中，我们采纳专家的建议，把实验 3 的目的表述为"通过调节检验的方法再次验证了基于自我效能和反应效能的内在机制"。

相应的修改内容见正文 P10【L15】; P12【L5】。

To address the above conceptual and empirical issues, I recommend the authors to run an additional study, in which they can do the following: (1) Manipulating the donation appeal construct by varying the "履行责任/奉献爱心" component and keeping the "we/you" component constant across different donation appeal cells. (2) Measuring the key dependent variable right after the donation appeal and charity perception manipulations, without being possibly contaminated by other measures.

Good luck with the research and look forward to reading your further revision!

回应: 专家针对我们所面临的理论与实证问题所给予的两条详细做法，为本研究的文章修改工作提供了清晰的思路和可行的方案！对于这两点提议，我们均已采纳，分别见于我们对您的意见 1 和意见 2 的回应。我们非常感激您在帮助文章的成长，感谢您认真辛勤的付出！
··

审稿人 3 意见:

The current manuscript sought to examine the effectiveness of using individualizing and binding appeals in donation solicitation. Differentiating fundraisers into two kinds (warmth and competence), the authors showed that individualizing (binding) appeal is more effective when the fundraisers are characterized by warmth (competence), and that efficacy perception (self‑efficacy and response efficacy, respectively) underlies the interactive effect. Below, I outline some of my major concerns.

回应: 非常感谢专家在百忙之中抽出宝贵的时间对本文进行细致审阅，您专业而具体的意见

给了我们对文章的修改与完善很大的启发！为了更清晰地回应您的关切问题，我们将您针对理论部分(意见 1)的关切问题分为意见 1.1、意见 1.2 和意见 1.3，将您针对每个实验所提出的小问题也分点列出(例如，针对第一个实验的意见 2 分为意见 2.1 和意见 2.2)，并对修改意见进行逐条改进与完善，以下是详细的回应内容。为方便专家查找与审阅，在每条回复结尾，我们标注了修改内容在正文中的具体位置，其中 P 为页码，L 为行数(采用每页重编行号)。

意见 1 Theory: Authors based their conceptualization on moral foundation theory (MFT) and stereotype content model (SCM). The former theory constitutes the grounds for the categorization of the two kinds of charitable appeals. Despite such conceptual support of this categorization, the current manuscript lacks a discussion on prior literature which has extensively researched on 1) what the common types of appeals are and how their effectiveness varies across situations, 2) how the characteristics of the fundraiser affects the effectiveness of donation solicitation and when the characteristics can help or hurt, and 3) how efficacy perceptions modified donation behaviors and when a specific type of efficacy plays a more critical role. Without a comprehensive review on the donation literature and mapping the current manuscript on a specific stream, the theoretical contribution is undermined.

回应：非常感谢专家的细致审阅与宝贵意见。我们非常认同您的观点，足够清晰的理论阐述才能更好地体现本研究的理论贡献。基于您提及的三个待完善方向，我们认真梳理了现有的相关研究，在修改稿中重新撰写了论述的内容，包括(a)道德诉求方式的类型、核心内涵及作用；(b)劝捐主体的温暖/能力特质影响劝捐效果；(c)两种不同效能感的侧重点及其在慈善捐赠情境中的作用。这三点内容将分别具体体现在以下针对意见 1.1、意见 1.2 和意见 1.3 的修改回应之中。希望这些论述不仅可以将相关的概念及变量间的关系阐述得更为清晰，也能为前人的研究与本研究之间搭建起一个桥梁，以突出我们的研究目的与理论贡献。

意见 1.1 Conceptualization of appeal types. Literature has long suggested two distinct kinds of obligation underlying donation, personal (e.g., I am a kind person and so I would like to help; Langer and Abelson 1972) and normative (e.g., it is expected to acting for common goods; Cialdini et al. 1975, Schwartz 1970). Based on my understanding of the manuscript, individualizing appeal highlights the importance of being caring and emphasizes on personal obligation. That is, people help not because of fulfilling the expectations from other persons or society but because of internalized motivation to make the world a better place to live and minimize damage. On the other hand, binding appeal stresses more on the obligation to prioritize public interests over self‑interests. However, the uses of terminology (individualizing vs. binding) is rather confusing; for example, individualizing refer to any kind of appeals making use of personalization message while binding conveys no idea of normative obligation. These terms are not precise enough either in Chinese or in English in conveying the focus on different kinds of obligation and moral beliefs. Besides, some Chinese descriptions, such as "奉獻愛心" for individualizing appeal, are distracting and lead audience to associate other donation‑relevant concept like empathy (caring about another's predicament). If individualizing appeals become more effective because of the stress on personal obligation, it is possible that those who are not caring and kind may not follow the individualized aspects of moral foundation. Neither would they see the need to 奉獻愛心. If this is true, it is a boundary condition for the effects under the individualizing appeals. While the authors may have identified two important kinds of appeal which may lead to interesting prediction, there lacks sufficient justifications how these appeals

map on the previously identified appeals and how their distinction from those appeals is important. Despite practical importance, the authors should also elaborate theoretically why it is important to pull the two types of appeal together.

回应：专家中肯的意见促进了我们对本研究更深入的思考。下面，我们会先回答专家在意见中提及的几个问题，随后呈现我们针对意见 1.1 在修改稿中的修改方案。

其一，专家提到了术语(变量名称)的问题："⋯the uses of terminology (individualizing vs. binding) is rather confusing; for example, individualizing refer to any kind of appeals making use of personalization message while binding conveys no idea of normative obligation. These terms are not precise enough either in Chinese or in English in conveying the focus on different kinds of obligation and moral beliefs⋯"在本研究中，个体性诉求指的是"基于个体层面的道德诉求"(如出于个体的内心而助人)，群体性诉求指的是"基于群体层面的道德诉求"(如出于群体的规范而助人)。Binding 有"约束，捆绑，凝聚"之意，binding appeal 是从群体角度出发的，正如 Smith 等(2014)所说的"binding people together and helping them thrive as groups, tribes, and nations"。Mooijman 等(2017)也指出 binding moral values 是"group-focused/ group-oriented"的，故我们认为，binding appeal 可翻译为"群体性诉求"，强调人们从群体的层面出发思考道德的问题，与之相对应的是个体性诉求，表示人们从个体的层面思考道德的问题。我们之前在文献回顾中对"道德诉求方式"缺乏清晰的论述，可能会引起读者的困惑。对此，我们在新稿件中完善了两种道德诉求概念化的内容，以让读者更好地理解两种道德诉求。

其二，专家提到了个体性诉求刺激材料的问题："⋯some Chinese descriptions, such as "奉獻愛心" for individualizing appeal, are distracting and lead audience to associate other donation‐relevant concept like empathy (caring about another's predicament)⋯"为了避免您所说的问题(如用词"奉献爱心"等)给实验结果带来的干扰，我们已置换了道德诉求的刺激材料。

参照 Kidwell 等(2013)在实验中的操纵方式，个体性诉求凸显"sense of doing what they alone feel is best"、"sense of reducing harm and suffering of others"等信息(强调从个体层面考虑)，避免出现像"爱心"这样的字眼。例如，实验 1 个体性诉求为"心系贫困山区的孩子们，就行动起来吧！您从心底里知道，您的在乎和行动是对的选择。正因为有像您一样的人，我们可以减少贫困对这些孩子的伤害，促进贫困山区儿童教育的发展。"其它用于道德诉求操控的刺激材料可见附录。

其三，专家建议修缮两种道德诉求的理论阐述："⋯While the authors may have identified two important kinds of appeal which may lead to interesting prediction, there lacks sufficient justifications how these appeals map on the previously identified appeals and how their distinction from those appeals is important. Despite practical importance, the authors should also elaborate theoretically why it is important to pull the two types of appeal together⋯"我们通过重新梳理这部分的理论逻辑，确定了更清晰的研究思路。现在，我们首先从"人们如何考虑去做一个有道德的人"这个问题开始说起，再引出后面的论述内容。

"身份定位"不同导致个体的行为差异，人们可以基于个体层面或群体层面来考虑"如何做有道德的人"。在社会生活中，人们的身份并不是单一的，对身份的认同影响着行为决策。例如，如对性别身份(gender identity)的认同影响人们对内群体和外群体的捐赠行为(Winterich, Mittal, & Ross, 2009)；再如，对政治身份(political identity)的认同影响消费者的捐赠意愿(Winterich, Zhang, & Mittal, 2012)。每个人既是独立的个体，也是社会群体的一部分(Mooijman et al., 2017)，具有"双重身份"。当人们看待怎样做一个有道德的人时，他们既有可能从"个体身份"来考虑，也有可能从"群体身份"来考虑这个问题。例如，Critcher 和 Dunning(2013)的研究发现，当预测一个人的善行时，人们会更看重个体层面的行为驱动力，

如道德意识(moral conscience)，而当预测一群人的善行时，人们会更看重群体层面的驱动力，如社会规范(social norms)。可见，唤醒不同的"身份"对人们做出道德行为起着重要的作用。在本研究中，我们认为不同的道德诉求是有效唤醒个体 vs.群体身份的工具。

个体性 vs.群体性诉求的理论来源。道德基础理论(moral foundation theory, MFT)明确了人们主要通过五大方面来构建道德价值体系，分别是关怀/伤害(care/harm)、公平/欺骗(fairness/cheating)、忠诚/背叛(loyalty/betrayal)、权威/破坏(authority/subversion)以及纯洁/堕落(purity/degradation)(Graham et al., 2011; Haidt & Graham, 2007; Smith et al., 2014)。

个体性 vs.群体性诉求的内涵与区别。个体性诉求(individualizing appeal 或 individual-based appeal)与群体性诉求(binding appeal 或 group-based appeal)是基于道德基础理论的诉求分类，强调通过唤醒不同身份(个体身份 vs. 群体身份)而影响人们对道德的判断(Winterich, Zhang, & Mittal, 2012; Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013)。具体而言，个体性诉求凸显个体身份(如"一个人应该怎么做才是道德的")，引起人们对道德判断中的关怀/伤害、公平/欺骗维度的关注；群体性诉求则凸显群体身份(如"一群人应该怎么做才是道德的")，导致人们更关注道德判断中的忠诚/背叛、权威/破坏和纯洁/堕落维度的内容(Mooijman et al., 2017; Smith et al., 2014)。可见，个体性诉求和群体性诉求的本质区别就是通过唤醒人们对自己的不同身份定位(个体身份 vs. 群体身份)而产生相应的道德驱动。

个体性 vs.群体性诉求与其他诉求的不同。其他理论，如自我建构理论(Self-construal Theory)，它的独立型(independent) vs.互依型(interdependent)诉求与个体性 vs.群体性诉求并不相同。一方面，前者强调的是诉求中个体与捐赠对象的关系，而后者凸显诉求的道德驱动力源于内在(如道德意识)还是外在(如道德规范)；另一方面，前者通常采用简单的"我"vs."我们"进行信息操纵，而后者是一种综合知觉，常通过表达道德基础内容来操纵(Winterich, Zhang, & Mittal, 2012; Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013; Simpson, White, & Laran, 2018)。

前人研究中关于个体性诉求与群体性诉求的效果比较。除了 MFT 提出了个体性诉求与群体性诉求的分类，不少实证研究也将两者的诉求效果进行了比较分析。例如，Kidwell 等(2013)的研究表明，采用个体性诉求时更能有效说服自由主义者(以强调个人、追求平等为特点)进行绿色消费，采用群体性诉求时更能有效说服保守主义者(以强调集体、尊重权威为特点)进行绿色消费。Winterich 等(2012)的研究发现，当慈善机构向自由主义者强调个体性道德基础(i.e., 个体性诉求)，而向保守主义者强调群体性道德基础(i.e., 群体性诉求)时能将慈善机构的道德主张与个体的政治身份进行"最优组合"而提升消费者的捐助意愿。是故，本文在前人研究的基础上，继续沿用这两种道德诉求的划分方式，基于 Stereotype Content Model (SCM)，探讨不同社会知觉下道德诉求方式对慈善捐赠行为的影响及其内在机制。

*涉及的参考文献：

Smith, I. H., Aquino, K., Koleva, S., & Graham, J.. (2014). The moral ties that bind...even to out-groups: the interactive effect of moral identity and the binding moral foundations. Psychological Science, 25(8), 1554-1562.

Mooijman, M., Meindl, P., Oyserman, D., Monterosso, J., Dehghani, M., & Doris, J. M., et al. (2017). Resisting temptation for the good of the group: Binding moral values and the moralization of self-control. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, doi: 10.1037/pspp0000149

Kidwell, B., Farmer, A., & Hardesty, D. M. (2013). Getting liberals and conservatives to go green: political ideology and congruent appeals. Journal of Consumer Research, 40(2), 350-367.

Winterich, K., Mittal, V., & Ross, W. (2009). Donation behavior toward ingroups and outgroups: The role of gender and moral identity. Journal of Consumer Research,36(2), 199–214

Critcher, C. R. , & Dunning, D. . (2013). Predicting persons' versus a person's goodness: behavioral forecasts

diverge for individuals versus populations. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 104(1), 28-44.

Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt J., Iyer R., Koleva S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011), "Mapping the Moral Domain" Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101(2), 366–385.

Haidt, J., & Graham, J. (2007). When morality opposes justice: Conservatives have moral intuitions that liberals may not recognize. Social Justice Research, 20, 98–116.

Winterich, K. P., Zhang, Y., & Mittal, V.. (2012). How political identity and charity positioning increase donations: insights from moral foundations theory. International Journal of Research in Marketing, 29(4), 346-354.

Simpson, B., White, K., & Laran, J. (2018). When public recognition for charitable giving backfires: the role of independent self-construal. Journal of Consumer Research, 44(6), 1257-1273.

相应的修改内容见正文 P1【L18~29】；P2【L5~11】。

意见 1.2 From warmth to personal obligation and competence to normative obligation. Whereas the match between competence and normative obligation is more apparent, that between warmth and personal obligation is more elusive. Related to above discussion, not all individuals are caring, kind, and even moral in nature. When exposing these individuals to individualizing appeal, would it be effective? I guess the answer is "no" without considering the characteristics of fundraisers because they may not be aware of the importance of being caring as a desirable personal quality. This is to say, there is something more than "matching" effect occurring. I am not fully convinced by the simple match/ fit paradigm as there are so many missing gaps in theory. While we can generally describe the effects as fit effect per se, the underlying mechanism is more complicated for each kind of appeal, and particularly, for individualizing appeal. The authors should explain and examine more clearly how the warmth of fundraisers affects how the appeal recipients perceive the importance of being kind (personal obligation) and how this affect the weighting on self-efficacy in determining donation.

回应：受专家意见的启发，在增加文献支撑的基础上，我们对原来的"个体性诉求—温暖型劝捐主体—自我效能—慈善捐赠"假设推演思路进行了调整。

(1) 温暖(warmth)是个体对他人行为意图(如，好意 good intentions)的衡量指标(Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick, 2007)。Gershon 和 Cryder(2018)认为，高温暖的企业具有更高的公共意图(communal intent)，会更"发自内心地将受赠人的福利放在心上"。被感知为低温暖的主体(尽管做出温暖的行为)往往会被怀疑是"别有用心"(for ulterior motives)(Cuddy, Glick, & Beninger, 2011)。可见，温暖型劝捐主体所具有的善意、慷慨、热情的特点应体现出"发自内心"而非其他意图(Aaker, Vohs, & Mogilner, 2010)。

(2) 个体性诉求唤醒了"个体身份"，导致人们更看重个体层面的行为驱动力(道德意识)，此时他们更关注的是"做自己认为对的事情"，例如做出给予他人关怀、避免他人受到伤害等道德行为(Critcher & Dunning, 2013; Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013)。此时，具有个体性基础的人们(基于个体层面考虑道德问题)会倾向跟随道德意识来决定自己的行为。在慈善劝捐过程中，温暖型的劝捐主体在形象上的善意、热情、慷慨、富有同情心等特点正是人们内在的道德意识所认同的(Critcher & Dunning, 2013; Gershon & Cryder, 2018)。我们认为，他们会更愿意选择与他们一样"发自内心"行善的温暖型劝捐主体，因为其更有可能在个体性基础所看重的关怀、互惠、公平等道德领域表现突出(Winterich, Zhang, & Mittal, 2012)。因此，当消费者知觉劝捐主体为温暖型时，采取个体性诉求方式对提升劝捐效果更为有效。

(3) 自我效能(self-efficacy)指的是个体相信自己有能力实现既定目标的信念(Han, Duhachek, & Agrawal, 2016)。一方面，个体性诉求下的消费者更强调从个体层面出发考虑道

德问题(Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013; Winterich, Zhang, & Mittal, 2012)，他们认为成为一个有道德的人是通过内在道德意识(而非外在群体规范的压力)来实现，因而会更加聚焦于内心对其行为的控制上，引起更高的自我效能(Ajzen, 2002; Judge et al., 2002)。另一方面，温暖、热情是情感性社会支持(emotional social support)的重要内容(Zhu, Sun, Chang, 2016; 骆紫薇, 陈斯允, 2018)，而个体所感知到情感性社会支持则能增强其自我效能(Aumeboonsuke, 2017)。换言之，当劝捐主体被感知为高温暖时，消费者对自己能在慈善项目中发挥作用具有更高的期待和信心，即促进自我效能。综上，温暖型劝捐主体采用个体性诉求时主要通过增强自我效能而提升劝捐效果(Choi, Krieger, & Hecht, 2013)。

*涉及的参考文献：

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., & Glick, P. (2007). Universal dimensions of social cognition: Warmth and competence. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 11(2), 77-83.

Gershon, R., Cryder, C. (2018). Goods Donations Increase Charitable Credit for Low-Warmth Donors. Journal of Consumer Research, 45(2): 451–469.

Cuddy, A. J. C. , Glick, P. , & Beninger, A.. (2011). The dynamics of warmth and competence judgments, and their outcomes in organizations. Research in Organizational Behavior, 31, 73-98.

Aaker, J., Vohs, K. D., & Mogilner, C. (2010). Nonprofits are seen as warm and for-profits as competent: Firm stereotypes matter. Journal of Consumer Research, 37(2), 224-237.

Critcher, C. R. , & Dunning, D. . (2013). Predicting persons' versus a person's goodness: behavioral forecasts diverge for individuals versus populations. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 104(1), 28-44.

Kidwell, B., Farmer, A., & Hardesty, D. M. (2013). Getting liberals and conservatives to go green: political ideology and congruent appeals. Journal of Consumer Research, 40(2), 350-367.

Winterich, K. P., Zhang, Y., & Mittal, V.. (2012). How political identity and charity positioning increase donations: insights from moral foundations theory. International Journal of Research in Marketing, 29(4), 346-354.

Han, D. H., Duhachek, A., & Agrawal, N. (2016). Coping and construal level matching drives health message effectiveness via response efficacy or self-efficacy enhancement. Journal of Consumer Research, 43(3): 429-447.

Ajzen, I.. (2002). Perceived behavioral control, self-efficacy, locus of control, and the theory of planned behavior. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32(4), 665-683.

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E., & Thoresen, C.J.. (2002). Are measures of self-esteem, neuroticism, locus of control, and generalized self-efficacy indicators of a common core construct?. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83(3), 693-710.

Zhu, D. H., Sun, H., & Chang, Y. P. (2016). Effect of social support on customer satisfaction and citizenship behavior in online brand communities: the moderating role of support source. Journal of Retailing & Consumer Services, 31, 287-293.

骆紫薇, 陈斯允. (2018). 营销领域的社会支持研究述评与展望. 外国经济与管理, 40(1), 18-32.

Aumeboonsuke, V. (2017). Parents or peers, wealth or warmth? The impact of social support, wealth, and a positive outlook on self-efficacy and happiness. International Journal of Social Economics, 44(6), 732-750.

Choi, H. J., Krieger, J. L., & Hecht, M. L. (2013). Reconceptualizing efficacy in substance use prevention research: Refusal response efficacy and drug resistance self-efficacy in adolescent substance use. Health Communication, 28(1), 40-52.

相应的修改内容见正文 P3【L1~9】；P4【L6~14】。

意见 1.3　Role of efficacy perceptions and its underlying cognitive appraisals. Related to the

appeal conceptualization, the authors conceptualized that individualizing and binding appeals evokes more intense self‑efficacy and response efficacy perceptions in specific conditions. These efficacy perceptions are underlain by distinct cognitive appraisals concerning control, attribution, and thus obligations (Lazarus 1991). Given that the authors conceptualized these perceptions as the underlying mechanism, they should highlight more clearly how these perceptions related to different moral foundation and what specific kind of appraisals may be involved.

回应：接受专家中肯的建议。对于两种不同效能感知(即自我效能和反应效能)如何作为内在机制来解释道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型对劝捐效果的影响过程，我们作补充说明如下：

首先，关于两种不同效能感的核心要点。当个体决定执行某种行为时，对自身执行力的评估与对目标实现有效性的评估影响着后续的行动(Bandura, 1982; Block & Keller, 1997; Keller, 2006)。自我效能(self-efficacy)指的是个体相信自己有能力实现既定目标的信念(i.e., the belief that one can take the steps required to achieve an outcome)，而反应效能(response efficacy)则指的是个体对预期结果有效性的评估(i.e., the belief that the steps taken will result in the desired outcome)(Han, Duhachek, & Agrawal, 2016)。自我效能更强调的个体对自身达成某种目标的容易程度，聚焦于自身的影响力，而反应效能本质上是一种"结果预期效能"(outcome expectation efficacy)，侧重结果有效性。两者虽具有相关性但通常具有不同的前因和结果变量，因此是能够相互区分的两个构念 (Keller, 2006; Sharma & Morwitz, 2016)。

其次，关于不同效能感在慈善捐赠情境中的作用。前人关于效能感的研究扎根于各种不同的社会情境,如健康说服广告情境(Choi, Krieger, & Hecht, 2013)。劝捐本质也是一种说服，效能感在慈善劝捐情境中也是适用的(Sharma & Morwitz, 2016)。已有研究发现，呈现被害人的具体细节(vs.概括描述)信息有助于提升人们的捐赠意愿，这是由捐赠者的感知影响力(donor's perceived impact)所驱动的(Cryder, Loewenstein, Scheines, 2013)。在慈善捐赠情境下，自我效能被认为是捐赠者对自身能力对实现某一目标(如帮助到受助对象或促进慈善事业发展)的影响力评估。反应效能是捐赠者对某一目标(如帮助到受助对象或促进慈善事业发展)执行结果的有效性的预期。一般而言，当预期结果越无望时，人们采取行动的意愿就会越低(Keller, 2006)。Sharma 和 Morwitz(2016)通过实证研究把两种不同的效能感置于慈善捐赠情境之中，也为本研究的理论与实验均提供了重要的支持。由上，本研究所提的两个中介变量——自我效能与反应效能均正向影响劝捐效果。

最后，关于道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型的匹配如何通过两种效能感而对劝捐效果产生影响。个体性诉求下的消费者更强调从个体层面出发来考虑问题(Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013; Winterich, Zhang, & Mittal, 2012)，他们认为成为一个有道德的人是通过内在道德意识(而非外在群体规范的压力)来实现，因而会更加聚焦于内心对其行为的控制上，引起更高的自我效能(Ajzen, 2002; Judge et al., 2002)。人们所感知到情感性社会支持(emotional social support，如温暖，热情)也能有效增强其自我效能(Aumeeboonsuke, 2017; Zhu, Sun, Chang, 2016)。因此，温暖型劝捐主体采用个体性诉求时，消费者对自己能在慈善项目中发挥作用具有更高的期待和信心，即促进自我效能，从而提升劝捐效果(Choi, Krieger, & Hecht, 2013)。相反，群体性诉求下的消费者则更强调从群体层面出发来考虑问题，强调外在群体规范的压力作用，这些外在的规范可以是社会规则、社会秩序或他人期许等外部因素(Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013; Smith et al., 2014)，因而具有群体性道德基础的人们在某种程度上倾向于把道德行为的实现归因于外部条件。相比于内部归因者，他们认为自身努力与项目结果之间并没有很强的联系(Ng & Butts, 2009)，更关注外在条件(如慈善机构的权威)对项目有效性的决定作用。能力型劝捐主体与预期结果有效性(即反应效能)密切相关。例如，政治候选人的能力和智力特征(均属能力维度)正向预测其成功选举(Hoegg & Lewis, 2011)。《孙子兵法·用间篇》也有道："故惟明君贤将，能以上智为间者，必成大功"，寓意高能力者更有可能实现预

期目标。是故，能力型劝捐主体采用群体性诉求时，消费者会对其所负责的慈善项目有效性产生乐观评估，增强反应效能，进而提升劝捐效果(Han, Duhachek, & Agrawal, 2016)。

*涉及的参考文献：

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. American Psychologist, 37(2), 122-147.

Block, L. G., & Keller, P. A. (1997). Effects of self-efficacy and vividness on the persuasiveness of health communications. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 6(1), 31-54.

Keller, P. A. (2006). Regulatory focus and efficacy of health messages. Journal of Consumer Research, 33(1), 109-114.

Han, D. H., Duhachek, A., & Agrawal, N. (2016). Coping and construal level matching drives health message effectiveness via response efficacy or self-efficacy enhancement. Journal of Consumer Research, 43(3): 429-447.

Sharma, E., & Morwitz, V.. (2016). Saving the masses: The impact of perceived efficacy on charitable giving to single vs. multiple beneficiaries. Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 135, 45-54.

Choi, H. J., Krieger, J. L., & Hecht, M. L. (2013). Reconceptualizing efficacy in substance use prevention research: Refusal response efficacy and drug resistance self-efficacy in adolescent substance use. Health Communication, 28(1), 40-52.

Cryder, C. E. , Loewenstein, G. , & Scheines, R. . (2013). The donor is in the details. Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 120(1), 15-23.

Kidwell, B., Farmer, A., & Hardesty, D. M. (2013). Getting liberals and conservatives to go green: political ideology and congruent appeals. Journal of Consumer Research, 40(2), 350-367.

Winterich, K. P., Zhang, Y., & Mittal, V.. (2012). How political identity and charity positioning increase donations: insights from moral foundations theory. International Journal of Research in Marketing, 29(4), 346-354.

Ajzen, I. (2002). Perceived behavioral control, self-efficacy, locus of control, and the theory of planned behavior. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32(4), 665-683.

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E., & Thoresen, C.J. (2002). Are measures of self-esteem, neuroticism, locus of control, and generalized self-efficacy indicators of a common core construct? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83(3), 693-710.

Aumeboonsuke, V. (2017). Parents or peers, wealth or warmth? The impact of social support, wealth, and a positive outlook on self-efficacy and happiness. International Journal of Social Economics, 44(6), 732-750.

Zhu, D. H., Sun, H., & Chang, Y. P. (2016). Effect of social support on customer satisfaction and citizenship behavior in online brand communities: the moderating role of support source. Journal of Retailing & Consumer Services, 31, 287-293.

Smith, I. H., Aquino, K., Koleva, S., & Graham, J.. (2014). The moral ties that bind...even to out-groups: the interactive effect of moral identity and the binding moral foundations. Psychological Science, 25(8), 1554-1562.

Ng, T. W., & Butts, M. M.. (2009). Effectiveness of organizational efforts to lower turnover intentions: the moderating role of employee locus of control. Human Resource Management, 48(2), 289-310.

Hoegg, J., & Lewis, M. V. (2011). The impact of candidate appearance and advertising strategies on election results. Journal of Marketing Research, 48(5), 895-909.

相应的修改内容见正文 P3【L28~35】；P4【L1~27】。

意见 2　Methodology-Study 1A

意见 2.1　When looking at the experiment stimuli, I found that there are more than one aspects manipulated. It is unclear whether the authors manipulated "Individualizing vs. binding" or "you (现在您就可以行动起来) vs. we (现在就让我们携手行动起来)" or "Caring‐oriented (為孩子們獻出您的一份愛心⋯正因為有像您一樣的人，孩子們才能在充滿關愛的社會中健康、快樂地成長) vs. obligation‐oriented (為孩子們盡一份公民應有的責任⋯孩子們也會在穩定的社會秩序中健康、快樂地成長)." Notwithstanding I understand individualizing/binding is a complex concept, it is critical to isolate their effect with other established ones with clean manipulation and experimental design. In particular, the concept of individualizing should be distinct from being caring. Related to the discussion in the abovementioned theory part, it is elusive what the two kinds of appeals are in essence and how they are related yet distinct from other related constructs which have been extensively researched.

回应：感谢专家的细致审稿与宝贵建议。在修改稿中，我们针对道德诉求的理论阐述进行了全面梳理，提炼出个体性诉求与群体性诉求的本质差异，并根据前人的操纵方法设计了操纵材料，排除了专家的担忧。具体而言，本研究的道德诉求方式也可以理解为"慈善道德侧重点"(moral emphasis of the charity，Winterich, Zhang, & Mittal, 2012)。参照 Kidwell 等(2013) 的研究，个体性诉求突出"sense of doing what they alone feel is best"、"sense of reducing harm and suffering of others"等信息，而群体性诉求强调"sense of in-group affiliation"、"sense of duty"和"sense of authority"等信息。两者分别基于个体层面与群体层面强调内在与外在的道德驱动。下面，以实验 1 的刺激材料为例，说明我们的材料如何体现上述要素。

【实验 1 共同背景】目前，许多贫困山区的儿童仍无法接受学校教育，无法学习所需知识。在此，本公益项目所筹款项将捐给贫困山区的学校。

【个体性诉求】心系贫困山区的孩子们，就行动起来吧！您从心底里知道，您的在乎和行动是对的选择。正因为有像您一样的人，我们可以减少贫困对这些孩子的伤害，促进贫困山区儿童教育的发展。体现"sense of doing what they alone feel is best"如"心系、您从心底里知道，您的在乎和行动是对的选择"；体现"sense of reducing harm and suffering of others"如"减少贫困对这些孩子的伤害"。

【群体性诉求】担起公民的责任，跟大家一起行动起来吧！帮助贫困山区的孩子是体现您责任感的行为。正因为有像您一样的人，我们能更好地追随公益领导者的步伐，促进贫困山区儿童教育的发展。体现"sense of in-group affiliation"如"跟大家一起行动起来吧"；体现"sense of duty"如"担起公民的责任、是体现您责任感的行为"；体现"sense of authority"如"更好地追随公益领导者的步伐"。另两个实验的道德诉求刺激材料可见附录。

*涉及的参考文献：

Kidwell, B., Farmer, A., & Hardesty, D. M. (2013). Getting liberals and conservatives to go green: political ideology and congruent appeals. Journal of Consumer Research, 40(2), 350-367.

Winterich, K. P., Zhang, Y., & Mittal, V.. (2012). How political identity and charity positioning increase donations: insights from moral foundations theory. International Journal of Research in Marketing, 29(4), 346-354.

相应的修改内容参见正文 P5【L1~7】；P7【L24~29】；P11【L1~5】。

意见 2.2　Concerning the objective and findings of this study, this study showed that appeal types could affect the perceptions of fundraiser's warmth and competence. However, the proposed framework conceptualized the characteristics of fundraiser (warmth or competence) as moderator. The observed effects on these perceptions seemed contradictory to the conceptualization. That is, the independent variable should have no impact on the moderator. This finding also hinted that the

manipulation of appeal type also manipulated fundraiser's characteristics (or related concept such as being caring).

回应：感谢专家中肯的意见。鉴于原稿件用于道德诉求的刺激材料的不足(e.g.,成分，用词)，我们在这次修改中替换了刺激材料。我们认为，之所以之前会出现实验 1A 的结果，某种程度上是因为在我们之前在道德诉求误导性地中出现了诸如"呵护、爱心"的用词而引起高温暖知觉的情况。在使用了改进的道德诉求的刺激材料之后，我们发现，其实这两个变量的操纵是不会相互影响的，这也符合专家所说的逻辑。因此，我们去掉了原稿中的实验 1A 及其由于不正确的操纵得到的结论。在新稿件中，我们直接以实验 1 为本研究的第一个实验，探讨道德诉求方式和劝捐主体类型对劝捐效果的交互影响。非常感谢专家的指正！

意见 3　Methodology-Study 1B

Given the same materials used in both studies 1A and 1B, the authors need to make it clearer what statistical test is used for analyses in manipulation check. In particular, they should report if there is any significant interactive effect of appeal and fundraiser's characteristics.

回应：感谢专家的细致审阅与宝贵意见。实验 1(原实验 1B)的操纵检验结果如下：以个体性道德基础认同程度为因变量分析表明，道德诉求方式主效应显著(M 个体性 = 4.65, M 群体性 = 3.58, M 中性 = 4.09; $F(2, 245) = 16.98$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta 2 = 0.12$)，劝捐主体类型的主效应($F(1, 245) = 2.08$, $p = 0.15$)以及两者的交互效应($F(2, 245) = 0.22$, $p = 0.81$)均不显著。以群体性道德基础认同程度为因变量分析表明，道德诉求方式主效应显著(M 个体性 = 3.63, M 群体性 = 4.72, M 中性 = 4.05; $F(2, 245) = 25.19$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta 2 = 0.17$)，劝捐主体类型的主效应($F(1, 245) = 2.01$, $p = 0.16$)以及两者的交互效应($F(2, 245) = 0.28$, $p = 0.67$)均不显著。另外，温暖组被试对所介绍慈善机构具有更高温暖知觉(M 温暖 = 4.87, M 能力 = 4.39; $F(1, 245) = 12.09$, $p = 0.001$, $\eta 2 = 0.05$)，道德诉求方式($F(2, 245) = 1.50$, $p = 0.23$)及两者的交互效应($F(2, 245) = 0.33$, $p = 0.70$)均不显著；能力组被试对所介绍慈善机构具有更高能力知觉(M 温暖 = 4.13, M 能力 = 4.80; $F(1, 288) = 21.07$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta 2 = 0.08$)，道德诉求方式($F(2, 245) = 2.10$, $p = 0.13$)及两者的交互效应($F(2, 245) = 0.44$, $p = 0.64$)均不显著。上述结果表明实验中道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型均操纵有效。

相应的修改内容参见正文 P6【L6~17】；P8【L28~35】。

意见 4　Methodology-Study 2

意见 4.1　Using gender to manipulate warmth and competence is problematic because there are too many conceptual differences across gender apart from the interested constructs. Along with other differences in the description details, the validity of the manipulation of fundraiser's characteristics is questionable. While it is good that the authors ruled out the difference in attractiveness with a pretest, the manipulation is not clean enough for understanding the *fit* effect. It'd be better with either male or female alone while varying two characteristics with verbal description or smile alone.

回应：接受专家中肯的意见，我们在修改稿中统一采用图片（同一人物的笑容大小不同）对温暖/能力知觉进行操控，确保干净的实验环境。由于笑容较大更容易引起被试对感知对象的温暖知觉，而笑容较小倾向于引起被试的感知对象的能力知觉(Wang et al., 2017)。在本实验中，我们希望用笑容较大者代表温暖型劝捐主体，笑容较小者代表能力型劝捐主体。采用 PhotoshopCS6(图像处理软件)对同一个人的笑容强度进行编辑后，形成两个笑容大小不同的代表人物。我们通过独立前测控制了两组人物的吸引力和感知可靠性。操纵图片见附录 C。

*涉及的参考文献：

Wang, Z., Mao, H., Li, Y. J., & Liu, F. (2017). Smile big or not? Effects of smile intensity on perceptions of warmth and competence. Journal of Consumer Research, 43(5), 787-805.

相应的修改内容参见正文 P8【L2~7】。

意见 4.2　As in study 1B, the authors need to report non‑significant interaction effect for manipulation check.

回应：感谢专家的宝贵意见。我们对实验 2 的操纵检验结果进行了补充(含不显著效应)：

以个体性道德基础认同程度为因变量的方差分析显示，道德诉求方式主效应显著(M 个体性 = 4.43, M 群体性 = 3.49, M 中性 = 3.90; $F(2, 288) = 16.44$, $p < 0.001$, η 2 = 0.10)，劝捐主体类型的主效应($F(1, 288) = 1.24$, $p = 0.27$)以及两者的交互效应($F(2, 288) = 0.53$, $p = 0.59$)均不显著。以群体性道德基础认同程度为因变量分析表明，道德诉求方式主效应显著(M 个体性 = 3.65, M 群体性 = 4.62, M 中性 = 3.98; $F(2, 288) = 28.02$, $p < 0.001$, η 2 = 0.16)，劝捐主体类型的主效应($F(1, 288) = 0.33$, $p = 0.57$)以及两者的交互效应($F(2, 288) = 0.70$, $p = 0.52$)均不显著。另外，温暖组被试对所介绍慈善机构具有更高温暖知觉(M 温暖 = 5.17, M 能力 = 4.60; $F(1, 288) = 26.21$, $p < 0.001$, η 2 = 0.08)，道德诉求方式($F(2, 288) = 0.50$, $p = 0.61$)及两者的交互效应($F(2, 288) = 0.34$, $p = 0.71$)均不显著；能力组被试对所介绍慈善机构具有更高能力知觉(M 温暖 = 4.64, M 能力 = 5.36; $F(1, 288) = 47.66$, $p < 0.001$, η 2 = 0.14)，道德诉求方式($F(2, 288) = 1.07$, $p = 0.35$)及两者的交互效应($F(2, 288) = 1.50$, $p = 0.23$)均不显著。上述结果表明，本实验的道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型操控成功。

相应的修改内容参见正文 P6【L6~17】；P8【L28~35】。

意见 4.3　When looking at table 1, I find that the pattern for donation amount and response efficacy were consistent with prediction whereas that for self‑efficacy were not. Specifically, the difference in self‑efficacy between individualizing and control appeal should not be significant (5.19 vs. 5.05 respectively). To this extent, the difference in donation amount between these two conditions should not be explained by self‑efficacy.

回应：感谢专家的细致审稿与宝贵意见。在更换了实验 2 的道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型的刺激物材料之后，我们按照严格的程序重新实施了实验 2。根据专家的建议，在纠正了原稿件中的成分混淆、干扰性用词等问题后，新实验的数据结果与我们的假设一致。

相应的修改内容参见正文 P9【L4~31】。

意见 4.4　Related to point 3, the mediation analysis involves a three‑level IV and a two‑level moderator. When using model 8, there could be more than one level of comparison when splitting along the two levels of the moderator. That is, the authors should report further analyses to indicate how each mediator explained the difference between each pair (e.g., binding vs. individualizing, binding vs. control, and individualizing vs. control). Without considering the control appeal condition, the findings basically matched with the theorizing. However, the current findings hinted that there was a drop in self‑efficacy for binding appeal when the fundraiser was warm (i.e., a female), and thus that self‑efficacy may not sufficiently explain the proposed effect. The findings echoed with my speculation concerning the warmth‑individualizing fit discussed in the theory part.

回应：感谢专家的细致审阅及中肯意见。鉴于您的建议，我们从假设推演与实证分析两方面作如下回应：(1)假设推演部分：个体性诉求下的消费者更强调从个体层面出发来考虑问题 (Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013; Winterich, Zhang, & Mittal, 2012)，他们认为成为一个有道

德的人是通过内在道德意识(而非外在群体规范的压力)来实现，因而会更加聚焦于内心对其行为的控制上，引起更高的自我效能(Ajzen, 2002; Judge et al., 2002)。人们所感知到情感性社会支持(emotional social support，如温暖，热情)也能有效增强其自我效能(Aumeboonsuke, 2017; Zhu, Sun, Chang, 2016)。因此，温暖型劝捐主体采用个体性诉求时，消费者对自己能在慈善项目中发挥作用具有更高的期待和信心，即促进自我效能，从而提升劝捐效果(Choi, Krieger, & Hecht, 2013)。(2)实证分析部分：道德诉求方式是一个含三水平的分类变量，在进行中介分析前进行了哑变量编码处理。首先，将中性诉求组作为参照组，设置两个哑变量d1(个体性诉求组编码为 1，其他编码为 0)和d2(群体性诉求组编码为 1，其他编码为 0)。然后，将 d1 作为自变量，自我效能与反应效能作为中介变量，捐赠金额作为因变量，运用Bootstrap 程序(Model 8，选择重复抽取样本量为 5000，偏差校正的非参数百分位法)进行中介检验。结果显示，自我效能的中介作用显著(间接路径效应=-1.81, 95% CI [-3.1636, -0.7763])。道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型的交互项对自我效能产生影响(β = -1.06, t =-3.36, p = 0.009; 95% CI [-1.6846, -0.4392])。在温暖型组中自我效能的中介效应显著(间接路径效应=2.07, 95% CI [1.1901, 3.1386])，而在能力型组中自我效能的中介效应不显著(间接路径效应=0.26, 95% CI [-0.5326, 1.1612])，因此，自我效能是温暖型劝捐主体采用个体性诉求(相比于中性诉求)提升劝捐效果的中间机制。最后，我们将 d2 作为自变量进行中介检验分析，结果显示，反应效能的中介作用显著(间接路径效应=3.17, 95% CI [1.7599, 4.8134])。道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型的交互项对反应效能产生影响(β = 1.14, t =4.28, p < 0.001; 95% CI [0.6217, 1.6574])。在能力型组中反应效能的中介效应显著(间接路径效应=2.84, 95% CI [1.6929, 4.2037])，而在温暖型组中反应效能的中介效应不显著(间接路径效应=-0.33, 95% CI [-1.4134, 0.7505])，因此，反应效能是能力型劝捐主体采用群体性诉求(相比于中性诉求)提升劝捐效果的中间机制。上述结果给假设 H2a 与 H2b 提供了数据支持。

相应的修改内容参见正文 P4【L6~27】；P9【L16~31】。

意见 5　Methodology-Study 3
意见 5.1　Manipulation of appeal type shared some features with other studies like study 1A and 1B. Particularly, the individualizing appeal highlights the importance of warmth and caring in the description "您將成為它們最貼心的呵護使者" which activates concepts related to warmth and thus causing a match with the warm fundraiser. If so, this effect is a priming effect rather than a fit effect.
回应：感谢专家的此点宝贵意见。在梳理已有文献与整合本研究模型的基础上，我们已置换道德诉求刺激材料(可见我们对您意见 2.1、意见 2.2 的回复)，确保道德诉求方式的操纵不干扰劝捐主体类型(即社会知觉)，在此基础上探讨两者对劝捐效果的匹配效应。

相应的修改内容参见正文 P5【L1~7】；P7【L24~29】；P11【L1~5】。

意见 5.2　While the authors reported the significance of interactive effect, it would be better to report in a table particularly when the design was complex.
回应：接受专家宝贵的建议，我们已经在修改稿中绘制了实验 3 所有交互效应的 F 值、显著性的表格，使实验 3 的数据结果更加一目了然。

相应的修改内容可见正文 P12，表 2 和表 3。

意见 5.3　Choice of dependent variable. The measurement of altruistic attribution and attitude towards the company may not be intuitively consistent with donation tendency, particularly for altruistic attribution. Altruistic attribution may not be relevant for donation decisions under the

individualizing appeal condition and/or the high self‑efficacy condition because in these conditions, people are concerned how their contribution to remedy the victim's predicament is easy and whether they can manifest such personal qualities as caring and kind through their donation. I don't know whether the investigation of altruistic attribution helps or hurts the conceptualization.

回应：感谢专家的细致审稿与宝贵意见。关于因变量指标，我们采纳专家的建议，只对购买意愿予以保留，而将其余两个指标(即企业态度和利他归因)予以删除处理。使用购买意愿作为善因营销情境中的因变量指标确实较为普遍(Kim & Johnson, 2013; Samu & Wymer, 2009; 江若尘，郑玲，2017)。感谢您的指正！

*涉及的参考文献：

Kim, J. E. , & Johnson, K. K. P. . (2013). The impact of moral emotions on cause-related marketing campaigns: A cross-cultural examination. Journal of Business Ethics, 112(1), 79-90.

Samu, S., & Wymer, W.. (2009). The effect of fit and dominance in cause marketing communications. Journal of Business Research, 62(4), 432-440.

江若尘，郑玲. (2017). 善因营销的捐赠水平与消费者态度:一个有中介的调节效应模型检验. 心理学报, 49(5), 692-698.

相应的修改内容参见正文 P11【L14~15】；P11【L28~35】。

All in all, the authors conducted four studies in a systematic way to examine the proposed interaction (i.e. the match) between appeal types and fundraiser's characteristics. While the findings provided some converging evidence for the effect and the potential underlying mechanism. The contribution of this manuscript can be significantly enhanced if the authors map their conceptualization on the extant literature better and elaborate particularly more on the mechanism underlying the warmth‑individualizing match and the role of self‑efficacy (or the cognitive appraisal underlying such perception).

I wish the authors best of luck with their research.

_____

第二轮

审稿人 1 意见：

经过修改后的文章在理论框架、概念辨析等方面均取得了一定的进步，在写作逻辑上也更为完善。研究本身具有一定的实践意义和创新意义，但是在实证研究的部分还有一些地方需要完善，在写作中也存在一些错误。以下是一些建议。

回应：非常感谢专家对本研究实践性和创新性的积极评价，同时对我们上一轮修改工作的肯定，并继续提出富有建设性的意见，以帮助文章质量的进一步提升。在本轮评审中，专家主要针对三个实验(即实证部分)分别提出了改进建议。以下，为方便专家审阅，您的修改意见将以分点的方式逐一列出(下划线标出)，随后我们对各条意见进行回应说明，并指明其在修改稿中的具体位置(P 表示页码，L 表示所在页的行数，采用每页重编行号)。

意见 1 参照 Winterich 等(2012)，个体性诉求条目为"这则诉求体现出了关心弱势人群/保护个体权利/避免伤害"($\alpha = 0.72$)；群体性诉求条目为"这则诉求体现出了保护群体利益/履行公民义务/尊重权威" ($\alpha = 0.77$)。单因素方差结果显示，个体性诉求组的被试较为认同个体性道德基础(M 个体性= 4.89, M 群体性= 3.68, M 中性= 4.31; $F(2, 64) = 15.13$, $p < 0.001$, η2 =

0.32)，而群体性诉求组的被试更认同群体性道德基础(M 个体性= 3.78, M 群体性= 5.17, M 中性= 4.47; F(2, 64) = 22.71, p < 0.001, η 2 = 0.41)。如果要得出作者的结论，必须要在 ANOVA 之后加入 Post-hoc Analysis 进行两两比较，只有当作者发现针对个体性诉求条目，个体性组> 群体性组 or 中性组 (在统计学上显著)，作者才可以得到这一结论。对于群体性诉求组条目，同理。但是作者在做完 One-Way ANOVA 之后没有做 Post-hoc Analysis。

回应：感谢专家对此数据分析缺失问题的指正。我们已在修改稿中补充了事后比较(LSD)的内容：个体人道诉求组的被试更认同个体性道德基础(M 个体= 5.10, M 群体= 3.82, M 中性= 4.42; F(2, 55) = 14.96, p < 0.001, η 2 = 0.35)，其中个体人道诉求组显著高于中性诉求组(p = 0.021)，中性诉求组显著高于群体规范诉求组(p = 0.036)。另外，群体规范诉求组的被试更认同群体性道德基础(M 个体= 3.86, M 群体= 5.03, M 中性= 4.36; F(2, 55) = 17.02, p < 0.001, η 2 = 0.38)，其中群体规范诉求组显著高于中性诉求组(p = 0.008)，中性诉求组显著高于个体人道诉求组(p = 0.042)。补充的内容参见正文 P18，L13~18。

意见 2 温暖型简介为 "GH 基金会成立于 2017 年，它为改善儿童的教育和生活现状而倾注热血，它精心呵护属于每个儿童的小世界"；能力型简介为 "GH 基金会成立于 1995 年，截至今年累计接受捐款 140.4 亿元，资助困难学生 574.8 万名，曾获首届中国消除贫困奖及中华慈善奖"。我理解作者根据过去研究来设计材料的意图，但是这样的设计依然存在诸多混淆变量。而且既然作者已经用独立前测来测量道德诉求的作用，但是为什么不另做一个独立前测来证明温暖 vs. 能力知觉操纵的效果，而是要在正式实验中进行？此外，独立前测的另一个好处在于可以通过前测确定该实验中这个温暖 vs 能力知觉的操纵会不会影响到消费者的总体评价/态度。

回应：感谢专家的细致审阅与宝贵意见。为了解决专家的疑虑，我们团队在优化温暖/能力刺激材料的基础上，用新收集的实验 1 数据进行新的结果汇报。具体而言，我们采用不同颜色的倡议书封面进行操纵。Labrecque 和 Milne(2012)的研究指出，色调(hue)会影响人们对品牌个性的判断。其中，黄色会更让人们认为该品牌是真诚的、友好的(即温暖属性)，而蓝色会更让人们认为该品牌是有能力的(即能力属性)。两组封面的其他展示要素(如标题，字体等)均保持一致(见附录 A)。需要说明的是，我们在三个实验中用于温暖/能力的操纵是不同的，包括颜色(实验 1)、照片(实验 2)以及文字(实验 3)，希望通过更换不同的操纵方式，为研究的结论提供较为稳健的证据。修改部分参见正文 P18，L19~24。

关于道德诉求方式进行独立前测的问题，我们是基于这样的考虑：我们参考前人的研究 (如 Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013)设计出不同的道德诉求，但是由于中英文差异等问题，我们不确定这样参考下的刺激材料是否有效，所以想在进行正式实验前先对刺激物进行有效性检验，若通过，我们便将之用于接下来的实验中。这个独立前测的过程是用于确定刺激材料能否用于正式实验的，因而没有干扰到在正式实验中我们对道德诉求方式的测量及其操控检验。另外，在本文的三个正式实验中，我们均采用的操纵变量后测(放在因变量)的方式，以验证核心变量在正式实验中的操控是否成功。相关内容参见正文 P18，L9~18；P18，L28~33；P21，L5~8；P24，L1~4。

*涉及的参考文献：

Labrecque, L. I., & Milne, G. R. (2012). Exciting red and competent blue: The importance of color in marketing. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 40(5), 711-727.

Kidwell, B., Farmer, A., & Hardesty, D. M. (2013). Getting liberals and conservatives to go green: political ideology and congruent appeals. Journal of Consumer Research, 40(2), 350-367.

意见 3 该实验的因变量是捐赠意愿(7 点量表)，但是为何在结果阶段，作者却用捐赠金额来描述研究结果？(例如：温暖组被试具有更高的捐赠金额 blabla)

回应：感谢专家的细致审阅与指正。该问题是作者之前笔误所造成的，我们已经在修改稿中予以纠正。修改细节见正文 P19，L16~29。

意见 4 能力组被试对所介绍慈善机构具有更高能力知觉($M_{温暖}$ = 4.13, $M_{能力}$ = 4.80; $F(1, 288) = 21.07$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta 2 = 0.08$)，道德诉求方式($F(2, 245) = 2.10$, $p = 0.13$)及两者的交互效应($F(2, 245) = 0.44$, $p = 0.64$)均不显著。上述结果表明实验中道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型均操纵有效。为什么里面会出现一个"288"，这和该实验的样本量不符合。

回应：感谢专家的细致审稿与指正意见。在这里的"288"属于笔误，修改稿已经予以改正。由这种失误给专家审阅带来了困扰，我们深感抱歉，为了避免出现类似的问题，作者对所有实验的结果呈现部分进行了仔细检查，力求准确严谨。

意见 5 关于捐款数额的统计。作者有检验过捐款数额的 skewness 吗？如果 highly skewed(不符合正态分布)，应该进行对数转换才能进行分析。

回应：感谢专家的细致审阅与宝贵意见。我们在分析之前对实验 2 中捐赠金额通过偏度判断出该变量的分布与对称的正态分布无显著差异，即捐赠金额数据整体符合正态分布。

意见 6 因变量的测量(购买意愿)阐述太简单，具体条目的例子，量表级数都应该报告。

回应：感谢专家的细致审阅与中肯建议。我们已经在修改稿中补充了因变量(购买意愿)测项的典型条目及量表级数等内容。修改内容参见正文 P23，L33~34。

意见 7 此外，作者在该实验中几乎每个阶段都插入了操纵检验，我理解作者这样做的用意，但是更好的方式应该是在独立的前测中分别测试操纵的有效性，否则整个实验任务并不能真实反映生活中的劝捐场景。如果作者实在要在一个实验中测量这些操纵检验题目，也应该是放在因变量之后，否则实验结果本身存在 demanding effect 的嫌疑。建议作者在几个实验中都能统一采用独立前测，而不是有些操纵或者变量用独立前测，而另一些则直接在正式实验中操纵检验，因为没有任何 justification 支持为什么对于这些变量采用不同的操纵检验模式。祝好运！

回应：感谢专家的细致审阅与独到见解。鉴于您的意见，在本轮修改中，我们对操纵及其检验部分进行了完善与改进。在陈述改动内容之前，希望先借此机会向您解释我们在研究中决定采用或不采用前测的思路：对于不确定能否用在正式实验中的刺激材料，我们会先进行前测，以确保其有效性，而如果采用与先前实验较为类似或与已有研究一致的操纵方式，我们就不采取前测，根据先前研究的方式直接用于正式实验中。例如，在实验 1 中，我们对道德诉求方式采取了前测，原因在于我们并不能确定由英文研究(如 Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013)翻译过来的实验刺激材料是否有效，所以我们想通过一个独立前测来检验其有效性，若操控有效，我们便将之进一步运用到正式的实验中。而实验 1 中的采用黄色/蓝色来操纵温暖/能力，这是与前人研究完全一致的(Labrecque & Milne, 2012)，我们直接将其用于实验 1 中。另外，对于实验 2 中机构代表人物的图片(附录 B)，我们采取前测是为了检验两组图片在吸引力、感知可靠性上有无差异(Wang et al., 2017)。因此，前测的目的都是为了检验我们所选用的刺激材料能否进一步用到正式实验之中，不是用于数据分析部分的操纵检验的。换言之，在本研究中，所有的实验将统一采用在正式实验中对被操控的变量进行测量，且这些测量均放在因变量测量之后，以消除需求效应的嫌疑(正如专家所建议)，也在一定程度上反映较真实的劝捐情境。修改内容参见正文 P20，L33~35；P21，L1~5；P23，L24~34。

*涉及的参考文献：

Kidwell, B., Farmer, A., & Hardesty, D. M. (2013). Getting liberals and conservatives to go green: political ideology and congruent appeals. Journal of Consumer Research, 40(2), 350-367.

Labrecque, L. I., & Milne, G. R. (2012). Exciting red and competent blue: The importance of color in marketing. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 40(5), 711-727.

Wang, Z., Mao, H., Li, Y. J., & Liu, F. (2017). Smile big or not? Effects of smile intensity on perceptions of warmth and competence. Journal of Consumer Research, 43(5), 787-805.
···

审稿人 2 意见：

I greatly appreciate the authors' effort in revising the manuscript thoroughly. In particular, the authors further clarified the conceptualization of the two types of charity appeals and addressed a set of procedural issues by re-running main studies. Now the manuscript is in a better shape. Below please see some suggestions about how the authors could further improve the manuscript.

回应： 非常感谢专家对我们上一轮修改工作的正面评价，并在这次评审中继续提出有助于进一步改进文章的建设性意见！下面，我们将先把您的修改意见用下划线标出，随后对这些意见进行逐条回应，并指明其在修改稿正文中的具体位置(P 表示页码，L 表示所在页的行数，采用每页重编行号)。

意见 1 Conceptualization of charity appeals

In the revised manuscript and responses to the reviewers' comments, authors further explain that (1) the distinction between individualizing appeals and binding appeals derive from Moral Foundation Theory (MFT) and is borrowed from prior research, and (2) this distinction is different from the distinction between independence and interdependence. I totally understand that the focal construct "个体性诉求 vs. 群体性诉求" is directly built on the well-established MFT. Nevertheless, I still feel that the current theorization and operationalization is not clean enough and instead confounded with more than one factors. For example, the message "担起公民的责任，跟大家一起行动起来吧" can be changed to "担起公民的责任，就行动起来吧" without sounding awkward, so that it is more equivalent to "心系贫困山区的孩子们，就行动起来吧." Similar to what I suggested in my comments on the first draft, my recommendation is that the authors frame their appeal construct in a cleaner and less confusing way, such as "care-focused appeal" and "obligation (or norm)-focused appeal" rather than borrowing the construct directly from previous research without any reservations. This is especially important given that the Chinese translation is even more confusing and somewhat misleading. The authors can argue that "care-focused vs. obligation (or norm)-focused appeals" are derived from MFT and actually a refined version of the previously developed MFT-based appeals.

回应： 感谢专家的细致审阅与宝贵意见。关于道德诉求方式实验刺激物的问题，我们已经在本轮修改中予以改进。例如，将"担起公民的责任，跟大家一起行动起来"改为"担起公民的责任，就行动起来吧"(实验 1)，后续的两个实验也对道德诉求的材料进行检查与适当变动，以此确保两种诉求刺激材料的对等性。相应的内容参见正文 P18，L2~8；P20，L21~26；P23，L26~30。另外，关于本文中的 individualizing appeal/binding appeal 的翻译问题，您为我们提供了良好且明确的建议，即定位于 care-focused 诉求与 obligation/norm-focused。综合考虑您的建议与审稿人 3 的意见(意见 1)，本轮修改中，我们统一将"个体性诉求"替换为

"个体人道诉求"，而"群体性诉求"更换为"群体规范诉求"，以便直接明了地体现两种道德诉求的核心要义与内涵，同时在一定程度上避免原翻译带来的混淆和误导的可能性。感谢您的建议！

意见 2 The logic chain regarding the mediating roles of self-efficacy and response efficacy
Study 2 demonstrates the mediating effects of self-efficacy and response efficacy. However, as the authors also noted in the manuscript, the efficacy measures being used are generalized measures rather than measures specific to the focal donation scenario (such as those used as manipulation checks in Study 3). Although it is possible that scenario-specific perceived efficacy may spill over to generalized perceive efficacy that was measured in the study, authors need to make more elaborations to fill this obvious gap in the logic chain.

回应：感谢专家细致的审阅与对该问题的独到见解。关于实验 2 中效能感(测量，独立于慈善捐赠情境)与实验 3 中效能感(操纵，依赖于慈善捐赠情境)之间的实验设置，我们主要参考了 Sharma 和 Morwitz(2016)的观点，其研究中的 Study 1 测量的是 general perceived efficacy，在一定程度上避免被试受慈善机构某些方面(如需求或能力)的干扰，而是直接根据自身的效能感来做出判断(如 p.47 "To avoid manipulating the actual needs and abilities of the charitable organization, we used an experimental manipulation of perceived efficacy that was independent of the charitable context, and that encouraged participants to consider their general ability to take steps to meet their goals.")。这样做确实有优点，但是也具有实践性不足的缺点：对慈善机构而言，他们传达信息是有成本的，这些信息纳入在他们的捐赠诉求之中，即效能感的信息的呈现应不独立于慈善捐赠情境(如 p.48 "In practice, there may be limited opportunities for organizations to encourage their donors to consider times they could accomplish their goals prior to requesting charitable gifts.")。非常感谢专家的此点提议，补充两者之间的逻辑联系陈述能够让实验 2 与实验 3 的关系更为紧凑和连贯。相关修改内容参见正文 P23，L7~9。

*涉及的参考文献：
Sharma, E., & Morwitz, V. (2016). Saving the masses: The impact of perceived efficacy on charitable giving to single vs. multiple beneficiaries. Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 135, 45-54

意见 3 Theorize the moderating roles of self-efficacy and response efficacy clearly
In Study 3, demonstrating the moderating roles of self-efficacy and response efficacy is a more stringent way to reveal the proposed mechanism. Nevertheless, the authors should clearly predict how the efficacy priming would moderate the basic effects in the first place before presenting the results. According to the reported results, the self-efficacy priming turned off/inhibited the response efficacy mechanism in the binding appeal cell in the competence condition, and the response efficacy priming turned off/inhibited the self-efficacy mechanism in the individualizing appeal cell in the warmth condition. The authors should clearly explain the rationale underlying the proposed moderation and specify the moderation patterns beforehand.

回应：感谢专家细致的审阅与中肯意见。根据您的建议，我们进行了以下的补充工作：在汇报实验 3 的结果前，理清这个调节作用之所以产生的基本逻辑，并明确陈述操纵后的自我效能与反应效能如何在道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型对劝捐效果的交互影响中发挥调节作用(i.e., the moderation patterns)。相应修改内容参见正文 P23，L16~18。

意见 4 Direction of comparison in result reporting and data presentation

According to the way the authors propose the hypotheses, donation appeal is the IV, and social perception is the MO (all the hypotheses state how the effects of donation appeals (IV) differ across the warmth and competence conditions (MO)). The result reporting and data presentation of Study 2 should be adjusted to be in line with the direction of the hypotheses.

Specifically, in the result section, "同时，对于温暖型劝捐主体(F(2, 245) = 6.89, p = 0.001, η 2 = 0.05)，采取个体性诉求的劝捐效果(捐赠金额)优于群体性诉求(p = 0.003)与中性诉求(p = 0.001)，群体性诉求与中性诉求劝捐效果无显著差异(p = 0.86)；对于能力型劝捐主体(F(2, 245) = 7.69, p < 0.001, η 2 = 0.06)，采取群体性诉求的劝捐效果优于个体性诉求(p < 0.001)与中性诉求(p = 0.01)，个体性诉求与中性诉求劝捐效果无显著差异(p = 0.23)" should be discussed at the beginning at the paragraph. "具体而言，当采取个体性诉求时，相比于能力组(M = 4.59)，温暖组被试具有更高的捐赠金额(M = 5.79, F(1, 245) = 22.43, p = 0.001, η 2 = 0.08)；当采取群体性诉求时，相比于温暖组(M = 5.00)，能力组被试具有更高的捐赠金额(M = 5.60, F(1, 245) = 4.93, p = 0.027, η 2 = 0.02)；当采取中性诉求时，温暖组与能力组被试的捐赠金额无显著差异(M = 4.95 vs. M =4.91, p = 0.88)" can be discussed as supplementary results later in the paragraph.

In Table 1, the presentations of "道德诉求方式" and "劝捐主体类型" should be swapped in order to be consistent with the direction of hypotheses and data presentation of Figure 1 and Table 3.

回应：感谢专家关于数据结果汇报的具体建议。遵循您的建议，我们调整了您所提及的两部分数据结果的前后顺序，即先呈现在不同的劝捐主体类型之间道各德诉求方式的劝捐效果差异，再补充采用不同道德诉求时各劝捐主体类型获得的效果差异。相关修改内容参见正文P21，L32~35；P22，L1~7。另外，我们调换了表 1 中道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型的位置，使之与研究假设、图 1 和表 2 的数据呈现都保持一致(见正文 P22，表 1)。

意见 5　In the result section of Study 1, the DV should be "捐赠意愿" rather than "捐赠金额." Hope the above suggestions will help.

回应：接受专家的指正意见。我们已经对实验 1 结果汇报中的该笔误予以纠正。修改细节见正文 P19，L16~29。非常感谢专家上述所有富有建设性的修改建议，它们对本文质量的提升，以及作者今后研究水平的提高均提供了有益帮助。
···

审稿人 3 意见：

The revised manuscript improved several areas (e.g., using more refined manipulation, including more manipulation checks, dropping some problematic studies, and using more relevant measures). To help further strengthen the manuscript, this review will focus on new issues raised by the new data/revised theory section and lingering issues brought into clearer relief as a result of the extensive changes made to the manuscript.

回应：非常感谢专家对我们上一轮修改工作的肯定与认可，并在此次评审中继续提出富有建设性的意见，来帮助文章的进一步改进与完善。以下，您的各评审意见将被下划线标出，随后是我们对它们的回复说明及相应修改内容(P 表示页码，L 表示所在页的行数，采用每页重编行号)。

Theory: Introduction / Part 1.1

意见 1　In the introduction, the authors started discussing the importance of their investigation from describing the moral foundation theory (MFT), stereotype content model (SCM), and their

possible interplay in charitable intention. Before such description, the authors should elaborate a bit more about why it is important to use the two types of moral appeals (vs. neutral ones). If not making different moral standards or value salient (individualizing vs. binding), would one essentially be moral? The most basic assumption of this manuscript, I guess, is that people may not realize their moral values unless being told. Highlighting this assumption may help the authors to set up the importance of understanding about the different dimensions of moral values, their relationship with the two types of appeals, and what being lacked in the current manuscript, the relationship between moral values and charitable intentions.

Concerning translation of the two appeal types, I think the current Chinese translation is a bit confusing. I am not sure whether 個體性 and 群體性 is established translation or not. However, these translated terms can be easily mistaken as independent vs. interdependent construal, concerning which there is considerable research having been conducted. Rather than translating these terms literally, I suggest translating them based on their specific implications in this context (e.g., 個人道訴求 vs. 群體責任訴求).

回应：感谢专家细致的审阅与独到的见解。根据您的建议，我们在阐述道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型对劝捐效果的交互影响之前，补充了采用个体人道诉求/群体规范诉求的重要性的相关阐述。具体来说，已有研究表明，消费者的身份定位影响其后续的捐赠决策与行为(Winterich, Mittal, & Ross, 2009)。在具体的捐赠情境中，消费者对自身的身份定位是具有可塑性的，道德诉求是改变消费者所感知的"身份"的有效方式之一(Winterich, Zhang, & Mittal, 2012)。在本研究中，个体人道诉求与群体规范诉求，分别主张人们应基于"个体身份"还是"群体身份"来考虑捐助，而劝捐主体所采取的诉求应该与其自身特点相契合，才能发挥良好的效果(Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013; Winterich, Zhang, & Mittal, 2012)。相应的补充内容参见正文 P14，L20~21；P15，L16~17。另一方面，关于文中两种道德诉求 individualizing appeal/binding appeal 的翻译问题，我们非常赞同您的观点，此观点与审稿人 2 的修改建议(意见 1)也是较为吻合的。经团队讨论与探讨，我们决定，在本轮修改中，摒弃原先"字对字"的生硬翻译方式，统一将"个体性诉求"替换为"个体人道诉求"，而"群体性诉求"更换为"群体规范诉求"，以便直接、明确地体现两种道德诉求的核心要义与内涵，且在一定程度上避免原先翻译(即个体性诉求 vs.群体性诉求)带来混淆和误导的可能性。

*涉及的参考文献：

Winterich, K., Mittal, V., & Ross, W. (2009). Donation behavior toward ingroups and outgroups: The role of gender and moral identity. Journal of Consumer Research,36(2), 199–214.

Winterich, K. P., Zhang, Y., & Mittal, V. (2012). How political identity and charity positioning increase donations: Insights from moral foundations theory. International Journal of Research in Marketing, 29(4), 346-354.

Kidwell, B., Farmer, A., & Hardesty, D. M. (2013). Getting liberals and conservatives to go green: political ideology and congruent appeals. Journal of Consumer Research, 40(2), 350-367.

Theory: Part 1.2 and 1.3

意见 2 The authors sought to base their theorization on the effectiveness of persuasion. That is, the effectiveness of a donation appeal depends how the appeal is constructed and conveys its message. Concerning persuasiveness specifically, one critical consideration is the fit between the appeal type (individualizing vs. binding) and the characteristics of the fundraiser (warmth vs. competence, respectively). Concerning the concept of fit, there is considerable research (e.g., Gain/Loss [Rothman, Martino, et al. 1999]; regulatory fit [Aaker and Lee 2006; Cesario et al. 2008]) having been done. The authors should acquire some insights from these works on the

possible "fit" mechanism, or at least, should acknowledge these works in their paper.

回应：感谢专家细致的审阅与中肯意见。之前由于考虑到《心理学报》的"问题提出"部分的字数限制于 3500 以内，我们对这部分内容作了省略处理，但我们也承认，该内容的阐述确实非常有必要和重要的，因此，遵循您的建议，我们在修改稿中增加了关于匹配效应对信息说服效果的影响的已有研究：实质上，劝捐也是一种信息说服过程，其效果取决于诉求信息如何被信息接收者有效吸收。以往大量的实证研究证实了当信息的内容或框架与信息接收者的认知、情感或动机等特征相匹配时，说服效果更佳(Uskul, Sherman, & Fitzgibbon, 2009)。例如，当信息内容与个体的调节聚焦(Cesario, Grant, & Higgins, 2004)、政治取向(Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013)、道德认同(Winterich, Mittal, & Ross, 2009)相匹配时，信息更具说服力。相应的修改内容参见正文 P16，L1~4。

*涉及的参考文献：

Uskul, A. K., Sherman, D. K., & Fitzgibbon, J. (2009). The cultural congruency effect: Culture, regulatory focus, and the effectiveness of gain- vs. loss-framed health messages. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45(3), 535-541.

Cesario, J., Grant, H., & Higgins, E. T. (2004). Regulatory fit and persuasion: Transfer from "feeling right". Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86(3), 388-404.

Kidwell, B., Farmer, A., & Hardesty, D. M. (2013). Getting liberals and conservatives to go green: political ideology and congruent appeals. Journal of Consumer Research, 40(2), 350-367.

Winterich, K., Mittal, V., & Ross, W. (2009). Donation behavior toward ingroups and outgroups: The role of gender and moral identity. Journal of Consumer Research,36(2), 199–214.

意见 3 Looking into the mechanism more specifically, the arguments in regarded to the individualizing appeal and warmth in 1.2 and 1.3 seem to be not quite consistent. In 1.2, the authors highlight individualizing appeal stresses internalized moral values "from heart" and thus people are appealed to someone being similar with them. In 1.3, the authors highlight social warmth as social support, a kind of psychological resources, and given heightened support, people feel themselves having more efficacies. These arguments are not conceptually coherent and may lead to different predictions (see my comments under study 2).

回应：感谢专家细致的审阅与宝贵意见。为了更好地阐述道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型对劝捐效果交互影响的中间机制(即自我效能和反应效能)，我们对第 1 章的 1.3 小节进行了调整与改写，使之与第 1.2 小节的论证内容更为一致。其中，我们去除了与社会支持相关的文献(因为用其作为推理依据略欠贴切，正如专家言)，保持与第 1.2 小节一致的观点。具体而言，个体人道诉求唤起了人们基于个体的层面来考虑道德行为，它在某种程度上是一种价值驱动(value-driven)的诉求，即仁慈、关怀等内在价值的驱动(Zhu et al., 2017)。当人们更多地聚焦于内心准则对其行为的控制时，往往对自己的行为更有信心，即具有较高的自我效能(Ajzen, 2002; Judge et al., 2002)。温暖型劝捐主体倾向于唤醒人们善意、真诚、慷慨等动机，使得人们相信自己能通过某种行为(如捐款)而发挥作用的信念更加凸显。换言之，当劝捐主体被感知为高温暖时，消费者对自己能在慈善项目中发挥作用具有更高的期待和信心，即促进自我效能，而这种自我效能将促进人们采取捐赠行动，从而提升劝捐效果(Choi, Krieger, & Hecht, 2013)。相应的修改内容参见正文 P17，L11~18。

*涉及的参考文献：

Zhu, L., He, Y., Chen, Q., & Hu, M. (2017). It' s the thought that counts: The effects of construal level priming and

donation proximity on consumer response to donation framing. Journal of Business Research, 76, 44-51.

Kidwell, B., Farmer, A., & Hardesty, D. M. (2013). Getting liberals and conservatives to go green: political ideology and congruent appeals. Journal of Consumer Research, 40(2), 350-367.

Winterich, K. P., Zhang, Y., & Mittal, V. (2012). How political identity and charity positioning increase donations: Insights from moral foundations theory. International Journal of Research in Marketing, 29(4), 346-354.

Ajzen, I. (2002). Perceived behavioral control, self-efficacy, locus of control, and the theory of planned behavior. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32(4), 665-683.

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E., & Thoresen, C.J. (2002). Are measures of self-esteem, neuroticism, locus of control, and generalized self-efficacy indicators of a common core construct? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83(3), 693-710.

Choi, H. J., Krieger, J. L., & Hecht, M. L. (2013). Reconceptualizing efficacy in substance use prevention research: Refusal response efficacy and drug resistance self-efficacy in adolescent substance use. Health Communication, 28(1), 40-52.

意见 4 In fact, the proposed mediating role of efficacy perceptions is still not clear enough not only because of the issues raised above but also because of the lack of consideration of alternative accounts. For example, for either individualizing or binding appeals, people may just feel more "right" when encountering a warmer or more competent fundraiser. Feeling right (as a result of the fit between moral values and fundraiser's characteristics) is a quite established account for fit effects. Besides, it is possible that for individualizing appeal, people may not intuitively have the moral values of being kind and warm but such values are made salient when encountering a warm fundraiser. Such encounter evokes their caring standards and leads them to be more altruistic. As for binding appeals which concerns obligations, the encounter of a competent fundraiser may evoke the idea of "the more power and ability, the more responsibilities" which matches with the normative expectations. Notwithstanding the presence of evidence of mediating role of efficacy perceptions, the authors did not explain why using efficacy perceptions is most relevant and better than other parsimonious accounts.

回应：感谢专家细致的审阅与独到见解。我们仔细斟酌了您的建议，并对此作了新的反思与改进。已有文献记载着感知正确性(feeling-right，如 Cesario, Grant, & Higgins, 2004; Ran, Wei, & Li, 2016)、卷入度(involvement，如 Wheeler, Petty, & Bizer, 2005)等均有可能随着匹配效应而产生。根据专家的意见，在新实验 2 中增加了对它们的测量与检验。测量方法、典型测项及检验结果等已经在正文中详细汇报。除了假设推演，选用效能感作为中间解释机制还出于以下的考虑：从理论方面来看，大量的已有研究已经探讨了诸如 feeling-right 等变量在匹配效应中发挥的作用，我们的研究更希望不仅能提供一种易于劝捐主体操控的中介变量，也同时为劝说领域的匹配效应提供一种新的解释视角。越来越多的研究表明，不同类型的效能在决定人们的行为倾向中起着关键的作用(Casey et al., 2009; Han, Duhachek, & Agrawal, 2016)。在慈善捐赠倡议中启动或激发消费者的自我效能(i.e., belief in one's ability to perform a behavior)与反应效能(i.e., belief that a response will be effective)应是至关重要的。从数据方面来看，以替代性解释 feeling-right 为例，本研究(实验 2)中的道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型相匹配时确实可以提升 feeling-right，然而，虽然温暖组中的个体人道诉求(β = 0.90, t = 3.12, p = 0.002, LLCI = 0.3338, ULCI = 1.4724)与能力组中的群体规范诉求(β = 0.61, t = 2.11, p = 0.035, LLCI = 0.0421, ULCI = 1.1743)均增强了 feeling-right，但这种匹配无法通过 feeling-right 的提高而引起捐赠金额的增加，中介效应不显著(间接路径效应 = -0.23, 95% CI [-0.5016, 0.3447])。综上，我们基于理论方面和数据方面认为自我效能与反应效能可作为本研究效应

一种较为合理且重要的解释机制。具体内容可参见正文 P21，L13~16；P22，L17~22。

*涉及的参考文献：

Cesario, J., Grant, H., & Higgins, E. T. (2004). Regulatory fit and persuasion: Transfer from "feeling right". Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86(3), 388-404.

Ran, Y., Wei, H., & Li, Q. (2016). Forgiveness from emotion fit: Emotional frame, consumer emotion, and feeling-right in consumer decision to forgive. Frontiers in Psychology, 7(1775), 1−16.

Kidwell, B., Farmer, A., & Hardesty, D. M. (2013). Getting liberals and conservatives to go green: Political ideology and congruent appeals. Journal of Consumer Research, 40(2), 350-367.

Wheeler, S., Petty, R., & Bizer, G. (2005). Self‑schema matching and attitude change: Situational and dispositional determinants of message elaboration. Journal of Consumer Research, 31(4), 787-797.

Casey, M. K. , Timmermann, L. , Allen, M. , Krahn, S. , & Turkiewicz, L. P. . (2009). Response and self-efficacy of condom use: A meta-analysis of this important element of AIDs education and prevention. Southern Communication Journal, 74(1), 57-78.

Han, D. H., Duhachek, A., & Agrawal, N. (2016). Coping and construal level matching drives health message effectiveness via response efficacy or self-efficacy enhancement. Journal of Consumer Research, 43(3): 429-447.

Studies: Study 2

意见 5 The items of efficacy perceptions are not specific to the donation context. It is rather surprising there is interaction effect rather than a main effect of fundraiser's characteristics. Based on the proposed mechanism, warmth provides some sort of social support which in turns boosts self-efficacy. If so, we should expect self-efficacy increases under all warmth (vs. competence) conditions while it mediates only the effect of appeal types when warm fundraiser was involved. Given the observed effects, the link between social support and self-efficacy was not fully clear, nor did it explain the pattern sufficiently.

回应：感谢专家细致的审阅与中肯建议。此点意见与您的意见 3 相关联，主要的问题在于社会支持与自我效能的关系能不能成为本研究中道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型交互作用的推导依据。经专家指点与团队探讨，在修改稿中我们去掉了与社会支持相关的文献，并重新撰写了关于自我效能中介机制的推导部分。修改内容参见正文 P17，L11~18。

意见 6 There were problems in the mediation analyses: First, more updated version of PROCESS allows using a categorical IV more than two levels. The authors can make use of the new version for more user-friendly analyses. Alternatively, two dummy variables are generated from a three-level categorical IV and both need to enter the model simultaneously for accurate analysis. That is, when putting d1 as IV, d2 has to be included as a covariate. Second, rather than reporting the bootstrapping effect of the interaction, the authors should report the pattern of each mediator based on their ANOVA analyses for clarity. If not, they should put superscript to indicate the simple effects on the table. Third, based on the current reporting, I am not sure if the two efficacy perceptions were entered to the model *simultaneously*. When putting both together at the same time, the results can be quite different than when putting one each time. Current presentation is confusing because the statistics reporting can hardly be matched with the given dummy intuitively. Besides, the author should make it more clear how they segregate the analyses (e.g., splitting the cells either by appeal types or by fundraiser's characteristics) and not just

mentioned how the dummy was coded. Overall, the bootstrapping model was not stated clearly enough. The presentation of mediation analyses was mixed with what supposed to be presented in ANOVA. Everything adding together makes it a bit difficult to understand.

回应：感谢专家细致的审阅与宝贵建议。关于该实验中的中介检验分析部分，我们根据您的具体建议重新进行了汇报，汇报的要点整体如下：第一，我们采用最新版的 PROCESS 插件进行分析；第二，我们在表 1 中以上标的形式补充注明了差异分析的结果；第三，我们同时将自我效能与反应效能置于模型之中进行分析和汇报，第四，阐明是根据道德诉求方式还是根据劝捐主体类型来分析各组数据。具体阐述参见正文 P22，L8~17；表 1。

Studies: Study 3

意见 7 First, please indicate the simple effect (contrast between cells) with superscript on the table. I understand the constraints in length that the authors cannot report everything in details. For a more comprehensive understanding, readers need to know which cell is significantly different from another especially when the design is rather complicated.

回应：感谢专家细致的审阅与实用建议。我们已经进行了相应的数据分析，并在表 2 中补充了相应的结果(上标形式)。具体改动内容参见正文 P24，表 2。

意见 8 Second, the manipulation of efficacy type was not clear. Did the participants elaborate on or read something? Please clarify. The rationale I ask is that predictions can vary depending on what were primed among the mind of participants in the self-efficacy conditions when they saw a competent fundraiser. Suppose the manipulation of self-efficacy focus narrowed the basis of donation decision to the perceptions of one having ability specific to the context. For individualizing appeals, people may in one case think another person's ability may not matter to their decisions. Then there should not be any difference for the competent fundraiser under the self-efficacy group than the response-efficacy group. However, donation decreased directionally in the current case (3.46 vs. 3.83). This potential difference caught my attention. In another case, participants may draw attention to their own competence when seeing another competent person. Such attention should increase altruistic inclination among those who are essentially more competent as a result of realization "the more ability, the more obligations." Putting these specific arguments aside, I love the idea of using moderation in validating a potential mechanism yet am not sure if the current manipulation is clear and sufficient enough to confirm the mechanism.

回应：感谢专家细致的审阅与宝贵建议。对于实验操纵材料的描述不够清晰这个问题，我们已予以补充。在实验 3 中，我们主要参考了前人的研究(如 Han, Duhachek, & Agrawal, 2016)对被试进行两种不同效能感的操纵(以阅读的形式)。对于自我效能组，被试所阅读的内容为"助力环保事业其实非常简单，您可以轻易实现！"；对于反应效能组，阅读内容为"募捐是助力环保事业的有效方式，具有良好的效果！"。相应的内容参见 P23，L30~33。

*涉及的参考文献：

Han, D. H., Duhachek, A., & Agrawal, N. (2016). Coping and construal level matching drives health message effectiveness via response efficacy or self-efficacy enhancement. Journal of Consumer Research, 43(3): 429-447.

The current manuscript has significantly improved in terms of both theorizing and evidence. The new studies consistently replicated the proposed effect of appeal types and fundraiser's

characteristics. While I am confident with this basic effect, the conceptualization should be further streamlined. The authors may need to rethink the choice of process and the importance of basing the effect on different types of efficacy perceptions. Moreover, despite the presented evidence for the role of efficacy perceptions, I am not very certain and comfortable to believe the proposed process given the confusion and missing links in the proposed mechanism. Anyway, well done and good luck.

<div align="center">第三轮</div>

审稿人 1 意见：

修改后的文章在理论和实证部分均得到了一定的强化，但还是有一些细节需要完善。最后提出一些意见。

回应：非常感谢专家对我们上一轮修改工作的肯定，并继续提出富有建设性的意见，以帮助文章质量的进一步提升。以下，专家审阅中关于一些细节的改进意见将以分点的方式逐一列出(下划线标出)，随后我们对各条意见进行回应说明，并指明其在修改稿中的具体位置(P 表示页码，L 表示所在页的行数，采用每页重编行号)。

意见 1 实验 1 部分："题项如"我愿意为该公益项目捐款"(r = 0.90，p < 0.001; 1 = 完全不，7 = 非常)" 作者应该阐明因变量题目数量以及信度。

回应：感谢专家的细致审稿与宝贵意见。针对这一点，我们已在修改稿中补充了相应的内容。修改的内容参见本文档 P53，L30~32。

意见 2 实验 1 数据分析部分，在操纵检验的地方作者依然只放了 f 检验结果，却没有放入 planned contrast （如：M 个体 = 4.68, M 群体 = 3.53, M 中性 = 4.12; F (2, 231) = 21.54, p < 0.001, η 2 = 0.16）同样的问题出现在实验 2 和实验 3 中。

回应：感谢专家的细致审稿与宝贵意见。我们在修改稿中汇报了缺失的事后比较的结果。以实验 1 为例："对于个体性道德基础，道德诉求方式主效应显著(M 个体性 = 4.68, M 群体性 = 3.53, M 中性 = 4.12; F(2, 231) = 21.54, p < 0.001, η 2 = 0.16)，其中个体人道诉求组显著高于中性诉求组(p = 0.001)，中性诉求组显著高于群体规范诉求组(p = 0.002)。劝捐主体类型的主效应(F(1, 231) = 1.93, p = 0.16)以及两者的交互效应(F(2, 231) = 0.34, p = 0.71)均不显著。对于群体性道德基础，道德诉求方式主效应显著(M 个体性 = 3.56, M 群体性 = 4.51, M 中性 = 4.02; F(2, 231) = 11.78, p < 0.001, η 2 = 0.09)，其中群体规范诉求组显著高于中性诉求组(p = 0.010)，中性诉求组显著高于个体人道诉求组(p = 0.024)。劝捐主体类型的主效应(F(1, 231) = 0.61, p = 0.44)以及两者的交互效应(F(2, 231) = 0.55, p = 0.58)均不显著。"我们对实验 2 和 3 也进行了相应的补充。具体内容参见本文档 P54，L10~18(实验 1)；P56，L28~34(实验 2)及 P59，L13~17(实验 3)。

意见 3 作者应该将捐赠金额的 skewness 检验放入正文中而不仅仅是呈现在 response letter 里，这样读者才会更加了解数据原始性质。

回应：感谢专家的细致审稿与宝贵意见。我们已经在修改稿中呈现了捐赠金额的 skewness 检验的结果，以便读者更好地了解数据性质。修改的内容参见本文档 P57，L4~5。

审稿人 3 意见：
　　There have been continuous improvements in the manuscript throughout the review process. The current framework is more coherent than before. The authors have gathered evidence to prove the existence of the proposed effect of appeal type and donor characteristics. Despite the evidence, the underlying mechanism build on self‑ and response efficacy remains unclear both theoretically and empirically.

回应：非常感谢专家对我们上一轮修改工作的正面评价！同时感谢您在这次评审中继续提出有助于进一步改进文章的观点与意见。下面，我们将先把您的修改意见用下划线标出，随后对这些意见进行逐条回应，并指明其在修改稿正文中的具体位置(P 表示页码，L 表示所在页的行数，采用每页重编行号)。

意见 1　Role of self‑efficacy in explaining the effect concerning individualizing appeal

The authors proposed a "value‑driven" mechanism that individualizing appeal draws people attention to some desirable values such as being kind and caring, and these salience values may alter how people perceive their ability to help the needy. The missing link lies in what exactly the salient value shapes. In the current conceptualization, the authors argued that salient values would be sufficient to alter how one perceive themselves as being able to take steps to help and such perception would be strengthened when the donor is warm rather than competent. First, I wonder if making caring values salient is sufficient to alter one' self perceptions. Although I can imagine people would use those values as a basis for decision and judgment, whether this would boost one's self efficacy is not clear. Second, it is ambiguous how warmth comes into the play. When people base their decision on warmth‑related qualities, they may find a warm donor more capable to take proper steps. They may not necessarily generalize such judgment for evaluating their own ability to take the steps. There is a nuance difference between the donor and the helper. It is possible that the appeal recipients (donor) consider the charity (helper) as an agent and would like to donate when they perceive the agent as more capable. In theory, such attribution concerns whether proper steps can be taken to help. This echoes with the definition of self‑efficacy. Yet in this case, we should not conceptualize it as "self" efficacy because it is an evaluation on the charity and not the appeal recipients themselves. The authors should highlight in their theorization that concerning the warmth route, it involves the efficacy perception (which resembles and may lead to self‑efficacy) of the charity as an agent of oneself having the ability to take proper steps in caring the needy. More precisely, the authors cannot directly equate such perceptions to self-efficacy without more detailed elaboration.

回应：非常感谢专家的细致审稿与宝贵意见。我们团队认真消化、琢磨和理解专家对"温暖型劝捐主体"中"个体人道诉求——自我效能——劝捐效果"路径的相关疑问后，很认同专家的建议，即有必要在文中就"自我效能"的相关路径做进一步的阐明，以厘清该路径中各变量之间的潜在联系，主要基于如下的考虑：捐赠者往往都不是直接帮助到有需要的人的，而是通过劝捐主体(如慈善机构)来帮助有需要的人，在这里，劝捐主体起到了一个中间操作手的作用。换而言之，在慈善捐赠情境下，人们往往是"借"劝捐主体之手，"行"捐赠者之善。当个体决定执行某种行为时，对自身执行力的评估与对目标实现有效性的评估影响着后续的行动(Choi, Krieger, & Hecht, 2013; Keller, 2006)。在人们进行捐赠行为时，会考虑到"我"在这次的捐赠中能发挥怎样的作用？"我"是否能帮助到那些需要帮助的人？我们认为，由于捐赠者并不是直接将钱交到受惠者手里，而是通过劝捐主体作为一个代理人角色来完成捐赠，在某种程度上捐赠者对劝捐主体帮助到所需之人的信心或信念会投射到自己身上。以往

研究发现，由于物质(如金钱)是个人能力和权力的一种展现，慈善捐赠会让人们觉得自己更有能力、更有信心(Gershon & Cryder, 2018; Langan & Kumar, 2019; Zhu et al., 2017)。我们推测，慈善捐赠所引起的自我效能感会在温暖型劝捐主体展示个体人道诉求时更为凸显。Zhu等(2017)的研究提出的两种捐赠诉求策略，努力导向策略(effort-oriented strategy)与能力导向策略(ability-oriented strategy)，其中前者就重在表现出慈善机构的努力和用心。当慈善机构发出努力、用心的信号时，会提升人们对其执行结果的评价，认为它更有可能帮助到所需之人，而当捐赠者借其之手、行己之善时会将这种效能感投射在自己身上，即具有更高的自我效能感(Krishnan, Netemeyer, & Boles, 2002)。温暖型劝捐主体本身可以唤醒人们善意、真诚、慷慨等动机，若采取努力导向策略会更容易引发消费者基于"价值驱动"(如 being kind or caring)层面来进行判断与决策，这与个体人道诉求(相比于群体规范诉求)唤起人们基于个体的层面来考虑道德行为相得益彰，也进一步增强了自我效能，因此，对本研究而言，当消费者知觉劝捐主体为温暖型时，采取个体人道诉求(vs.群体规范诉求)方式使人们相信自己能通过某种行为(即捐款)而发挥作用的信念(自我效能)更为凸显，进而对提升劝捐效果更有效。我们已修缮相应的假设推演部分，具体修改的内容参见本文档 P51，L5~18。

*涉及的参考文献：

Choi, H. J., Krieger, J. L., & Hecht, M. L. (2013). Reconceptualizing efficacy in substance use prevention research: Refusal response efficacy and drug resistance self-efficacy in adolescent substance use. Health Communication, 28(1), 40-52.

Keller, P. A. (2006). Regulatory focus and efficacy of health messages. Journal of Consumer Research, 33(1), 109-114.

Zhu, L., He, Y., Chen, Q., & Hu, M. (2017). It's the thought that counts: The effects of construal level priming and donation proximity on consumer response to donation framing. Journal of Business Research, 76(7), 44-51.

Krishnan, B. C., Netemeyer, R. G., & Boles, J. S. (2002). Self-efficacy, competitiveness, and effort as antecedents of salesperson performance. Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 22(4), 285-295.

Langan, R., & Kumar, A. (2019). Time versus money: The role of perceived effort in consumers' evaluation of corporate giving, Journal of Business Research, 99(6), 44-51.

Gershon, R., Cryder, C. (2018). Goods Donations Increase Charitable Credit for Low-Warmth Donors. Journal of Consumer Research, 45(2): 451–469.

意见 2 Operationalized definitions of the two types of efficacy

The authors based their conceptualization of efficacy perceptions on Keller (2006) as well as Sharma and Morwitz (2016). These researchers differentiated efficacy perceptions into two types, one concerning whether people can take the steps (perceived ease) and another concerning whether the steps taken are effective in achieving the goals (perceived effectiveness). This research gathered process evidence in two studies. In study 2 (p.21), the authors measured the perceptions (general) and examined whether the perceptions could mediate the proposed effect. In study 3 (p. 23), they manipulated the perceptions(context－specific) and examined the mechanism by moderation. With reference to the cited literature, the operationalization of efficacy perceptions in study 3 is more coherent in terms of face validity and context specificity, but that in study 2 seems to be too general and vague to produce an effect. Unlike control perception, efficacy perceptions are usually more specific to a context. When exposing to a warm (competent) charity under an individualizing (binding) appeal, I wonder if this is sufficient to boost one's belief in the ease to take steps (response effectiveness) in all aspects even not tying to the donation context.

Honestly, I am so surprised to see the empirical evidence. Rather than considering these measures as indication of the psychological mechanism underling the proposed effect, I wonder if the effect on these perceptions would be a result of positive self‑regards arising from making effective donation. Furthermore, the current translation of the efficacy perception lacks face validity and not so consistent with the construct defined by either Keller or Sharma and Morwitz.

回应：非常感谢专家的细致审稿与宝贵意见。专家的深刻见解增进了我们对实验 2 中两种不同类型效能感(自我效能与反应效能)测量的进一步思考。在实验 2 中，我们测量了被试自然状态下的两种效能感，一种是 perceived ease 即达成某种目标的容易程度；另一种则是 perceived effectiveness 即所采取的措施对实现目标的有效性(Keller, 2006; Han, Duhachek, & Agrawal, 2016)，在阐述本次修改内容之前，请允许我们先解释一下上一稿中如此操作的一些考虑：(1)参考了 Sharma 和 Morwitz(2016)的研究，测量自然状态下个体的效能感在一定程度上避免操纵其他因素(如慈善机构能力等)，见 p.47 "…To avoid manipulating the actual needs and abilities of the charitable organization, we used an experimental manipulation of perceived efficacy that was independent of the charitable context, and that encouraged participants to consider their general ability to take steps to meet their goals…"。(2)我们考虑到人们总体的效能感(general efficacy)会有一定的"放射性"，总体自我效能感高可能意味着对自己执行目标能力的信心越强，总体反应效能感高可能意味着地项目结果效果的判断也趋向积极(Bandura, 1982; Block & Keller, 1997; Sharma & Morwitz, 2016)，因此此前预期自我效能高的个体对自己在慈善捐赠中的能力和实现目标的容易程度也较高，而反应效能较高的个体对慈善捐赠项目的有效性具有更高的评估。尽管有基于以上两点的考虑和缘由，我们也认为专家对此点的疑虑是非常合理的，为了解决这一疑虑，我们重新实施了实验 2，并采取测量 context‑specific 的自我效能和反应效能：自我效能的条目为"我对自己实现本次捐赠的目的很有信心"和"我认为实现捐赠的目的是容易的"(1 = 非常不同意，7 = 非常同意; r = 0.69, p < 0.001)；反应效能的条目为"本次捐赠的结果能产生影响"和"本次捐赠的结果会是有效的"(1 = 非常不认同，7 = 非常认同; r = 0.75, p < 0.001)。在新一版本的修改稿中，我们相应地在实验程序、数据分析与结果部分更新了相关内容。修改的内容参见本文档 P56，L18~22；P57，L18~26。

*涉及的参考文献：

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. American Psychologist, 37(2), 122-147

Block, L. G., & Keller, P. A. (1997). Effects of self-efficacy and vividness on the persuasiveness of health communications. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 6(1), 31-54.

Han, D. H., Duhachek, A., & Agrawal, N. (2016). Coping and construal level matching drives health message effectiveness via response efficacy or self-efficacy enhancement. Journal of Consumer Research, 43(3): 429-447.

Keller, P. A. (2006). Regulatory focus and efficacy of health messages. Journal of Consumer Research, 33(1), 109-114.

Sharma, E., & Morwitz, V. (2016). Saving the masses: The impact of perceived efficacy on charitable giving to single vs. multiple beneficiaries. Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 135, 45-54.

意见 3 Alternative accounts

In study 2, the authors sought to explore the effect of alternative accounts including "feeling‑right" and involvement. Several considerations should be noted. First, the authors did not report the ANOVA analysis for these constructs. Neither did they report the mean pattern on the table. They highlighted in the review letter that there were some effects on "feeling right" measure.

Without the details, I cannot make a judgment if these accounts have been properly addressed. More importantly, the authors conceptualized the feeling right account as the extent to which the appeal recipients think that their donation is "right" (i.e. morally desirable). What I mentioned in the previous round of review is that "feeling right" refers to the fit (subjective fluency) of the match between the appeal type and the charity character. These concepts are rather distinct in theory. To this extent, study 2 could not really provide insights for the role of the fit account. Despite this, the authors probed into mood in study 1. Those mood measures would be a better indication of whether the appeal recipients feel fluent and "right" upon the exposure to the appeal. Analyses on these mood measures may potentially address the fit account. Again, the authors did not report the statistics and deter me from understanding whether the fit account is sufficient or not.

回应：感谢专家的细致审稿与宝贵意见。非常抱歉上一稿由于学报的篇幅限制未能全面汇报关于被排除的解释变量的一些内容，对专家审稿造成了不便。在本轮修改中，我们根据专家的建议，作出了以下两大方面的调整：一是实验 2 中的感知正确性(feeling right)测项的更换，正如专家所说"feeling right refers to the fit (subjective fluency) of the match between the appeal type and the charity character"，新实验的数据分析结果已在修改稿中进行汇报；二是根据专家建议补充其它相关数据的分析与展示。主要补充工作如下：

(1) 对实验 2 中感知正确性进行 ANOVA 分析，结果显示，道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型对感知正确性的交互影响不显著($F(2, 237) = 2.27, p > 0.10$)，各组均值情况如下：个体人道诉求组 M 温暖= 4.58, SD =1.24 vs. M 能力= 4.05, SD = 1.25；群体规范诉求组 M 温暖= 4.05, SD =1.26 vs. M 能力= 4.27, SD =1.10；中性诉求组 M 温暖= 3.98, SD =1.29 vs. M 能力= 4.13, SD =1.17。中介检验显示，无论在个体人道诉求组(95% CI [-0.5381, 0.4397])还是在群体规范诉求组(95% CI [-0.2563, 0.2199])中感知正确性中介效应均不成立(区间包含 0)。

(2) 对实验 2 中卷入度进行 ANOVA 分析，结果显示道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型对卷入度的交互影响不显著($F(2, 237) = 1.02, p > 0.30$)，各组均值情况如下：个体人道诉求组 M 温暖= 3.74, SD =1.50 vs. M 能力= 4.18, SD = 1.61；群体规范诉求组 M 温暖= 3.44, SD =1.33 vs. M 能力= 3.90, SD =1.43；中性诉求组 M 温暖= 3.96, SD =1.53 vs. M 能力= 3.84, SD =1.48。中介检验表明，无论是在个体人道诉求组(95% CI [-0.3076, 1.2917])还是在群体规范诉求组(95% CI [-0.2450, 1.2477])卷入度中介效应均不显著(区间包含 0)。

(3) 对实验 1 中的积极情绪和消极情绪进行 ANOVA 分析。PA(积极情绪)：道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型对积极情绪的交互影响不显著($p > 0.20$)，各组均值情况如下：个体人道诉求组 M 温暖= 3.89, SD =1.38 vs. M 能力= 4.10, SD = 1.19；群体规范诉求组 M 温暖= 4.07, SD =1.06 vs. M 能力= 4.37, SD =1.11；中性诉求组 M 温暖= 4.40, SD =1.04 vs. M 能力= 4.40, SD =1.09。NA(消极情绪)：道德诉求方式与劝捐主体类型对积极情绪的交互影响不显著($p > 0.50$)，各组均值情况如下：个体人道诉求组 M 温暖= 4.27, SD =1.44 vs. M 能力= 4.10, SD = 1.29；群体规范诉求组 M 温暖= 4.10, SD =1.28 vs. M 能力= 3.89, SD =1.23；中性诉求组 M 温暖= 4.14, SD =1.07 vs. M 能力= 3.88, SD =1.04。我们希望这些辅助分析能帮助解决专家的此点疑虑，我们同时绘制了一个新的表格展示这些数据放于附录之中供读者参考。针对意见 3 相关的修改的内容参见本文档 P56，L22~23；P57，L26~30；P66，L4~6。

意见 4 Minor issues
a) The superscript on the tables is not properly marked.
b) The organization of table 1 can be improved (following the structure of table 2).
c) Please report the mean pattern and statistics for all measures (e.g., mood in study 1, feeling

right and involvement in study 2).

回应：感谢专家的细致审稿与宝贵意见。我们在修改稿中已经对这三点问题予以修正：(1)上角标 a,b 表示两组均值的差异达到显著水平(p < 0.05)，见表 1 和表 2；(2)参照表 2 的样式完善表 1；(3)汇报实验 1 中积极情绪和消极情绪、实验 2 中感知正确性和卷入度的均值和标准差等数据。修改内容参见本文档 P57；P59 及 P66。希望能解决专家的疑虑。

The empirical evidence is stronger and more coherent in this package. The manipulation and design are cleaner. Still, the comments concerning the theorization is not minor and it demands proper attention in re‑conceptualizing. However, I believe the abovementioned issues are addressable. Good luck.

_____

第四轮

审稿人 3 意见：

The revised manuscript has manifested your effort in improving the conceptual framework and empirical package. It has been advanced substantially. I agree to accept this paper for journal publication. Aside from that, I notice that there are couples of empirical issues which the authors should address. The issues are stated in the following:

1) Study 2

- Please state the number of items included in the scale of 感知正确性 and 卷入度, in addition to providing a sample item

- For the manipulation of 群体性道德基础，please explicitly specify the statistics (non-significance) for the 道德诉求方式 × 劝捐主体类型 interaction

- Before reporting the mediation analyses, you should report the analyses on MEAN pattern. Concerning the word limit constraint, you should at least report on a table and indicate possible difference between pairs (in appendix)

- For mediation analyses, you should provide information about model specification. PROCESS allows you to include all possible mediators (自我效能, 反应效能, 感知正确性, 卷入度) in a single model. Before reporting the indirect effects for specific contrasts, you should report the overall mediated moderation effect first.

- You mentioned the consideration of control variables in the last sentence of the paragraph concerning mediation. What specific variables are those covariates?

- Table 1: please also superscripted the statistics concerning 中性诉求.

回应：非常感谢专家对我们修改工作的肯定并同意接收此稿件。我们按照专家的进一步意见进行了以下改进：(1)增加陈述感知正确性和卷入度的测项数量，并提供典型条目以供参考(见本文档第 58 页，3.2 实验程序)。(2)补充在操纵检验中道德诉求方式×劝捐主体类型的交互作用的数据结果(见本文档第 58 页，3.3 数据分析与结果)。(3)在附录中标明可能存在的均值差异(见本文档第 68 页)。(4)补充陈述中介检验中选择的模型与变量选入情况(见本文档第 59 页，3.3 数据分析与结果)。(5)专家提及的控制变量分别为赈灾援助的熟悉度、对灾民的同情程度以及感知捐赠重要性，已在中介分析的最后一段进行说明(见本文档第 59 页，3.3 数据分析与结果)。(6)已在相应的表格中标注了中性诉求的上标符号，以表明差异分析结果(见本文档第 59 页，表 1)。感谢专家的细致审稿与具体建议。

2) Study 3

- Is there any marginally significant effect concerning manipulation (check)? I notice that the current p-value is greater than 0.05 and not 0.1.

- Please add the superscripts for the 中性诉求 condition and make sure the superscripts are aligned (Meanwhile, the specification across efficacy conditions is not consistent.)

回应：非常感谢专家的仔细审阅。我们以下作两点回复：(1)实验 3 操纵检验的结果如下：被试感知温暖型劝捐主体具有更多温暖特质(M 温暖 = 4.86, M 能力 = 4.35; F(1, 449) = 18.35, p < 0.001, η 2 = 0.04)，而认为能力型劝捐主体具有更多能力特质(M 温暖 = 4.10, M 能力 = 4.67; F(1, 449) = 22.65, p < 0.001, η 2 = 0.05)；个体人道诉求组更认同个体性道德基础(M 个体 = 4.78, M 群体 = 3.90, M 中性 = 4.21; F(2, 449) = 19.93, p < 0.001, η 2 = 0.08)，其中个体人道诉求组显著高于中性诉求组(p < 0.001)，中性诉求组显著高于群体规范诉求组(p = 0.029)。群体规范诉求组更认同群体性道德基础(M个体 = 3.95, M群体 = 4.80, M中性 = 4.33; F(1, 449) = 18.19, p < 0.001, η 2 = 0.07)，其中群体规范诉求组显著高于中性诉求组(p = 0.001)，中性诉求组显著高于个体人道诉求组(p = 0.007)。自我效能组被试对自己的行动更有信心(M 自我 = 4.82, M 反应 = 4.27; F(1, 449) = 21.38, p < 0.001, η 2 = 0.05)；反应效能组被试对项目有效性评估更高(M 自我 = 3.97, M 反应= 4.49; F(1, 449) = 19.58, p < 0.001, η 2 = 0.04)，其余主效应或交互效应均不显著(p's > 0.05)。以上数据结果未出现边缘显著的情况。(2)已在相应的表格中标注了中性诉求的上标符号，以表明差异分析结果(见本文档第 61-62 页，表 2)。感谢专家的细致审稿与具体建议。

Meanwhile, the conceptual framework is much clearer and three studies have been improved in terms of design, analyses, and reporting. I am grateful to be involved in the review process. Hope you find the comments useful. Thank you for your great work. Wish you the best in future research.

_____

编委复审

编委意见：

同意发表，但需作者添加如下信息：

1. 在每个实验的"实验程序"部分添加"被试信息"。即，被试来源（网络？大学生？），性别比例，平均年龄，样本量是如何决定的。

2. 在每个实验的"数据处理与分析结果"部分说明剔除被试的标准。目前只有实验一有说明。

回应：非常感谢编委专家对本研究的认可。我们已按照专家提及的两点要求在文中相应部分进行了补充，具体如下：(1)在"实验程序"部分添加被试来源、样本量、性别比例和平均年龄等被试信息，请见本文档第 56 页(实验 1)；第 59 页(实验 2)；第 61 页(实验 3)。(2)在"数据分析与结果"部分说明剔除被试的标准(如填写问卷不完整、注意力测试未通过等)，请见本文档第 57 页(实验 1)；第 59 页(实验 2)；第 62 页(实验 3)。感谢专家的细致审阅。

_____

主编终审

主编意见：

研究探讨捐赠的影响因素和机制问题，具有较强的时代性和实际价值。论文试图探讨捐赠个体的道德诉求方式和劝捐主体的温暖和能力对捐赠意愿和行为的影响，特别是突出道德诉求方式与劝捐主体的印象的交互作用，有理论贡献。经过四轮的修改和完善，论文基本达到发

表的要求。但是，还存在几个问题：第一，实验 3 为什么关于中介机制的研究，为什么不通过中介统计检验，而是通过三相交互作用来说明？第二，对于操作效果检验中的所谓交互效应不显著，其不显著的结果变量是什么？指代不清楚；第三，实验 1 没有描述统计的数据，需要补充；第四，被试的组间设计的随机化分布，样本量的情况缺乏信息，也不知道人口学变量是否有显著差异，最好有简单的说明。

回应：非常感谢主编对本研究及论文修改工作的肯定。我们认真思考了您提出的几点问题，作出如下回复：第一，实验 3 中关于中介机制的探讨采用的是操控中介的方法，通过三阶交互效应来反映，是对直接通过中介统计检验(即实验 2)的有效补充(Han, Duhachek, & Agrawal, 2016; Spencer, Zanna, & Fong, 2005)。第二，关于操纵检验中交互效应不显著的数据结果，我们在相应的部分增加指明了不显著的结果变量，以明确其指代的清晰性，参见 P58 (2.3 分析结果，第一自然段)、P60~61 (3.3 数据分析与结果，第一自然段)、P63(4.3 数据分析与结果，第一自然段)。第三，我们按照要求在正文中补充了实验 1 的描述统计的数据，参见 P58 (2.3 分析结果，第二自然段)。第四，关于被试的组间设计的随机化分布，根据您的建议，我们对三个实验的样本量信息分别进行了简单交代，其中实验 1 的样本量信息补充参见 P58 (2.3 分析结果，第一自然段)，实验 2 的样本量信息补充见表 1(P61)，实验 3 的样本量信息补充见表 2(P64)。此外，我们还对文章的其余部分进行了系统检查与调整，力求全文逻辑连贯和文笔流畅。再次衷心感谢主编的细致审阅与宝贵建议，帮助文章的进一步完善。