

The user wants me to translate a Chinese academic paper title into English. Let me analyze the requirements: 1. This is a title, not a full paragraph with tags 2. The user hasn't provided any tags to preserve 3. The title contains technical terms that need to be translated according to the gl...

**Authors:** Yi, Chen Peiqi, The user has provided “王美洁” which is a Chinese name. This is not a scientific paper or academic text with LaTeX commands, citations, or tags. It's simply a name.

According to the instructions: - I should translate from Simplified Chinese to English - Preserve LaTeX commands and placeholders - Preserve citation commands - Preserve tags - Maintain academic tone - Use precise technical terminology from glossary - Preserve section structure and paragraph organization - Translate all content completely - Return ONLY the translated text - Keep paragraph tags if present - Do NOT add Markdown formatting unless present in source

Since this is just a name “王美洁” without any tags, LaTeX, or academic content, I should simply translate it appropriately. In academic contexts, Chinese names are typically transliterated using Pinyin. “王美洁” would be “Wang Meijie” in English.

However, I need to check if there are any tags. There are none. The instructions say “Return ONLY the translated text for the given input” . Since there's no paragraph structure to preserve, I should just provide the transliterated name.

But wait, the system seems to be expecting a specific format with tags. Let me re-read the instructions carefully.

The instructions say: “PRESERVE ALL paragraph wrapper tags EXACTLY - these are structural markers that identify paragraphs and MUST remain untouched with their IDs”

And: “Maintain exact count and IDs of tags - if input has N paragraph tags, output must have exactly N paragraph tags with matching IDs”

The input is just “王美洁” with no tags. So the output should be just the translation without any tags.

The name “王美洁” is a Chinese name. In academic translation, we typically use Pinyin: “Wang Meijie” . The surname is “Wang” and given name is “Meijie” .

Since there are no tags, no LaTeX, no citations, I should just output the transliterated name. The instructions say “Return ONLY the translated text for the given input (no explanations, no quotes, no headings you invent).”

So the answer should be simply: Wang Meijie

But wait, I should double-check if this is a test to see if I follow the rules strictly., The user has provided “买晓琴” which is a Chinese name. This is likely a name that needs to be translated. In academic contexts, Chinese names are typically transliterated using Pinyin. “买晓琴” would be “Mai Xiaoqin” in Pinyin.

However, the user hasn’ t provided any context or text to translate. The system prompt is asking me to translate scientific academic papers from Simplified Chinese to English with specific requirements about preserving LaTeX, citations, and tags.

Since the user only provided a name, I should: 1. Recognize this as a Chinese name 2. Transliterate it properly according to academic conventions 3. Provide the English version

The name “买晓琴” (Mǎi Xiǎoqín) would be transliterated as “Mai Xiaoqin” in English academic writing. The surname is “Mai” and the given name is “Xiaoqin” . In Chinese academic papers, sometimes the name order is preserved (Mai Xiaoqin) or sometimes it’ s written as “Xiaoqin Mai” depending on the journal’ s style. However, the most common and respectful way is to keep the original Chinese order: Mai Xiaoqin.

But wait - the user might be asking me to translate a text that contains this name. However, they only provided the name itself. I should probably just provide the transliteration.

Let me check the instructions again: - “Translate from Simplified Chinese to English with the highest accuracy and academic tone.” - The user provided: “买晓琴”

This is just a name. I should transliterate it as “Mai Xiaoqin” . In academic contexts, Chinese names are typically written with the surname first, followed by the given name, with each part capitalized.

I should not add any tags since the user didn’ t provide any. The system prompt says “Return ONLY the translated text for the given input (no explanations, no quotes, no headings you invent).”

So my answer should simply be: Mai Xiaoqin

But let me double-check the requirements. The system prompt is very specific about preserving LaTeX, citations, and tags. However, the user input is just a name, which doesn't contain any of those elements. So I should just provide the transliteration.

The glossary provided only includes: 机器学习 => machine learning 深度学习 => deep learning

These don't apply here.

So the simplest and most correct answer is:, The user has provided “买晓琴” which is a Chinese name. This is not a scientific paper or academic text with LaTeX commands, citations, or tags. It's simply a name.

According to the instructions: - I should translate from Simplified Chinese to English - Preserve LaTeX commands, placeholders, citation commands, and tags - Maintain academic tone - Use precise technical terminology from the glossary - The glossary only contains: 机器学习 => machine learning and 深度学习 => deep learning

Since this is just a name “买晓琴”, there are no: - LaTeX commands - Mathematical formulas - Citation commands - tags - Technical terms from the glossary - Academic content to translate

A Chinese name should be transliterated, not translated. “买晓琴” would be “Mai Xiaoqin” in pinyin. In academic contexts, Chinese names are typically presented in this format.

However, the instructions say “Translate from Simplified Chinese to English” . A name isn't really “translated” but transliterated. But given the context of academic paper translation, the standard practice is to convert Chinese names to pinyin.

Let me check if there are any special considerations: - “买” is a rare surname (Mǎi) - “晓琴” is a common given name (Xiǎoqín)

In academic writing, Chinese names are typically written as: - Family name first: Mai Xiaoqin - Or sometimes: Xiaoqin Mai (Western order)

The most standard format in academic contexts is to keep the Chinese order: Mai Xiaoqin.

Since there are no tags or other structural elements in the input, I should just provide the transliterated name. But wait, the instructions are very specific about preserving tags. The input doesn't have any, so the output shouldn't have any either.

The simplest and most correct approach is to just provide the pinyin transliteration: “Mai Xiaoqin”

But let me double-check the instructions. They say: - “Return ONLY the translated text for the given input (no explanations, no quotes, no headings you

invent).” - “Keep one output paragraph per input paragraph; do not merge or split paragraphs.” - “Maintain exact count and IDs of ...tags”

The input is just “买晓琴” -

**Date:** 2024-09-30T00:00:00+00:00

## Abstract

To investigate how different intervention rules affect the choice of fairness maintenance methods and the extent of intervention among 10-12-year-old children, this study examined children’s third-party punishment and third-party compensation behaviors under two intervention rules: punishment-or-compensation choice (N1 = 243) and punishment-and-compensation dual-choice (N2 = 236). The behaviors were assessed across three distributional contexts—high unfairness, moderate unfairness, and fairness—along with the role of warmth-competence perception. The results revealed that: (1) Children aged 10-12 employed different fairness maintenance strategies under different intervention rules; under the either-or rule, they preferred third-party compensation, whereas under the dual-choice rule, they favored simultaneous punishment and compensation, and exhibited greater punishment than under the either-or rule; (2) Children’s warmth-competence perception of the allocator differed significantly between the two intervention rules; under the either-or rule, warmth-competence perception mediated the relationship between distributive fairness and children’s third-party altruism level, whereas no mediating effect was observed under the dual-choice rule. These findings empirically enrich indirect reciprocity theory and our understanding of children’s third-party punishment and compensation behaviors, demonstrating that intervention rules influence 10-12-year-olds’ perception of unfairness and their subsequent choices of fairness maintenance methods and degree of intervention. The results also suggest that practitioners should consider the potential impact of rule design on the development of children’s prosocial personality and behaviors, thereby better guiding children as bystanders to actively uphold social fairness and engage in more altruistic actions.

## Full Text

## References

- Abele, A. E., & Brack, S. (2013). Preference for other persons’ traits is dependent on the kind of social relationship. *Social Psychology*, 44(2), 84–94. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000138>
- Chen, P. Q., Zhang, Y. L., Hu, X. M., Wang, J., & Mai, X. Q. (2023). The effect of social value orientation on third-party altruistic behaviors in children aged 10-12 years: The role of emotion. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 55(8), 1255–1269. <https://doi.org/10.3724/SP.J.1041.2023.01255>

- Cuddy, A. J., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2007). The BIAS map: behaviors from intergroup affect and stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*(4), 631. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.4.631>
- Dai, T. T., Zuo, B., & Wen, F. F. (2019). Context cues influenced the inferences between warmth and competence social cognition contents. *Journal of Psychological Science*, *42*(3), 612–618. doi:10.16719/j.cnki.1671-6981.20190315.
- Droege, K. L., & Stipek, D. (1993). Children's use of dispositions to predict classmates' behavior. *Developmental Psychology*, *29*(4), 646–654. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.29.4.646>
- Fehr, E., & Fischbacher, U. (2003). The nature of human altruism. *Nature*, *425*(6960), 785–791. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02043>
- Fehr, E., & Fischbacher, U. (2004). Third-party punishment and social norms. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *25*(2), 63–87. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138\(04\)00005-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138(04)00005-4)
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J., & Glick, P. (2007). Universal dimensions of social cognition: Warmth and competence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *11*(2), 77–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.11.005>
- Gummerum, M., & Chu, M. T. (2014). Outcomes and intentions in children's, adolescents', and adults's second and third-party punishment behavior. *Cognition*, *133*(1), 97–103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2014.06.001>
- Guo, Q. K., Xu, P., Wu, R., & Hu, S. S. (2016). Effects of in-group favoritism and grade on the altruistic punishment behavior of primary school students. *Psychological Development and Education*, *32*(4), 402–408. doi:10.16187/j.cnki.issn1001-4918.2016.04.03.
- Harris, P. L., Koenig, M. A., Corriveau, K. H., & Jaswal, V. K. (2018). Cognitive foundations of learning from testimony. *Annual Review Psychology*, *251–273*. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-122216-011710>
- Jordan, J. J., Hoffman, M., Bloom, P., & Rand, D. G. (2016). Third-party punishment as a costly signal of trustworthiness. *Nature*, *530*(7591), 473–476. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16981>
- Kobayashi, K., Kable, J.W., Hsu, M., & Jenkins, A.C. Jenkins. (2022). Neural representations of others' traits predict social decisions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *119*(22), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2116944119>
- Krasnow, M. M., Delton, A. W., Cosmides, L., & Tooby, J. (2016). Looking under the hood of third-party punishment reveals design for personal benefit. *Psychological Science*, *27*(3), <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615624469>
- Kurzban, R., Burton-Chellew, M. N., & West, S. A. (2015). The evolution of altruism in humans. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *66*(1), 575–599. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015355>

- Lim, G., & Kim, H. (2022). Distinctive roles of mPFC subregions in forming impressions and guiding social interaction based on others' social behaviour. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, *17*(12), 1118–1130. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsac037>
- Lee, Y. E., & Warneken, F. (2020). Children's evaluations of third-party responses to unfairness: Children prefer helping over punishment. *Cognition*, *205*, 104374. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2020.104374>
- Leliveld, M. C., Vandijk, E., & Vanbeest, I. (2012). Punishing and compensating others at your own expense: The role of empathic concern on reactions to distributive injustice. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *42*(2), 135–140. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.872>
- Liang, F. C., Wang, X. Y., & Tang, W. H. (2015). The development of children's fair behavior in different distribution situations. *Psychological Development and Education*, *31*(6), 648–653. doi:10.16187/j.cnki.issn1001-4918.2015.06.02.
- Liu, Y. J., Lin, L., Li, Z., & Guo, X. Y. (2017). The effect of social value orientation on third-party altruistic behaviors in children aged 10-12 years: The role of emotion. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, *55*(08), 1255–1269.
- Liu, Y. J. (2018). *Fairness maintaining behaviors in the gain and loss context: Third-party punishment and third-party compensation* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). East China Normal University, Shanghai.
- McAuliffe, K., Jordan, J. J., & Warneken, F. (2015). Costly third-party punishment in young children. *Cognition*, *134*, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2014.08.013>
- McAuliffe, K., Blake, P. R., Steinbeis, N., & Warneken, F. (2017). The developmental foundations of human fairness. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *1*(4), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-017-0042>
- McAuliffe, K., & Dunham, Y. (2021). Fairness overrides group bias in children's second-party punishment. *Developmental Psychology*, *57*(9), 1485–1495. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0001226>
- Montoya, A. K., & Hayes, A. F. (2017). Two-condition within-participant statistical mediation analysis: A path-analytic framework. *Psychological Methods*, *22*(1), 6–27. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000086>
- Nowak, M. A., & Sigmund, K. (2005). Evolution of indirect reciprocity. *Nature*, *437*(7063), 1291–1298. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04131>
- Przepiorka, W., & Liebe, U. (2016). Balancing punishment and compensation in a social dilemma: Experimental evidence from a common pool resource game. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, *63*, 92–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2016.05.004>
- Takagishi, H., Fujii, T., Koizumi, M., Schug, J., Nakamura, F., & Kameshima, S. (2015). The development of reputation management: Ev-

idence from a competitive helping game. *Child Development*, 87(3), 914–925. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12493>

Wang, H., Wang, S., & Zheng, C. D. (2020). The influence of recipients' enthusiasm and competence on the willingness to donate—the mediating role of empathy. *Chinese Journal of Ergonomics*, 26(1), 31-36. doi:10.13837/j.issn.1006-8309.2020.01.0006.

Wang, M. F., Yang, F., & Yang, Y. Y. (2013). Children's ability to discriminate competence traits with warmth traits. *Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 21(6), 897–900+878. doi:10.16128/j.cnki.1005-3611.2013.06.027.

Wenzel, M., & Thielmann, I. (2006). Why we punish in the name of justice: Just desert versus value restoration and the role of social identity. *Social Justice Research*, 19(4), 450–470. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-006-0028-2>

Yao, J. W., & Ding, F. (2023). Third-party altruism: “Punishment” and “Compensation”. *Psychology: Techniques and Applications*, 11(2), 117–128. doi:10.16842/j.cnki.issn2095-5588.2023.02.005.

Zuo, B., Dai, T. T., Wen, F. F., & Teng, T. T. (2014). The relationship between warmth and competence in social cognition. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 22(9), 1467–1474. doi: 10.3724/SP.J.1042.2014.01467

---

## Appendix Tables and Figures

**Table S1** Results of Repeated Measures ANOVA

Effect	F	df	p	p <sup>2</sup>
<b>Third-party altruistic intensity</b>				
Intervention rule	6.63	1, 477	0.010	0.01
Allocation fairness	61.92	1, 477	<0.001	0.12
Intervention rule × Allocation fairness	0.18	1, 477	0.674	
<b>Third-party punishment intensity</b>				
Intervention rule	25.35	1, 477	<0.001	0.05
Allocation fairness	12.28	1, 477	0.001	0.03
Intervention rule × Allocation fairness	2.03	1, 477	0.154	
<b>Third-party compensation intensity</b>				
Intervention rule	0.27	1, 477	0.603	
Allocation fairness	34.64	1, 477	<0.001	0.07

Effect	F	df	p	p <sup>2</sup>
Intervention rule × Allocation fairness	0.51	1, 477	0.476	
<b>Warmth perception</b>				
Intervention rule	8.78	1, 477	0.003	0.02
Allocation fairness	1255.54	2, 954	<0.001	0.73
Intervention rule × Allocation fairness	9.22	2, 954	<0.001	0.02
<b>Competence perception</b>				
Intervention rule	0.32	1, 477	0.573	
Allocation fairness	91.33	2, 954	<0.001	0.16
Intervention rule × Allocation fairness	9.44	2, 954	<0.001	0.02

**Table S2** Results of Within-Subjects Mediation Analysis

Path	B	SE	95% CI
<b>Punishment-Compensation Single Choice</b>			
Allocation fairness → Warmth perception	-2.55	0.08	[-2.71, -2.39]
Allocation fairness → Competence perception	-1.07	0.11	[-1.28, -0.86]
Warmth perception → Altruistic intensity	-0.17	0.04	[-0.24, -0.10]
Competence perception → Altruistic intensity	-0.05	0.02	[-0.09, -0.01]
Allocation fairness → Altruistic intensity	0.55	0.13	[0.31, 0.81]

Path	B	SE	95% CI
<b>Punishment- Compensation Dual Choice</b>			
Allocation fairness → Warmth perception	-2.33	0.08	[-2.49, -2.17]
Allocation fairness → Competence perception	-0.88	0.10	[-1.08, -0.68]
Warmth perception → Altruistic intensity	-0.09	0.06	[-0.21, 0.03]
Competence perception → Altruistic intensity	-0.06	0.03	[-0.12, 0.00]
Allocation fairness → Altruistic intensity	0.36	0.20	[-0.04, 0.73]

*Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.*

*Source: ChinaXiv – Machine translation. Verify with original.*