

*Published in Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*

## Moralizing gods, impartiality, and religious parochialism across 15 societies

Martin Lang<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Benjamin G. Purzycki<sup>3</sup>, Coren L. Apicella<sup>4</sup>, Quentin D. Atkinson<sup>5,6</sup>, Alexander Bolyanatz<sup>7</sup>, Emma Cohen<sup>8,9</sup>, Carla Handley<sup>10</sup>, Eva Kundtová Klocová<sup>2</sup>, Carolyn Lesorogol<sup>11</sup>, Sarah Mathew<sup>10</sup>, Rita A. McNamara<sup>12</sup>, Cristina Moya<sup>13</sup>, Caitlyn D. Placek<sup>14</sup>, Montserrat Soler<sup>15</sup>, Thomas Vardy<sup>4</sup>, Jonathan L. Weigel<sup>16</sup>, Aiyana K. Willard<sup>17</sup>, Dimitris Xygalatas<sup>18</sup>, Ara Norenzayan<sup>19</sup> & Joseph Henrich<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Human Evolutionary Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, 02138, USA

<sup>2</sup>LEVYNA, Masaryk University, Brno, 602 00, Czech Republic

<sup>3</sup>Department of Human Behavior, Ecology and Culture, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig, 04103, Germany

<sup>4</sup>Department of Psychology, University of Pennsylvania, PA, 6241, USA

<sup>5</sup>Department of Psychology, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

<sup>6</sup>The Department of Linguistic and Cultural Evolution, Max Planck Institute for the Science of Human History, Jena, 07745, Germany

<sup>7</sup>Social Science Sub-Division, College of DuPage, Glen Ellyn, IL, 60137, USA

<sup>8</sup>School of Anthropology & Museum Ethnography University of Oxford, Oxford, OX2 6PE, United Kingdom

<sup>9</sup>Wadham College, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX2 6PE, United Kingdom

<sup>10</sup>Institute of Human Origins, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, 4101, USA

<sup>11</sup>Department of Anthropology, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, 63130, USA

<sup>12</sup>School of Psychology, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, 6140, New Zealand

<sup>13</sup>Department of Anthropology, University of California-Davis, Davis, CA, 95616, USA

<sup>14</sup>Department of Anthropology, Ball State University, Muncie, IN, 47306, USA

<sup>15</sup>Department of Anthropology, Montclair State University, Montclair, NJ, 07043, USA

<sup>16</sup>Department of Economics and Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, 02138, USA

<sup>17</sup>Centre for Culture and Evolution, Brunel University London, Middlesex UB8 3PH, United Kingdom

<sup>18</sup>Department of Anthropology, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, 06269, USA

<sup>19</sup>Department of Psychology, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, V6T 1Z4, Canada

\*Correspondence: Martin Lang: [martinlang@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:martinlang@fas.harvard.edu)

1 **Abstract**

2 The emergence of large-scale cooperation during the Holocene remains a central problem in the human  
3 evolutionary literature. Among several contributing mechanisms, one hypothesis points to culturally  
4 evolved beliefs in punishing, interventionist gods that facilitate the extension of cooperative behavior  
5 toward geographically distant co-religionists who are unlikely to reciprocate. Furthermore, another  
6 hypothesis points to such mechanisms being constrained to the religious ingroup, possibly at the  
7 expense of religious outgroups. To test these hypotheses, we administered two behavioral experiments  
8 and an extensive set of interviews to a sample of 2,228 participants from 15 diverse populations. These  
9 populations included foragers, pastoralists, horticulturalists, subsistence farmers and wage laborers,  
10 practicing world religions such as Buddhism, Christianity, and Hinduism, but also different forms of  
11 animism and ancestor worship. Using the Random Allocation Game (RAG) and the Dictator Game (DG) in  
12 which individuals allocated money between themselves, local and geographically distant co-religionists,  
13 and religious outgroups, we found that higher ratings of gods as monitoring and punishing reliably  
14 predicted decreased local favoritism (RAGs) and increased resource-sharing with distant co-religionists  
15 (DGs). The effects of punishing and monitoring gods on outgroup allocations revealed considerable  
16 between-site variability, suggesting that in the absence of intergroup hostility, some religious elements  
17 may be implicated in cooperative behavior toward outgroup members as well. These results provide  
18 support for the hypothesis that beliefs in monitoring and punitive gods who care about human  
19 normative conduct help expand the circle of sustainable social interaction, and open new questions  
20 about how different traditions respond to religious outgroups.

21 **Key words:** Cultural Evolution; Impartiality; Punishing Gods; Parochialism; Religion; Supernatural  
22 Punishment

23

24 **Introduction**

25 Over the last 12 millennia, the scale of human societies has dramatically expanded from hunter-gatherer  
26 networks involving a few hundred individuals to vast nation-states involving millions. Theories explaining  
27 the scaling-up of societies have combined insights about evolved cognition with cultural evolutionary  
28 models of social norms [1–3], delineating important roles for markets, kinship systems, marriage  
29 institutions, and religions [4–7]. Focusing on the role of supernatural beliefs, cultural evolution may have  
30 favored the extension of intuitions about social punishment to beliefs in increasingly interventionist  
31 gods who, because of their capacity to monitor and punish people for violating norms related to  
32 interpersonal conduct, fostered less favoritism toward individuals themselves, their families, and their  
33 communities vis-à-vis strangers sharing religious identities, effectively expanding the cooperative circle  
34 [8].

35 Historically, competition among communities to control fertile lands dramatically intensified at  
36 the onset of the Holocene, favoring larger, sedentary populations capable of communal defense and  
37 various forms of collective action [9,10]. Although there are ongoing debates about the precise timing of  
38 these historical changes and the nature of the causal relationships, a combination of archaeological and  
39 ethnographic data [11,12] suggests that the scaling-up of societies was associated with the gradual

1 evolution of religious beliefs and practices into cultural packages that included more powerful gods who  
2 were increasingly motivated and capable of monitoring norms favorable to the emergence of large  
3 scale societies. In particular, analyses of ethnographic data revealed the centrality of divine punishment  
4 in the evolution of political complexity in the Pacific [13] and robust global relationships between beliefs  
5 in punishing gods and various indicators of societal scale and complexity [14–16].

6 Consistent with these observations, global surveys have linked a stronger belief in heaven, hell,  
7 and punishing gods with stronger moral disapproval for cheating on taxes, buying stolen goods, and  
8 other such public goods [17], and a cross-cultural study of market integration revealed robust  
9 correlations between adherence to world religions involving moralizing deities and prosociality in  
10 economic games [6]. Complementing these macro-level patterns, a substantial body of literature using  
11 priming techniques has shown that among believers, religious reminders can effectively reduce self-  
12 favoritism and increase resource-sharing in economic games involving strangers [18–21]. Importantly, to  
13 experimentally test the role of belief in punishing and monitoring gods in the expansion of cooperative  
14 circle, we previously employed the Random Allocation Game (RAG) among participants from eight  
15 diverse field sites, and found that beliefs in monitoring and punishing gods were associated with less  
16 favoritism toward the self and local communities when playing with geographically distant co-  
17 religionists [8,22].

18 However, while these initial findings support the hypothesis of intra-religious impartiality (i.e.,  
19 extending impartiality to geographically distant co-religionists), the question as to whether these beliefs  
20 may also favor more equitable treatment of religious outgroups remains open to study. One cultural  
21 group selection account [23] suggested that parochial cooperation should be generally favored  
22 (compared to indiscriminate prosociality and uncooperative selfishness), especially during fierce conflict  
23 over resources/values [24,25] because it gives a competitive edge to groups with tight cooperative  
24 norms [26]. While supernaturally sanctioned norms may stabilize cooperation within a particular  
25 religious group (intra-religious impartiality), other groups may have different normative regulations  
26 and/or not extend their norms to outsiders [27]. Hence, cooperation between groups with different  
27 supernatural commitments is risky and prone to free-riding, predicting parochialism as a baseline  
28 relationship between religious groups. However, the cultural evolutionary account put forth by  
29 Norenzayan et al. [23] also predicts that in situations where a more inclusive strategy attracts new  
30 recruits and enhances cooperative networks, group norms may shift toward more universal application  
31 and indiscriminate prosociality to incorporate the members of religious outgroups if they are not in a  
32 direct conflict over resources/values [28,29]. To date, evidence appears to be mixed: some studies  
33 showed that participants affiliated with religions emphasizing universal morality embrace the extension  
34 of cooperation behavior to outgroup members [20,30–32] while other studies indicated that religious  
35 participants reveal hostility toward religious outgroups [33,34].

36 In this paper, we present data from 2,228 participants sampled in 15 socio-ecologically and  
37 religiously diverse societies (see Tab. 1). We aimed to replicate our previous findings that belief in  
38 punishing and monitoring gods helps curbing local favoritism [8,22] by deploying the same protocol in  
39 additional societies and, moreover, by deploying a different economic game, namely the Dictator Game  
40 (DG). Furthermore, we aimed to extend the previous research by examining the outstanding questions  
41 about the role of beliefs in punishing gods in the treatment of religious outgroups. At each site, we used  
42 preliminary ethnographic interviews to select one god interested in norms of interpersonal conduct, and

1 assessed those gods' abilities to monitor norm following and punish transgressions. In line with previous  
 2 research, we labeled such gods as "moralizing" [22]; however, note that these gods need not be creator  
 3 or supreme gods and do not need to care about "morality" as understood in Western philosophy.  
 4 Rather, they care about group-specific norms regulating interpersonal conduct [35,36]. As a comparison,  
 5 we also selected locally salient gods on the basis of their being relatively less concerned with  
 6 interpersonal conduct, less punitive, and less knowledgeable than their "moralizing" counterparts  
 7 (except for Hadza, Lovu, and Samburu sites where such gods could not be identified; see SM, section  
 8 S2.2 for details).

9 We adapted two experimental games, the Random Allocation Game (RAG) and the Dictator  
 10 Game (DG), to measure two distinct facets of cooperative behavior: curbed favoritism and impartial  
 11 resource sharing. In the RAG, participants anonymously selected one of two cups designated for  
 12 different recipients. They rolled a fair, two-colored die. If it came up one color, participants were  
 13 supposed to put the coin into the cup they selected. If the die came up the other color, participants  
 14 were supposed to put the coin into the opposite cup. Participants repeated this procedure for 30 coin  
 15 allocations and understood that all money will be distributed accordingly [37]. Since the allocations  
 16 were made in private, only the participants knew their decisions and they could distribute the  
 17 endowment according to their preferences (rather than die rolls), reflecting in- and/or out-group biases.  
 18 In the DG, participants anonymously allocated 10 coins between two recipients (also designated by  
 19 cups) based purely on their preferences [38]. These games have been widely used in cross-cultural  
 20 research and benchmarked against relevant real world behaviors [6,37,39–42]. In different ways, these  
 21 experiments permit us to assess the relationship between people's religious beliefs and their biases in  
 22 favor of themselves, their families, and their communities.

23 Participants played four rounds of either the RAG or the DG, distributing endowed money  
 24 between two cups in each round. To investigate the intra-religious impartiality, two rounds consisted of  
 25 contributions to distant co-religionists versus the self (SELF vs. DISTANT) or local co-religionists (LOCAL vs.  
 26 DISTANT). These two rounds aimed to replicate prior findings that belief in punishing and monitoring gods

Tab. 1. Site Descriptive Statistics

Group	Country	N	DISTANT	OUTGROUP	Prime	Moralizing God	Local God
Cachoeira	Brazil	274	Candomble	Evangelical	MLSC	Christian God	Candomblé God ( <i>Ogum</i> )
Coastal Tanna	Vanuatu	178	Christian	Kastom	MLC	Christian God	Garden spirit ( <i>Tupunus</i> )
Hadza	Tanzania	201	<i>Hadza</i>	<i>Datoga</i>	-	<i>Haine</i> (Traditional)	<i>Ishoko</i> *
Huatasani	Peru	94	Catholic	Evangelical	MC	Christian God	Mountain Spirits/Christ. Saints
Inland Tanna	Vanuatu	112	Kastom	Christian	MC	<i>Kalpapan</i> (Traditional)	Garden spirit ( <i>Tupunus</i> )
Kananga	DRC	200	<i>Non-Luluwa</i> Christ.	<i>Non-Luluwa</i>	MLSC	Christian God	<i>Kadim</i> /Ancestor spirits
Lovu	Fiji	76	Hindu	---	MC	Hindu Bhagwan	None available
Marajó	Brazil	77	Christian	---	MC	Christian God	Virgin Mary
Indo-Mauritians	Mauritius	245	Hindu	Muslim	MSC	Hindu Shiva	Ghost ( <i>Nam</i> )
Mysore	India	165	Hindu	Christian	MC	Hindu Shiva	Chamundeshwari
Samburu	Kenya	40	Christ. <i>Samburu</i>	<i>Samburu</i>	-	Christian/Traditional ( <i>Nkai</i> )	None available
Sursurunga	Papua New Guinea	163	Christ. <i>Sursurunga</i>	<i>Foreigner</i>	MLC	Christ. God ( <i>Káláu</i> )	Spirit ( <i>Sírmát</i> )
Turkana	Kenya	247	Christ. <i>Turkana</i>	<i>Turkana</i>	MLSC	Christ. God ( <i>Akuj</i> )	Ancestor spirits
Tyvas	Tyva Republic	81	Buddhist	---	MC	Buddha Burgan	Spirit-masters ( <i>Cher eezi</i> )
Yasawa	Fiji	75	Hindu	---	MC	Christian God	Ancestor spirits ( <i>Kalou-vu</i> )

Notes: \*There are no *Ishoko* data in Wave II (see SM, S2.2.3). DRC = Democratic Republic Congo. Primes: M = Moralizing gods prime; L = Local gods prime; S = Secular authority prime; C = Control condition. No Outgroups were selected for sites taking part only in Wave I (see Methods).

1 promotes expansion of rule following toward DISTANT co-religionists (RAG); and to assess whether  
2 these beliefs are also associated with increased resource-sharing (DG). The other two experimental  
3 rounds collected data on allocations to religious outgroups compared to allocations to the self (SELF vs.  
4 OUTGROUP) or to distant co-religionists (DISTANT vs. OUTGROUP), aiming to assess whether belief in  
5 punishing and monitoring gods promotes indiscriminate prosociality or whether the cooperative circle is  
6 limited only to religious ingroups (religious parochialism). SELF represented allocations that participants  
7 made to themselves. LOCAL co-religionist allocations were distributed to randomly selected, anonymous  
8 members of the same religion (associated with the selected moralizing gods) in the camp/village/town  
9 where we conducted experiments. DISTANT co-religionist allocations were distributed to randomly  
10 selected, anonymous individuals in a geographically distant village who practice the same religion as  
11 LOCALS. OUTGROUP allocations were distributed to anonymous members of a different religion in a  
12 geographically remote village (OUTGROUPS were selected such that they were not in a direct conflict  
13 with LOCALS).

14 Finally, to investigate the causal relationship between beliefs in moralizing gods and treatment  
15 of other groups, we utilized priming techniques by using locally salient reminders of a) punishing and  
16 monitoring moralizing gods; b) relatively less moralistically punitive and knowledgeable local gods; c)  
17 secular authorities (e.g., police); and d) a control condition. Although previous research has suggested  
18 causal influence of punishing gods on rule-following and resource sharing [21], the use of priming  
19 methods has been almost exclusively limited to Western populations and it is not clear whether the  
20 reported effects extend also to small-scale, non-industrial societies. By selecting our sites, we aimed to  
21 capture a significant portion of the world's human diversity while investigating the individual-level  
22 effects of belief in and priming with moralizing gods. We pre-registered two sets of predictions in the  
23 Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/epkbw/>) before data analysis:

24 1. *Expanding the Cooperative Circle to Distant Co-Religionists (DISTANT Games)*

25 Corresponding to the intra-religious impartiality hypothesis, we predicted that participants who  
26 (A) reported higher ratings of moralizing gods as punitive and monitoring will show less  
27 favoritism toward the SELF and LOCAL co-religionists when playing with DISTANT co-religionists  
28 in the RAG and DG, with cups labeled as SELF vs. DISTANT and LOCAL vs. DISTANT. Likewise,  
29 participants who (B) were primed with the concept of punitive and monitoring moralizing gods  
30 will show less SELF and LOCAL co-religionist favoritism compared to the other conditions.

31 2. *Parochial Religious Norm Adherence (OUTGROUP Games)*

32 According to the religious parochialism hypothesis, allocations in the SELF vs. OUTGROUP RAG and  
33 DG should not be influenced by (A) the ratings of, or (B) priming with, punitive and monitoring  
34 moralizing gods. That is, participants should bias allocations toward the SELF, irrespective of  
35 their religious belief or treatment conditions due to the limited scope of religious norms.

36 Moreover, we predicted that when allocating between DISTANT co-religionists and  
37 OUTGROUPS, participants who (C) reported higher ratings of, or (D) were primed with, punitive  
38 and monitoring moralizing gods will bias their allocations away from OUTGROUP members and  
39 in favor of DISTANT co-religionists in both the RAG and DG (religious parochialism). However, we  
40 also explored whether participants at Christian sites (universalistic, proselytizing religion) will  
41 taper their bias against OUTGROUPS by virtue of the aforementioned propensity to attract new  
42 members (indiscriminate prosociality).

# 1 Methods

## 2 *Participants*

3 During two waves of data collection, we recruited a total of 2,228 participants from 15 societies (1,126  
4 females; M age = 37.0, SD = 14.8). Specifically, during Wave I, we recruited 591 participants who played  
5 the DISTANT RAGs and reported the results of this data collection in several publications [8,22];  
6 however, 208 of those participants were contacted again during Wave II to collect the OUTGROUP RAGs.  
7 For Wave II, 1637 new participant were recruited, playing either the DISTANT and OUGROUP RAGs or  
8 the DISTANT and OUTGROUP DGs (153 participants played both RAGs and DGs). Here, we collapsed both  
9 Wave I and Wave II samples to provide robust tests of our hypotheses.

10 We excluded all participants from our analyses whose allocations did not sum to 30 for a  
11 particular RAG or 10 for a particular DG. Specifically, we excluded 30 participants from at least one RAG  
12 and 33 from at least one DG. Furthermore, we excluded 22 participants who misunderstood the  
13 procedure or did not correctly follow procedural steps. At one site, two research assistants  
14 counterfeited data, thus all the RAG and DG data collected by these assistants were removed (72  
15 participants). The number of participants in each analysis is displayed under specific models. While  
16 tables in the main text report only full models (these are missing three sites due to missing some of the  
17 co-variates), reduced models including all sites can be found in the SM, section S3. Our protocols were  
18 approved by the University of British Columbia's Behavioural Research Ethics Board (BREB) and by the  
19 equivalent at each individual researcher's home university. All subjects provided an informed verbal  
20 consent for participation before the experiment.

## 21 *Procedures*

22 Participants were recruited by random sampling from a street or chain sampling, while in smaller  
23 communities, researchers randomly sampled households. Upon arrival at a study location, participants  
24 were asked to wait before the experiment in a separate area to prevent collusion, and then entered  
25 individually into a room/tent/or a secluded area to play the RAGs and DGs. Before playing the games,  
26 each participant was given a show-up fee (approximating 1/4 of one day's wage), learned about game-  
27 specific rules, and had to demonstrate an understanding of those rules. Afterwards, the participant was  
28 left alone to play four rounds of either RAGs or DGs. Both DGs and RAGs were played in a random order.  
29 After the gameplay was finished, each participant received the amount contributed to the SELF cups and  
30 was escorted into a different area for demographic and religiosity interviews where we asked about  
31 moralizing and local gods (see SM, section S2 for more details on procedure).

## 32 *Materials*

33 We first conducted ethnographic surveys asking roughly 20 participants to list and rank up to five gods  
34 and spirits, from which each site selected one monitoring and punitive god/spirit (here labeled  
35 'moralizing') and one god/spirit less concerned with the interpersonal aspects of human normative  
36 behavior (here labeled 'local'). Confirming our choices of moralizing vs. local gods, the survey showed  
37 that the selected moralizing gods were rated on average as more punitive and monitoring than local  
38 gods, more concerned with interpersonal norms, and more rewarding. The magnitude of these  
39 differences varied by site (SM, Tab. S3). To examine the relationship between belief in punitive and  
40 monitoring gods who care about norm transgressions (i.e., moralizing gods) and the RAG and DG

1 allocations, we created a punishment-monitoring score by averaging four binary questions pertaining to  
2 the gods' ability and willingness to punish and monitor people. Note that apart from this composite  
3 measure, we also planned to examine the monitoring and punishing factors separately as in our  
4 previous study [22]; however, there was not enough variation in the monitoring factor to afford such  
5 analyses (for discussion see SM 2.1.2). All materials were translated from English into the local  
6 languages and back-translated to English to assure translation accuracy.

7 To examine the causal relationship between moralizing gods and impartiality, we adapted  
8 priming materials to the specificities of local contexts (see Tab. 1 for an overview of primed concepts).  
9 Four of our sites (Cachoeira, Mauritius, Sursurunga, Yasawa) used contextual priming in the RAGs  
10 (games were played inside a temple and a control location) while other sites used religious/secular  
11 imagery printed on a mat/table cloth (Coastal and Inland Tanna, Kananga, Huatasani, and Mauritius DG);  
12 religious/secular material objects (Cachoeira DG, Lovu, Marajó, Mysore, Turkana, Tyva); or verbal  
13 priming (Sursurunga DG). See SM, sections S2 and S3 for details. Note that in our correlational analyses,  
14 we hold the priming effects constant to account for the fact that not all sites used priming.

## 15 *Analyses*

16 In our regression models, we used the punishment-monitoring score of moralizing gods as well as our  
17 treatment conditions as main predictors of the RAG and DG allocations, controlling for a host of  
18 potentially confounding variables. In five modeling steps, we hold site-membership constant as simple  
19 fixed effects (i.e., mean site allocations), allowing us to make inferences about the general effect present  
20 across our sites while accounting for unmeasured between-site variance. Furthermore, we control for  
21 potentially competing explanations by holding constant the ratings of moralizing gods' rewarding  
22 abilities, local gods' punishment-monitoring score, and relationship to local secular authorities (e.g.  
23 police). Apart from these controls, we also hold constant demographic variables, emotional closeness to  
24 LOCAL, DISTANT and OUTGROUPS and game-related variables such as game-order (see SM, section S3  
25 for details).

## 26 **Results**

27 We observed high between-site variability in mean allocations in the RAG and DG (see Fig. 1). On  
28 average, in both games, participants tended to allocate more coins to the SELF and to LOCAL co-  
29 religionists compared to DISTANT co-religionists and OUTGROUPS. The allocations were generally more  
30 equitable in the RAG compared to the DG (despite the greater anonymity in the RAG), indicating that the  
31 rule-following aspect of the RAG played an important role in participants' decision-making.

### 32 *Moralizing Gods Promote Allocations to Distant Co-Religionists*

33 To replicate our previous findings from Wave I [8,22], we first analyzed the DISTANT RAGs on the sample  
34 from both data collection waves. In the enlarged sample and in line with Wave I, we observed that  
35 participants who rated their moralizing god as more punitive and monitoring tended to allocate more  
36 money to DISTANT co-religionists. Figure 2 illustrates that going from zero to one in our punishment-  
37 monitoring score was associated with an increase in the mean allocations to DISTANT co-religionists. To  
38 examine this effect more closely, we regressed RAG allocations on the punishment-monitoring scores  
39 using binomial regression models. In all specifications, the estimated punishment-monitoring

1 coefficients were positive, predicting larger DISTANT allocations: rating moralizing gods as punitive and  
2 monitoring increased the chances of allocating a coin to the DISTANT cup by 26% [95% CI = 6% – 49%] in  
3 the SELF vs. DISTANT RAG and by 22% [95% CI = 3% – 45%] in the LOCAL vs. DISTANT RAG. Crucially, none of  
4 the key control variables, including ratings of moralizing gods as rewarding, local gods’ punishment and  
5 monitoring abilities, or relationship to secular authority, showed stable effects on DISTANT allocations  
6 (see Tab. 2, Fig. 3, and SM, section S3.2 for specific modeling steps and Fig. S6 for comparison of Wave I  
7 and Wave II).

8 To extend the RAG results to a different economic game measuring a distinct facet of intra-  
9 religious impartiality, we included the DISTANT DGs during Wave II. We observed similar effects of  
10 moralizing gods on DISTANT allocations as in the RAGs (see Fig. 2). Regressing the DISTANT allocations  
11 on the punishment-monitoring measure in a series of five Tobit models revealed that the punishment-  
12 monitoring score was associated with an increase in participants’ allocations to DISTANT co-religionists.  
13 The effects of moralizing gods’ ratings predicted up to a 1.25 coin increase [95% CI = 0.25 – 2.24] in  
14 allocations to DISTANT co-religionists when playing with the SELF, and up to a 0.89 coin increase [95% CI  
15 = 0.07 – 1.70] when playing with LOCAL (maximum allocation was 10 coins). These results held for  
16 various model specifications, and none of our key controls predicted DISTANT allocations (Tab. 2, Fig. 3,  
17 and SM, section S3.2 for specific modeling steps)

18 To examine whether the effects of punishing gods on behavior can be experimentally  
19 manipulated under field conditions, in some sites (see Tab. 1), we randomly assigned participants to be  
20 primed with either moralizing gods, local gods, secular authority (the latter in the Dictator Game only),  
21 or a control condition. Since we were interested in the strength of effects of the moralizing gods prime  
22 compared to the other conditions, we set the moralizing gods prime as a reference category for  
23 comparisons in our models (note that this choice does not affect other coefficients of interest; see SM,  
24 S2.1.5).

25 We observed priming effects consistent with our hypotheses in the raw data (see SM, Fig. S7),  
26 although these patterns weakened after accounting for site fixed effects. Using binomial regression, we  
27 did not observe a difference between the moralizing gods and control conditions in the RAG; however,  
28 participants in the local gods condition had on average odds of 0.85 [95% CI = 0.70 – 1.01] of allocating a  
29 coin into the DISTANT cups compared to the moralizing gods condition (see Tab. 3). Similar patterns  
30 were observed for the DISTANT DGs: there were no differences between the moralizing gods and  
31 control conditions but the coefficients of the treatment with moralizing gods were higher compared to  
32 the local gods and secular authority treatments. While some of these differences were imprecisely  
33 estimated, all the coefficients were in predicted directions (ranging from a difference of 0.22 to 0.63  
34 coins; see Tab. 3 for 95% CI). We speculate that the lack of difference between the moralizing gods and  
35 control conditions occurred because participants in the control condition made allocations close to an  
36 equal split; so reminding people of their moralizing god could not make them, on average, any more  
37 impartial. However, reminding participants of the local gods could, and did to varying degrees, push  
38 people towards favoring SELF and LOCAL over DISTANT co-religionists. Thus, these findings offer only  
39 tentative support for prediction #1B and should be interpreted with caution (see SM, section S3.2 for  
40 further discussion).

#### 41 *Varying Effects of Moralizing Gods on Allocations to Outgroups*



1 The OUTGROUP games further expanded our Wave I design, pitting the SELF against an OUTGROUP  
2 individual (SELF vs. OUTGROUP), or a DISTANT co-religionist against an OUTGROUP individual (DISTANT vs.  
3 OUTGROUP). Exploring the raw data displayed in Fig. 2 suggested that the effects of punishing and  
4 monitoring gods on OUTGROUP allocations are highly variable and may be site-dependent. To test the  
5 OUTGROUP hypotheses (indiscriminate prosociality vs. religious parochialism), we used the same set of  
6 regression models as in the DISTANT games.

7 First, consistent with hypothesis #2A, we observed that the punishment-monitoring score  
8 showed no reliable effect on players' contributions to OUTGROUPs in the SELF vs. OUTGROUP RAG (see  
9 Tab. 2). In the DG, moralizing gods' punishment and monitoring was associated with increased  
10 contributions to OUTGROUPs at the players' expense up to an increase of 1.23 coins [95% CI = 0.08 –  
11 2.39]. However, this estimate was fairly imprecise and confidence intervals tightened to exclude zero  
12 only when holding the emotional closeness to and similarity with the OUTGROUP constant, suggesting  
13 that allocations to OUTGROUP members depend on pre-existing relationships (see Tab. 2, Fig. 3, and  
14 SM, Tab. S19).

15 Testing whether the punishment-monitoring score is associated with favoritism toward DISTANT  
16 co-religionists at the expense of OUTGROUPs (hypothesis #2C), the results from both the DISTANT vs.  
17 OUTGROUP RAG and DG revealed variable effects of the punishment-monitoring score. The general  
18 coefficients were in predicted directions, indicating that the punishment-monitoring score was  
19 associated with the odds of 0.9 [95% CI = 0.66 – 1.24] of allocation to the OUTGROUP cup in the RAG  
20 and with 0.33 [95% CI = -1.20 – 0.54] lower coin allocations in the DG. However, the confidence intervals  
21 suggested high-between site variation (see Tab. 2 and Fig. 3). Breaking down the variation by the type of  
22 moralizing gods' religion at each site (Christian vs. Other) suggested that the absence of the main effect  
23 may be explained by the fact that at Christian sites, gods' punishment-monitoring score was on average  
24 associated with higher allocations to OUTGROUPs, while the reverse applied to the other sites (see SM,  
25 section S3.3 for discussion).

26 Regarding experimental manipulation in the OUTGROUP games, we employed the same priming  
27 techniques as in the DISTANT games (see SM, Fig. S10). For the SELF vs. OUTGROUP RAG, we compared a  
28 control condition with the moralizing gods treatment, observing the odds ratio of 0.91 [95% CI = 0.84 –  
29 0.99] for allocations to OUTGROUPs in the control condition compared to the moralizing gods treatment  
30 (see Tab. 3). In the SELF vs. OUTGROUP DG, we added treatments with local gods and local secular  
31 authority, observing that the moralizing gods treatment predicted an increase of 0.36 coins [95% CI = -  
32 0.06 – 0.79] compared to the control condition, 0.68 coins [95% CI = 0.21 – 1.14] compared to the local  
33 gods treatment, and 0.75 coins [95% CI = 0.20 – 1.31] compared to the secular authority treatment (see  
34 Tab. 3). For the DISTANT vs. OUTGROUP games, there were no differences between the moralizing gods and  
35 control conditions in the RAG, and only weak negative differences between the moralizing gods and  
36 other treatments in the DG. In sum, the priming results in the OUTGROUP games do not provide support  
37 for our predictions (#2B and #2D), and suggest that priming may instead promote indiscriminate  
38 prosociality in the SELF vs. OUTGROUP games (see SM, section S3.3 for discussion).

39  
40  
41

**Tab 2.** Coefficients and 95% Confidence Intervals from Binomial and Tobit Regressions Estimating Allocations to the DISTANT/OUTGROUP Cups. Abbreviated Results From Full Models.

	DISTANT Games				OUTGROUP Games			
	Random Allocation Game		Dictator Game		Random Allocation Game		Dictator Game	
	SELF vs. DISTANT	LOCAL vs. DISTANT	SELF vs. DISTANT	LOCAL vs. DISTANT	SELF vs. OUTGROUP	DISTANT vs. OUTGROUP	SELF vs. OUTGROUP	DISTANT vs. OUTGROUP
	<i>OR</i>	<i>OR</i>	$\beta$ -Est.	$\beta$ -Est.	<i>OR</i>	<i>OR</i>	$\beta$ -Est.	$\beta$ -Est.
MG Pun-Mon	1.26** (1.06, 1.49)	1.22* (1.03, 1.45)	1.25* (0.25, 2.24)	0.89* (0.07, 1.70)	1.08 (0.79, 1.49)	0.90 (0.66, 1.24)	1.23* (0.08, 2.39)	-0.33 (-1.20, 0.54)
LG Pun-Mon	1.07 (0.94, 1.21)	0.99 (0.87, 1.12)	0.57 (-0.13, 1.28)	-0.04 (-0.62, 0.54)	0.76* (0.61, 0.94)	1.18 (0.94, 1.47)	-0.05 (-0.88, 0.79)	-0.37 (-1.00, 0.25)
MG Reward	0.98 (0.86, 1.11)	0.96 (0.84, 1.09)	-0.49 (-1.13, 0.15)	-0.27 (-0.80, 0.25)	0.88 (0.73, 1.06)	1.14 (0.94, 1.38)	-0.34 (-1.05, 0.37)	0.03 (-0.50, 0.57)
Police	1.03† (1.00, 1.07)	1.00 (0.97, 1.04)	0.01 (-0.16, 0.17)	-0.08 (-0.22, 0.05)	1.01 (0.96, 1.06)	1.02 (0.97, 1.07)	0.02 (-0.17, 0.21)	-0.06 (-0.20, 0.08)
Constant	0.81* (0.66, 0.98)	0.94 (0.77, 1.15)	4.43*** (3.24, 5.62)	3.54*** (2.50, 4.58)	1.30 (0.94, 1.79)	0.94 (0.68, 1.29)	2.65*** (1.29, 4.02)	4.75*** (3.71, 5.79)
N People	602	598	802	792	261	255	636	630
N Sites	12	12	9	9	7	7	8	8

Notes: *OR* = Odds ratio (exponentiated coefficients) from binomial regression;  $\beta$ -Est. = Beta Estimate from Tobit regression; MG = Moralizing Gods; LG = Local Gods; Pun-Mon = Punishment-monitoring. The full models hold constant site-specific mean allocations, treatment, age, sex, number of children, household size, material insecurity, emotional closeness and practice similarity to local and distant co-religionists and to outgroup, and police evaluation. Site means are modeled as simple fixed effects with Mysore as the reference category (see SM, section S3.1). Note that these models exclude three sites due to the lack of local god beliefs (Hadza, Lovu, and Samburu). Reduced models including all sites are displayed in the SM (see Models 2 for Tab. S7-10; Tab. S17-20).

†  $p < .1$ ; \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$

**Tab 3.** Coefficients and 95% Confidence Intervals from Binomial and Tobit Regressions Estimating Allocations to the DISTANT/OUTGROUP Cups according to Treatment Groups.

	DISTANT Games				OUTGROUP Games			
	Random Allocation Game		Dictator Game		Random Allocation Game		Dictator Game	
	SELF vs. DISTANT	LOCAL vs. DISTANT	SELF vs. DISTANT	LOCAL vs. DISTANT	SELF vs. OUTGROUP	DISTANT vs. OUTGROUP	SELF vs. OUTGROUP	DISTANT vs. OUTGROUP
	<i>OR</i>	<i>OR</i>	$\beta$ -Est.	$\beta$ -Est.	<i>OR</i>	<i>OR</i>	$\beta$ -Est.	$\beta$ -Est.
Control Prime	1.01 (0.96, 1.07)	0.97 (0.92, 1.03)	-0.24 (-0.66, 0.17)	-0.02 (-0.36, 0.32)	0.91* (0.84, 0.99)	0.99 (0.91, 1.08)	-0.36† (-0.79, 0.06)	-0.04 (-0.38, 0.31)
Local God Prime	0.89 (0.74, 1.06)	0.85† (0.70, 1.01)	-0.63** (-1.08, -0.17)	-0.22 (-0.60, 0.15)	--	--	-0.68** (-1.14, -0.21)	-0.36† (-0.74, 0.01)
Secular Authority Prime	--	--	-0.45 (-0.99, 0.10)	-0.29 (-0.73, 0.16)	--	--	-0.75** (-1.31, -0.20)	-0.22 (-0.68, 0.23)
Constant	0.98 (0.87, 1.10)	1.05 (0.93, 1.17)	4.82*** (4.08, 5.57)	3.50*** (2.90, 4.11)	1.1 (0.96, 1.26)	0.97 (0.84, 1.12)	3.77*** (3.02, 4.53)	4.99*** (4.37, 5.60)
N People	689	690	997	987	312	309	991	988
N Sites	9	9	9	9	4	4	9	9

Notes: *OR* = Odds ratio (exponentiated coefficients) from binomial regression;  $\beta$ -Est. = Beta Estimate from Tobit regression. Moralizing gods prime is the reference category, hence the coefficients report differences in the DISTANT and OUTGROUP allocations between the moralizing gods treatment compared to the other treatments. The models hold constant site-specific means with Mysore as the reference category; age; sex; number of children; size of household; and material insecurity.

†  $p < .1$ ; \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$

1

2

## 1 Discussion

2 Through four iterations of both the Random Allocation Game (RAG) and the Dictator Game (DG), as well  
3 as a priming battery, we examined the effects of beliefs related to supernatural monitoring and  
4 punishment on impartial treatment of various receivers. Controlling for a host of potentially  
5 confounding factors, our results show that higher ratings of moralizing gods as punitive and monitoring  
6 were associated with larger allocations to DISTANT co-religionists when playing with both the SELF and  
7 LOCAL co-religionists in the RAGs and DGs, supporting the intra-religious impartiality hypothesis. The  
8 experimental priming with moralizing gods typically produced larger contributions to DISTANT co-  
9 religionists compared to the treatments with local gods and secular authority, but not compared to the  
10 control condition. The lack of difference between the moralizing gods and control conditions resulted  
11 from the fact that the majority of participants committed to moralizing gods played close to 50/50 split  
12 in the control condition, hence the primes had low variation to act upon (in both the DG and RAG,  
13 giving half of the endowment is generally at ceiling on allocations to strangers [6,37]).

14 These findings support the idea that the cultural evolution of supernatural agents into punishing  
15 and monitoring gods who care about interpersonal, normative conduct may have played a role in the  
16 extension of the cooperative circle beyond kin-networks and local ingroup interests. In small-scale  
17 societies, supernatural agents are often confined to local ecologies with limited spatio-temporal  
18 relevance for people where they may promote parochial cooperation by demanding collective activities  
19 [43,44]. However, since some local gods are tied to a specific place, they do not necessarily provide an  
20 overarching identity for geographically distant communities and are not as interested in normative  
21 conduct of anonymous members of different communities (29; see also SM, Tab. S3). In line with this  
22 proposition, our correlational results showed that belief in moralizing—but not local— gods reduced  
23 local favoritism. Moreover, in the analyses of the priming conditions, the average allocations to DISTANT  
24 co-religionists across all the games were smaller in the local gods treatment compared to the moralizing  
25 gods treatment. While these results are consistent with what the theory predicts, we note that co-  
26 religionist recipients in these games were associated with the “moralizing” deity traditions and future  
27 cross-cultural work should investigate impartiality among “local” deity traditions.

28 The negligible effects of another key control variable— the reward ratings of moralizing gods—  
29 suggest that it is specifically the belief in the punishing and monitoring (not rewarding) aspects of  
30 supernatural agents that promote higher DISTANT allocations [45]. Similarly, a different body of  
31 literature has suggested that in some cultural and historical circumstances, secular institutions may  
32 outcompete the policing functions provided by belief in punishing and monitoring gods [46,47]. Again,  
33 our results in the DISTANT RAGs and DGs hold even when controlling for relationship to local secular  
34 authority in this particular sample. Consistent with this finding, the secular authority prime led to lower  
35 allocations to DISTANT co-religionists compared to the moralizing gods prime in the DGs, although  
36 confidence intervals for these estimates were quite wide, suggesting considerable variability for which  
37 we have not accounted.

38 The cultural evolutionary approach developed above further suggests that the increased  
39 impartiality shown toward DISTANT coreligionists in the RAG and DG should not necessarily extend to  
40 religious outgroups (religious parochialism; prediction #2A). Indeed, while self-favoritism was  
41 constrained by commitments to moralizing gods in the SELF vs. DISTANT RAG (above), the punishment-

1 monitoring score did not play a role in curbing self-favoritism when playing the RAG with OUTGROUP.  
2 This result points to the parochial effects of moralizing gods, who may be concerned with normative  
3 conduct toward co-religionists but not necessarily toward outgroups. The result of SELF vs. OUTGROUP DG  
4 was more complicated. In this DG, we observed a positive correlation between punishment-monitoring  
5 ratings and allocations to OUTGROUPs; however, this coefficient was not robust across different model  
6 specifications and only emerged as significant at conventional levels when both people's relationship  
7 with, and similarity to, the OUTGROUP were held constant (c.f. [48]). This relationship suggests that  
8 when groups are sufficiently similar and maintain prior favorable relationships, belief in punishing and  
9 monitoring gods may deter extremely selfish treatment of outgroup members in the DG (i.e., zero  
10 allocations; see SM, section S3.3 for discussion). In line with this interpretation, priming moralizing gods  
11 increased OUTGROUP allocations in both the SELF vs. OUTGROUP RAG and DG compared to the control  
12 condition (but never raised them above the 50/50 split).

13 Finally, we hypothesized that individuals would make a distinction between DISTANT co-  
14 religionists and OUTGROUPs (#2C), promoting the competitiveness of one's own religious group by  
15 increasing allocations to DISTANT co-religionists at the expense of OUTGROUPs. While the coefficients in  
16 both the RAG and DG were in the predicted direction, the confidence intervals of those effects  
17 suggested considerable between-site variability. We explored a hypothesis stating that in the absence of  
18 intergroup hostility (as shown by our OUTGROUP emotional closeness measure, see SM, Tab. S4),  
19 religions appealing to universal norms— which may ultimately foster proselytizing— would put  
20 emphasis on indiscriminate prosociality manifested in higher OUTGROUP allocations. Our supplemental  
21 analyses indeed suggest opposite trends in allocation to OUTGROUPs at Christian versus non-Christian  
22 sites; however, caution should be exercised in interpreting these results as we would need larger  
23 samples and other religions with universalistic appeal for precise estimates of this effect (see SM, section  
24 S3.3 for further discussion).

25 While deploying our experiments across cultures, we also encountered limitations to our multi-  
26 site experimental approach. Our main measure (punishment-monitoring abilities) exhibited low  
27 variation at some sites where the maximum value possible was also the modal score. This may have  
28 been an artifact of our pre-selection of gods that were specifically concerned with human interpersonal  
29 normative conduct, but more nuanced measurements of participants' beliefs should improve future  
30 estimates. Furthermore, while we attempted to define DISTANT co-religionists and OUTGROUPs solely  
31 along religious lines, some sites— due to facts on the ground— had to merge ethnicity and religion  
32 when defining recipient groups (see SM for more details and additional analyses). We attempted to  
33 control for different OUTGROUP relationships by our measure of relationship to the OUTGROUP, but  
34 future research should obtain detailed estimates of interaction frequency, cooperative exchange, and  
35 conflict history. This applies to other types of culturally evolved groupings such as markets or political  
36 institutions (for details see [49]). Finally, adapting priming techniques to fit the specific context at each  
37 site yielded substantial variability in those techniques, possibly hindering the general estimates of the  
38 priming effects. These effects might have also been confounded by the fact that our design necessitated  
39 the use of religious reminders on cup labels, possibly subtly priming all participants (see SM 3.2.4 for  
40 discussion).

41 Despite these limitations, the current work used a larger and more culturally diverse sample to  
42 support our previous findings regarding the role of moralizing gods in expanding the social circle [8,22],

1 and replicated these findings in a new experiment (the Dictator Game) while also revealing tentative  
2 support for our predictions using the priming technique in the field. Extending our experimental  
3 paradigm to investigate religious parochialism, we observed little or no support for our outgroup  
4 predictions; however, exploratory analyses suggested new lines of theoretical and empirical work. Taken  
5 together, this study investigated a particular culturally evolved mechanism that may have contributed to  
6 the expansion of human societies, and illustrates one interdisciplinary approach for moving beyond  
7 narrow sampling strategies and harnessing the planet's rich human diversity to shed light on key  
8 questions of cultural evolution.

9

## 10 **Acknowledgments**

11 We are thankful to all our participants and research assistants. Furthermore, we would like to thank  
12 Adam Barnett, Heidi Colleran, Cammie Curtin, Duncan Sibbard Hawkes, Radek Kundt, Ibrahim Mabulla,  
13 Peter Maño, and Gilbert Topos for helping in various stages of this project. We acknowledge funding from  
14 a research grant, "The Emergence of Prosocial Religions" from the John Templeton Foundation, and the  
15 Cultural Evolution of Religion Research Consortium (CERC), funded by a generous partnership grant (895–  
16 2011–1009) from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. C.H. and S.M. were  
17 funded by the John Templeton Foundation grant no. 48952.

## 18 **Author Contributions**

19 J.H., A.N. and B.G.P. conceived the study, prepared protocols, and managed data collection. C.L.A., Q.D.A.,  
20 A.B., E.C., E.K.K., C.H., C.L, S.M., R.A.M., C.M., C.P., B.G.P, M.S., T.V., J.L.W., A.K.W. and D.X. collected data.  
21 M.L. and B.G.P. managed the data set and team communication, and M.L. conducted all analyses, and  
22 made all graphs and tables. M.L., J.H., B.G.P. and A.N. drafted the paper. All authors provided input on  
23 methods and the manuscript.

## 24 **Competing interests**

25 The authors declare no competing interests.

## 26 **Data Accessibility**

27 The data set used for the current analyses together with protocols, hypotheses, and R code can be found  
28 at the Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/epkbw/>).

29

## References

1. Henrich J. 2015 *The Secret of Our Success: How Culture Is Driving Human Evolution, Domesticating Our Species, and Making Us Smarter*. Princeton University Press.
2. Turchin P. 2016 *Ultrasociety: How 10,000 Years of War Made Humans the Greatest Cooperators on Earth*. Berresta Books.
3. Boyd R. 2017 *A Different Kind of Animal: How Culture Transformed Our Species*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
4. Henrich J, Boyd R, Richerson PJ. 2012 The puzzle of monogamous marriage. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **367**, 657–669. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2011.0290)
5. Richerson P *et al.* 2016 Cultural group selection plays an essential role in explaining human cooperation: A sketch of the evidence. *Behav. Brain Sci.* **39**, e30. (doi:10.1017/S0140525X1400106X)
6. Henrich J, Ensminger J, McElreath R, Barr A, Barrett C, Bolyanatz A, Cardenas JC, Gurven M, Gwako E. 2011 Markets, religion, community size, and the evolution of fairness and punishment. *Science*. **327**, 1480–1484. (doi:10.1126/science.1182238)
7. Norenzayan A. 2013 *Big Gods: How Religion Transformed Cooperation and Conflict*. Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press.
8. Purzycki BG *et al.* 2018 The evolution of religion and morality: a synthesis of ethnographic and experimental evidence from eight societies. *Religion. Brain Behav.* **8**, 101–132. (doi:10.1080/2153599X.2016.1267027)
9. Bowles S. 2011 Cultivation of cereals by the first farmers was not more productive than foraging. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **108**, 4760. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1010733108)
10. Johnson AW, Earle TK. 2000 *The Evolution of Human Societies: From Foraging Group to Agrarian State*. Stanford University Press.
11. Marcus J, Flannery K V. 2004 The coevolution of ritual and society: New 14C dates from ancient Mexico. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **101**, 18257–18261. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0408551102)
12. Whitehouse H, Hodder I. 2010 Modes of Religiosity at Catalhöyük. In *Religion in the Emergency of Civilization: Çatalhöyük as a Case Study*. (ed I Hodder), pp. 122–145. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Watts J, Greenhill SJ, Atkinson QD, Currie TE, Bulbulia J, Gray RD. 2015 Broad supernatural punishment but not moralizing high gods precede the evolution of political complexity in Austronesia. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **282**, 1–7. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2014.2556)
14. Botero CA, Gardner B, Kirby KR, Bulbulia J, Gavin MC, Gray RD. 2014 The ecology of religious beliefs. *PNAS* **111**, 16784–16789. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1408701111)
15. Johnson D. 2005 God's punishment and public goods. *Hum. Nat.* **16**, 410–446. (doi:10.1007/s12110-005-1017-0)
16. Peoples HC, Marlowe FW. 2012 Subsistence and the evolution of religion. *Hum. Nat.* **23**, 253–269. (doi:10.1007/s12110-012-9148-6)

17. Atkinson QD, Bourrat P. 2011 Beliefs about God, the afterlife and morality support the role of supernatural policing in human cooperation. *Evol. Hum. Behav.* **32**, 41–49. (doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2010.07.008)
18. Lang M, Mitkidis P, Kundt R, Nichols A, Krajkčiková L, Xygalatas D. 2016 Music as a sacred cue? Effects of religious music on moral behavior. *Front. Psychol.* **7**, 1–13. (doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00814)
19. Tan J, Vogel C. 2008 Religion and trust: An experimental study. *J. Econ. Psychol.* **29**, 839–848.
20. Preston JL, Ritter RS. 2013 Different effects of religion and God on prosociality with the ingroup and outgroup. *Personal. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* **39**, 1471–1483. (doi:10.1177/0146167213499937)
21. Shariff AF, Willard AK, Andersen T, Norenzayan A. 2016 Religious priming: A meta-analysis with a focus on prosociality. *Personal. Soc. Psychol. Rev.* **20**, 27–48. (doi:10.1177/1088868314568811)
22. Purzycki BG, Apicella C, Atkinson QD, Cohen E, McNamara RA, Willard AK, Xygalatas D, Norenzayan A, Henrich J. 2016 Moralistic gods, supernatural punishment and the expansion of human sociality. *Nature* **530**, 327–330. (doi:10.1038/nature16980)
23. Norenzayan A, Shariff AF, Gervais WM, Willard AK, McNamara RA, Slingerland E, Henrich J. 2016 The cultural evolution of prosocial religions. *Behav. Brain Sci.* **39**, 1–65. (doi:10.1017/S0140525X14001356)
24. Atran S, Ginges J. 2012 Religious and Sacred Imperatives in Human Conflict. *Science.* **336**, 855–857. (doi:10.1126/science.1216902)
25. Ginges J, Hansen I, Norenzayan A. 2009 Religion and support for suicide attacks. *Psychol. Sci.* **20**, 224–230. (doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02270.x)
26. Choi JK, Bowles S. 2007 The coevolution of parochial altruism and war. *Science.* **318**, 636–640. (doi:10.1126/science.1144237)
27. Fessler DMT *et al.* 2015 Moral parochialism and contextual contingency across seven societies. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **282**, 20150907. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2015.0907)
28. Stark R. 1997 *The Rise of Christianity: How the Obscure, Marginal Jesus Movement Became the Dominant Religious Force in the Western World in a Few Centuries*. San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishers.
29. Richerson P *et al.* 2016 Cultural group selection plays an essential role in explaining human cooperation: A sketch of the evidence. *Behav. Brain Sci.* **39**, e30. (doi:10.1017/S0140525X1400106X)
30. Ginges J, Sheikh H, Atran S, Argo N. 2016 Thinking from God's perspective decreases biased valuation of the life of a nonbeliever. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **113**, 316–319. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1512120113)
31. Clingingsmith D, Khwaja AI, Kremer M. 2009 Estimating the impact of the Hajj: Religion and tolerance in Islam's global gathering. *Q. J. Econ.* **124**, 1133–1170. (doi:10.1162/qjec.2009.124.3.1133)
32. McCullough ME, Swartwout P, Shaver JH, Carter EC, Sosis R. 2016 Christian religious badges instill trust in Christian and non-Christian perceivers. *Psycholog. Relig. Spiritual.* **8**, 149–163.

(doi:10.1037/rel0000045)

33. Bushman BJ, Ridge RD, Das E, Key CW, Busath GL. 2007 When God sanctions killing: Effect of scriptural violence on aggression. *Psychol. Sci.* **18**, 204–207. (doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01873.x)
34. Shaver JH, Lang M, Krátký J, Klocová EK, Kundt R, Xygalatas D. 2018 The boundaries of trust: Cross-religious and cross-ethnic field experiments in Mauritius. *Evol. Psychol.* **16**, 1–15. (doi:10.1177/1474704918817644)
35. Purzycki BG. 2016 The evolution of gods' minds in the Tyva Republic. *Curr. Anthropol.* **57**, S88–S104. (doi:10.1086/685729)
36. Purzycki BG *et al.* 2018 The cognitive and cultural foundations of moral behavior. *Evol. Hum. Behav.* **39**, 490–501. (doi: 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2018.04.004).
37. Hruschka D *et al.* 2014 Impartial institutions, pathogen stress and the expanding social network. *Hum. Nat.* **25**, 567–579. (doi:10.1007/s12110-014-9217-0)
38. Engel C. 2011 Dictator games: A meta study. *Exp. Econ.* **14**, 583–610. (doi:10.1007/s10683-011-9283-7)
39. Ensminger J, Henrich J. 2014 *Experimenting with Social Norms: Fairness and Punishment in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. New York: Russell Sage Press.
40. Falk A, Becker A, Dohmen T, Enke B, Huffman D, Sunde U. In press. (In press). Global evidence on economic preferences. *Q. J. Econometrics*
41. Kröll M, Rustagi D. 2016 Shades of dishonesty and cheating in informal milk markets in India. *SAFE Work. Pap. No. 134*
42. Gächter S, Schulz JF. 2016 Intrinsic honesty and the prevalence of rule violations across societies. *Nature* **531**, 1–11. (doi:10.1038/nature17160)
43. Purzycki BG. 2011 Tyvan cher eezi and the socioecological constraints of supernatural agents' minds. *Relig. Brain Behav.* **1**, 31–45. (doi:10.1080/2153599X.2010.550723)
44. McNamara RA, Henrich J. 2018 Jesus vs. the ancestors: how specific religious beliefs shape prosociality on Yasawa Island, Fiji. *Religion. Brain Behav.* **8**, 185–204. (doi:10.1080/2153599X.2016.1267030)
45. Johnson KA, Cohen AB, Okun MA. 2016 God is watching you...but also watching over you: The influence of benevolent God representations on secular volunteerism among Christians. *Psycholog. Relig. Spiritual.* **8**, 363–374. (doi:10.1037/rel0000040)
46. Norenzayan A. 2013 *Big Gods: How Religion Transformed Cooperation and Conflict*. Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press.
47. Yilmaz O, Bahçekapili HG. 2016 Supernatural and secular monitors promote human cooperation only if they remind of punishment. *Evol. Hum. Behav.* **37**, 79–84. (doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2015.09.005)
48. Purzycki BG, Lang M. 2019 Identity fusion, outgroup relations, and sacrifice: A cross-cultural test. *Cognition* **186**, 1–6. (doi:10.1016/j.cognition.2019.01.015)



49. Henrich N, Henrich J. 2007 *Why Humans Cooperate: A Cultural and Evolutionary Explanation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

## Figure Captions

**Fig 1. Density Plots of DISTANT Co-religionist and OUTGROUP Allocations in the Random Allocation and Dictator Games.** **A.** Participants allocated 30 coins between two cups in each RAG. Deviations from the predicted binomial distribution point to biased money allocation. **B.** The distribution of participants' allocations in the DGs revealed more between-site variability compared to the RAGs. The dashed vertical lines indicate an equitable split between cups (15 in the RAGs and 5 in the DGs). In. Tanna = Inland Tanna; Co. Tanna = Coastal Tanna. Note that these raw data do not control for the fact that some participants were primed during experiments.

**Fig 2. Positive Effects of Moralizing Gods on DISTANT Allocations and Varying Effects on OUTGROUP Allocations.** Displayed are raw means with 95% CI and density plots; dashed vertical lines indicate the moralizing gods effect. These effects are illustrative only because we collapsed the punishment-monitoring score into three (instead of five categories for easier reading: 0.0-0.3, 0.3-0.7, 0.7-1.0). These plots also do not take into account between site differences and distributional assumptions (see Tab. 2 for specific estimates). Note that the number of participants in each level of the MG Pun-Mon variable substantially differs (with MG Pun-Mon = 1 having the most and MG Pun-Mon = 0 the least participants); see Fig. S2 for histograms.

**Fig 3. Moralizing Gods' Punishment-Monitoring Regression Coefficients with 95% CI Showing Different Effects on DISTANT and OUTGROUP Allocations.** Rating moralizing gods as monitoring and punishing predicted larger allocations to the DISTANT co-religionist cups when playing with both SELF and LOCAL co-religionist cups in both the RAGs and DGs. The same rating did not predict allocations to the OUTGROUP cups in the SELF vs. OUTGROUP RAG; however, we observed a positive effect in the SELF vs. OUTGROUP DG. The coefficients for the DISTANT vs. OUTGROUP RAG and DG were in predicted directions but exhibited between-site variability. X-axis for the RAG is on the logistic scale.