



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Global evidence of extreme intuitive moral prejudice against atheists

Gervais, W.M.; Xygalatas, D.; McKay, R.T.; van Elk, M.; Buchtel, E.E.; Aveyard, M.; Schiavone, S.R.; Dar-Nimrod, I.; Svedholm-Häkkinen, A.M.; Riekk, T.; Kundtová Klocová, E.; Ramsay, J.E.; Bulbulia, J.

Published in:
Nature Human Behaviour

DOI:
[10.1038/s41562-017-0151](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-017-0151)

[Link to publication](#)

Creative Commons License (see <https://creativecommons.org/use-remix/cc-licenses>):
CC BY-NC-ND

Citation for published version (APA):
Gervais, W. M., Xygalatas, D., McKay, R. T., van Elk, M., Buchtel, E. E., Aveyard, M., ... Bulbulia, J. (2017). Global evidence of extreme intuitive moral prejudice against atheists. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1(8), [0151]. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-017-0151>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (<http://dare.uva.nl>)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

Global evidence of extreme intuitive moral prejudice against atheists

Will M. Gervais¹
Dimitris Xygalatas^{2,3}
Ryan T. McKay⁴
Michiel van Elk⁵
Emma E. Buchtel⁶
Mark Aveyard⁷
Sarah R. Schiavone¹
Ilan Dar-Nimrod⁸
Annika M. Svedholm-Häkkinen⁹
Tapani Riekkö⁹
Eva Kundtová Klocová¹⁰
Jonathan E. Ramsay¹¹
Joseph Bulbulia¹²

- ¹ University of Kentucky (USA)
- ² University of Connecticut (USA)
- ³ Aarhus University (Denmark)
- ⁴ Royal Holloway, University of London (UK)
- ⁵ University of Amsterdam (Netherlands)
- ⁶ Education University of Hong Kong (Hong Kong)
- ⁷ American University of Sharjah (United Arab Emirates)
- ⁸ The University of Sydney (Australia)
- ⁹ University of Helsinki (Finland)
- ¹⁰ Masaryk University (Czech Republic)
- ¹¹ Singapore University of Social Sciences (Singapore)
- ¹² Victoria University of Wellington (New Zealand)

Address correspondence to Will Gervais (will.gervais@uky.edu)

34 **Global evidence of extreme intuitive moral prejudice against atheists**

35 *Mounting evidence supports longstanding claims that religions can extend cooperative*
 36 *networks¹⁻⁹. However, religious prosociality may have a strongly parochial component⁹.*
 37 *Moreover, aspects of religion may promote or exacerbate conflict with those outside a*
 38 *given religious group, promoting regional violence¹⁰, intergroup conflict¹¹, as well as*
 39 *tacit prejudice against nonbelievers^{12,13}. Anti-atheist prejudice—a growing concern in*
 40 *increasingly secular societies¹⁴—affects employment, elections, family life, and broader*
 41 *social inclusion^{12,13}. Preliminary work in the USA suggests that anti-atheist prejudice*
 42 *stems, in part, from deeply rooted intuitions about religion’s putatively necessary role in*
 43 *morality. However, the cross-cultural prevalence and magnitude—as well as*
 44 *intracultural demographic stability—of such intuitions, as manifested in intuitive*
 45 *associations of immorality with atheists, remain unclear. Here, we quantify moral*
 46 *distrust of atheists by applying well-tested measures in a large global sample (N=3256,*
 47 *13 diverse countries). Consistent with cultural evolutionary theories of religion and*
 48 *morality, people in most—but not all—countries viewed extreme moral violations as*
 49 *representative of atheists. Notably, anti-atheist prejudice was even evident among atheist*
 50 *participants around the world. Results contrast with recent polls that do not find self-*
 51 *reported moral prejudice against atheists in highly secular countries¹⁵, and imply that the*
 52 *recent rise in secularism in Western countries has not overwritten intuitive anti-atheist*
 53 *prejudice. Entrenched moral suspicion of atheists suggests that religion’s powerful*
 54 *influence on moral judgements persists, even among nonbelievers in secular societies.*

55 Speculation about whether morality depends on religious belief has a long history.
 56 The ancient Chinese philosopher Mozi claimed that belief in ghosts was essential for

57 moral restraint¹⁶. In Plato's *Euthyphro*¹⁷, Socrates debated whether morality can even be
58 properly defined without reference to divine preference. Dostoevsky¹⁸ famously
59 questioned whether moral prohibitions could carry weight without belief in a deity.
60 Modern investigations reflect this perceived link between belief in gods and morality, as
61 recent small sample studies in North America suggest deep moral suspicion of
62 individuals who do not believe in gods^{13,19}.

63 Evolutionary theories of religion predict that prejudice against atheists may persist
64 even in secular cultures, either as part of a suite of adaptations linking belief to within-
65 group cooperation²⁰, or as a consequence of culturally transmitted²¹ and entrenched pro-
66 religious norms²². Indeed, recent studies suggest religions evolved in part by supporting
67 trust and cooperation among coreligionists^{15,23,24}. Signals of religiosity can even extend
68 trust across religions among believers, though not to nonbelievers²⁵. On the other hand,
69 classic social psychological work²⁶ predicts that only believers will be prejudiced against
70 atheists, and that distrust of atheists would not be apparent in secular societies. To date,
71 these two perspectives have not been directly contrasted, and the global prevalence of
72 intuitive anti-atheist prejudice and its persistence among atheists themselves is currently
73 unknown. A recent Pew survey suggests a relationship between country-wide levels of
74 religious belief and explicit judgments that morality requires religion¹⁵. However, people
75 often lack introspective access to their intuitions, and respond to appear socially
76 desirable. As such, little is known about the potential cross-cultural ubiquity of intuitions
77 linking religion and morality.

78 Here, we test a prediction derived from a cultural evolutionary model of
79 religion²²: that anti-atheist prejudice remains globally prevalent, even in secular societies

80 and among atheists. In contrast to previous studies, we quantify levels of anti-atheist
81 distrust using well-tested measures of intuitive information processing that can be
82 adapted for studying prejudice in a large and diverse cross-cultural sample, while
83 adjusting for individual differences in level of religious belief, demographic covariates,
84 and country-level dependencies in responses. Our sample is drawn from 13 countries on 5
85 continents. We chose these countries because they 1) exhibit substantial country-level
86 variability in average religious belief including both highly secular societies (e.g.,
87 Netherlands, Czech Republic, Finland, China) and highly religious ones (e.g., United
88 Arab Emirates, Mauritius, India. *Supplementary Table 3* shows average belief in gods
89 across countries); 2) represent diverse dominant religions and religious histories,
90 including countries with Christian, Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, and secular majorities; and
91 3) represent diverse cultural, political, socioeconomic, historical, and geographical
92 contexts. This diverse sample allowed us to extend our investigation well beyond the
93 WEIRD (Western, educated, industrialized, rich, democratic) samples that predominate
94 the social sciences²⁷.

95 We developed a measure to assess extreme anti-atheist prejudice using a simple
96 experimental design that targets intuitive biases¹⁹. In this task, participants read a
97 description of a man who tortures animals as a child, then as an adult exhibits escalating
98 violence culminating with the murder and mutilation of five homeless people. Then,
99 participants judged whether it is more probable that the villain was: A) a teacher, or B) a
100 teacher who is also (manipulated between subjects) a religious believer/ does not believe
101 in gods. Thus, no individual participant is directly asked whether they think the
102 perpetrator is or is not a believer. Instead, the conjunction fallacy²⁸ rates (choosing option

103 B—a logically incorrect answer) between conditions can be used to indirectly infer the
104 degree to which a description of a serial murderer is intuitively seen as more
105 representative of religious people or atheists, respectively. Full stimuli appear in the
106 *Supplement*. In our preregistration of methods and hypotheses before data collection
107 commenced (<https://osf.io/f6tcr/>), we hypothesized both universality and variability
108 across countries, such that moral distrust of atheists would be evident in all sites, but the
109 strongest intuitive religion-morality links would be observed in the most strongly
110 religious samples.

111 We conducted identical experiments in all 13 sites. We targeted at least 100
112 participants per experimental condition (anti-atheist bias vs. anti-religious bias). After
113 filtering out inattentive participants (13%) and incomplete responses, there were a total of
114 3256 participants for final analysis (69% female, Age 16-70: $M = 25.07$, $SD = 7.84$), with
115 a median of 162 participants per country (range: 129-993). Participants came from
116 diverse societies and included both student and general population samples (*Supplement*).


117 Because our data represent a shared experimental design across sites with
118 participants nested within countries, we utilized a multilevel (hierarchical) modeling
119 approach. Specifically, our hierarchical Bayesian model²⁹ quantifies the extent to which
120 people view gross immorality (animal torture, serial murder, and mutilation) as more
121 representative of atheists than of believers, both overall and within each country,
122 adjusting for individual levels of belief in God, gender, age, and perceived
123 socioeconomic status (all standardized). Additionally, the model adjusts for country-level
124 dependencies by modeling the intercept and slope of anti-atheist prejudice as random
125 across countries (*Supplement*). Full model coefficients appear in Table 1. We observed

126 substantial heterogeneity in overall conjunction fallacy performance across countries.
127 Because our primary focus was on degrees of intuitive moral distrust of atheists (in
128 contrast to believers) across countries, we do not speculate further about sources of
129 heterogeneity in overall performance, and instead focus on experimental condition
130 differences within countries.

131 Our results offer strong evidence of extreme intuitive moral prejudice against
132 atheists. Our model predicts overall conjunction error rate probability of .58 for atheist
133 targets (95% highest posterior density interval [.48, .68]), but only .30 [.25, .34] for
134 religious targets, *Relative Risk (RR)* = 1.96 [1.53, 2.37], posterior probability of atheist
135 target errors exceeding religious target errors (henceforth posterior probability) exceeds
136 .999. Thus, people overall are roughly twice as likely to view extreme immorality as
137 representative of atheists, relative to believers. Importantly, the effects hold even after
138 adjusting for country variability in the strength of intuitive moral prejudice and
139 individual-level variability in demographics. Figure 1 and Table 2 summarize model
140 predicted conjunction error probabilities across sites for atheist and religious targets.
141 Consistent with predictions, extreme intuitive moral distrust of atheists is both globally
142 evident and variable in its magnitude across countries.

143

144 **Figure 1. Across 13 countries, serial murder was seen as more representative of**
 145 **atheists than of religious believers.** Predicted error probabilities are presented for the
 146 total estimate and all 13 sites.
 147



149 **Table 1. Full model summary.** Age, gender, subjective socioeconomic status, and
 150 participant belief in God were standardized. Target was coded: atheist = 1, religious = 0.
 151 95% highest posterior density interval illustrates uncertainty around posterior means, and
 152 indexes the interval in which the 95% most credible estimates lie.
 153

	coefficient	SD_{coef}	95% HPDI	
			Low	High
Fixed Effects				
Belief	0.10	0.06	-0.03	0.23
Age	0.11	0.05	0.01	0.19
Female	0.03	0.04	-0.04	0.11
SSES	0.03	0.04	-0.06	0.11
Belief x Target	0.11	0.09	-0.07	0.29
Random Intercepts				
Total	-0.86	0.12	-1.09	-0.63
Australia	-0.90	0.19	-1.27	-0.51
China	-0.28	0.22	-0.70	0.15
Czech	-0.99	0.19	-1.38	-0.62
Finland	-1.01	0.10	-1.22	-0.82
Hong Kong	-0.70	0.21	-1.11	-0.28
India	-0.66	0.15	-0.95	-0.37
Mauritius	-0.93	0.19	-1.31	-0.57
Netherlands	-0.94	0.18	-1.30	-0.57
New Zealand	-0.82	0.20	-1.21	-0.43
Singapore	-0.90	0.21	-1.31	-0.50
UAE	-1.17	0.26	-1.66	-0.67
UK	-0.87	0.20	-1.26	-0.48
USA	-1.08	0.21	-1.50	-0.69
Random Slopes (Target)				
Total	1.19	0.22	0.74	1.62
Australia	1.06	0.28	0.51	1.62
China	1.15	0.30	0.55	1.71
Czech	1.10	0.27	0.55	1.63
Finland	0.13	0.15	-0.14	0.43
Hong Kong	1.16	0.31	0.56	1.75
India	1.87	0.23	1.44	2.35
Mauritius	1.13	0.29	0.57	1.72
Netherlands	0.91	0.26	0.39	1.42
New Zealand	0.52	0.29	-0.06	1.08
Singapore	2.02	0.32	1.41	2.65
UAE	2.06	0.36	1.35	2.76
UK	0.80	0.29	0.21	1.34
USA	1.66	0.29	1.13	2.24


155 **Table 2: Model summary at mean belief in God** (50.91 out of 100). Predicted
 156 conjunction error probabilities for both atheist and religious targets [with 95% highest
 157 posterior density intervals], along with relative risks [95% HPDI], and posterior
 158 probability of atheist target error rates exceeding religious target error rates, $\Pr(A > R)$.
 159 Relative risk = $\Pr(\text{atheist target error}) / \Pr(\text{religious target error})$. UAE = United Arab
 160 Emirates, UK = the United Kingdom, USA = United States of America.
 161

	N	Atheist	Religious	Relative Risk	pr(A > R)
Total	3256	0.58 [0.48, 0.68]	0.30 [0.25, 0.34]	1.96 [1.53, 2.37]	> .999
Australia	158	0.54 [0.43, 0.65]	0.29 [0.22, 0.37]	1.89 [1.33, 2.55]	> .999
China	207	0.7 [0.62, 0.79]	0.43 [0.32, 0.53]	1.65 [1.23, 2.09]	> .999
Czech	187	0.53 [0.43, 0.62]	0.27 [0.20, 0.34]	1.97 [1.37, 2.66]	> .999
Finland	993	0.29 [0.25, 0.34]	0.27 [0.23, 0.31]	1.11 [0.89, 1.34]	.822
Hong Kong	129	0.61 [0.5, 0.71]	0.33 [0.25, 0.43]	1.87 [1.3, 2.48]	> .999
India	395	0.77 [0.69, 0.83]	0.34 [0.28, 0.41]	2.27 [1.82, 2.74]	> .999
Mauritius	161	0.55 [0.43, 0.67]	0.28 [0.21, 0.36]	1.96 [1.36, 2.64]	> .999
Netherlands	213	0.49 [0.40, 0.59]	0.28 [0.21, 0.35]	1.77 [1.23, 2.34]	.999
New Zealand	161	0.43 [0.33, 0.53]	0.31 [0.23, 0.39]	1.41 [0.92, 1.92]	.964
Singapore	162	0.75 [0.66, 0.84]	0.29 [0.21, 0.37]	2.63 [1.84, 3.47]	> .999
UAE	144	0.71 [0.60, 0.81]	0.24 [0.15, 0.32]	3.06 [1.95, 4.39]	> .999
UK	148	0.48 [0.38, 0.59]	0.30 [0.22, 0.38]	1.65 [1.09, 2.21]	.997
USA	198	0.64 [0.54, 0.73]	0.26 [0.18, 0.34]	2.56 [1.80, 3.48]	> .999

163 Surprisingly, after adjusting for substantial latent country-level dependencies
164 between sites, the within-country interaction between individual belief in God and
165 conjunction error rates across targets is weak (posterior probability = .88. See Table 1).
166 Thus, while anti-atheist prejudice varies strongly by country, such prejudice is largely
167 robust across the spectrum of participant religiosity within countries; both high and low
168 believers are about twice as likely to commit conjunction errors for atheist targets than
169 for religious targets (Figure 2). Further, we examined posterior model predictions for
170 atheists (those rating their belief in God at 0 out of 100). Among atheists, our model
171 predicts overall conjunction error rate probability of .52 for atheist targets [.40, .64], but
172 only .28 [.22, .33] for religious targets, $RR = 1.91 [1.41, 2.48]$ (posterior probability >
173 .999). Effects hold even in highly secular countries such as Australia, China, the Czech
174 Republic, the Netherlands, and the UK: even atheists are predicted to intuitively associate
175 serial murder with atheists more than with believers in these countries, all posterior
176 probabilities exceeding .98. Indeed, only in Finland (posterior probability = .48) and to a
177 lesser extent New Zealand (posterior probability = .90) was the evidence of intuitive anti-
178 atheist prejudice among atheists less conclusive (Full inferences at both minimum and
179 maximum belief appear in the *Supplement*). As a robustness check of intuitive moral
180 distrust of atheists among atheists, we conducted a second analysis isolating all
181 participants across sites who rated their belief in God at zero ($N = 553$) and explored
182 overall atheist intuitive moral distrust of atheists (experimental condition treated as fixed)
183 across sites (varying intercepts of country). Once again, atheist participants showed
184 higher conjunction error rates for atheist targets, .61 [.23, .95], than for religious targets,

185 .50 [.12, .88] (posterior probability = .999). Thus, consistent with theoretical predictions,
 186 even atheists intuitively associate immorality with atheists more than with believers.

187



188

189 **Figure 2. Predicted effect of participant belief in God**, marginalized across countries
 190 and adjusting for individual gender, age, and subjective socioeconomic status. Bold lines
 191 are overall estimates, blurred lines display 500 best-fit lines sampled randomly from the
 192 posterior to depict estimate uncertainty.

193 To address potential methodological confounds and alternative explanations for
194 our findings, we conducted three additional experiments (we note that although our
195 primary cross cultural investigation was preregistered, the followup studies were not).
196 Full details of all three studies appear in the *Supplement*, but they are briefly summarized
197 here. First, our cross-cultural experimental manipulation tested only extreme moral
198 violations and pitted a target “who does not believe in god(s)” against “a religious
199 believer,” perhaps confounding notions of belief in god and the broader construct of
200 religiosity. *Study S1* found that even when the experiment more symmetrically
201 manipulates belief vs. disbelief in god(s) and tests a more minor moral violation (not
202 paying for dinner in a restaurant), people still associate immorality more with atheists
203 than with believers (posterior probability = .981).

204 Second, our primary cross-cultural tests pitted a disbeliever in god(s) against a
205 religious believer. It is possible, however, that people are morally distrustful of
206 disbelievers in general, rather than of people who disbelieve in gods specifically. *Study*
207 *S2* used the same extreme moral violation as our main analysis and found that people
208 were more likely to intuitively assume that a perpetrator of moral evil was someone who
209 disbelieved in God than someone who disbelieved in evolution, the accuracy of
210 horoscopes, the safety of vaccines, or the reality of global warming (all posterior
211 probabilities between .956 and .9997).

212 Finally, it is possible that people may intuitively associate certain specific moral
213 violations, such as child molestation, with religious individuals rather than atheists.
214 However, *Study S3* found that people intuitively assume that a priest who molests young

215 boys for decades is more likely to be a priest who does not believe in God than a priest
216 who believes in God (posterior probability = .998).

217 In sum, participants intuitively assume that the perpetrators of immoral acts are
218 probable atheists. These effects appeared across religiously diverse societies, including
219 countries with Buddhist, Christian, Hindu, Muslim, and nonreligious majorities, showing
220 that intuitive moral prejudice against atheists is not exclusive to Abrahamic or
221 monotheistic majority societies. To the contrary, intuitive anti-atheist prejudice
222 generalizes to largely secular societies, and appears globally evident even among atheists.

223 Notably, our primary experimental paradigm used extreme examples of
224 immorality where anti-atheist prejudice would presumably be less explicitly defensible.
225 We tested moral prejudice using vicious acts of cruelty (animal torture, serial murder, and
226 mutilation), which participants—including atheist participants—nonetheless intuitively
227 associated with atheists. Combined, these results imply that across the world, religious
228 belief is intuitively viewed as a necessary safeguard against the temptations of gross
229 immoral conduct, and atheists are broadly perceived as potentially morally depraved and
230 dangerous. Viewed differently, people viewed belief in a god as a sufficient moral buffer
231 to inhibit immoral behavior.

232 Our results highlight a stark divergence between lay and scientific perceptions of
233 the relationship between religion and morality. Although religion likely influences many
234 moral outcomes and judgments^{3,23,24}, core moral instincts appear to emerge largely
235 independent of religion^{30,31}. Additionally, highly secular societies are among the most
236 stable and cooperative on earth¹⁴. Nonetheless, our findings reveal widespread suspicion
237 that morality requires belief in a god. For many people, including many atheists, the

238 answer to Dostoevsky's¹⁸ question, "Without God...It means everything is permitted
239 now, one can do anything?" is "yes", inasmuch "everything" refers to acts of extreme
240 immorality.

241 Religions underpin large-scale intragroup cooperation³, but also promote distrust
242 of nonbelievers^{13,19} who are excluded from such religious moral communities^{3,25}. Does
243 rising secularism^{14,32} moderate effects - as atheist norms become stronger within
244 societies? The present findings suggest that intuitive moral suspicion of atheists is
245 culturally widespread though not universal. Given that intuitive anti-atheist biases may
246 transfer across moral domains¹⁹ (*Studies S1 & S3*), the resilience of moral prejudice
247 against atheists reveals a potential barrier to the full acceptance of this growing segment³²
248 of the global population. Consistent with predictions derived from cultural evolutionary
249 theories of religion and morality²², extreme intuitive moral distrust of atheists is evident
250 globally, among believers and atheists in both religious and secular societies. Even as
251 secularism reduces overt religiosity in many places¹⁴, religion has apparently still left a
252 deep and abiding mark on human moral intuitions.

253 **Methods**

254 Data collection proceeded among teams acting locally across all thirteen
255 countries. Local ethics approval was completed by individual research teams within each
256 country.

257 The experiment employed a version of the representativeness heuristic²⁸. In the
258 classic version of this task, participants are given a description of a politically liberal,
259 single woman. When asked whether it is more likely that she is A) a bank teller, or B) a
260 bank teller who is active in the feminist movement, participants tend to erroneously pick

261 option B. Although logically incorrect (there are necessarily at least as many bank tellers
262 as bank tellers who are feminists), the description seems more representative of the
263 double identity provided in option B, leading people to intuitively choose that option
264 (termed the conjunction fallacy). By independently varying the contents of the
265 description and the identities implied by option B, researchers can assess the degree to
266 which people intuitively view a given description as representative of different
267 identities¹⁹.

268 We generated a representativeness heuristic task to quantify the degree to which
269 people around the world intuitively view religion as necessary for the inhibition of gross
270 immoral behavior. We provided a description of an immoral person who initially tortures
271 animals and eventually kills people for thrills (see *Supplement*), and then asked whether it
272 was more probable that the perpetrator was A) a teacher, or B) a teacher who either
273 (manipulated between subjects) does not believe in God, or is a religious believer. Higher
274 conjunction fallacy rates (picking option B) in the atheist condition indicate that people
275 intuitively view serial murder as more representative of atheists than of religious
276 believers¹⁹. This manipulation allowed us to test the relationship between intuitive
277 distrust of atheists and personal religious belief, while adjusting for countrywide variation
278 in this relationship, as well as demographic covariates.

279 **Analytic strategy.** The nested structure of our data required a multilevel (e.g.,
280 hierarchical) modeling strategy to generate aggregate inferences. Failure to adopt such a
281 strategy can lead to serious and potentially misleading inferential errors³³. Our analyses
282 relied on Bayesian hierarchical modeling²⁹ using the rethinking package³⁴ in R. Bayesian
283 approaches provide researchers a number of pragmatic benefits³⁵, including the use of

284 intuitive statements (e.g., posterior probabilities) about the probability of experimental
285 manipulations producing effects across countries, as well as the relative credibility or
286 plausibility of different potential parameter values^{29,36}. In addition, hierarchical (e.g.,
287 multilevel) models can mitigate some problems associated with multiple comparisons³⁷
288 —comparisons that could be especially concerning in the present study, which evaluated
289 intuitive moral distrust of atheists across 13 countries while adjusting for individual
290 demographics. Further, Bayesian estimation allowed us to represent the estimate
291 uncertainty using highest posterior density intervals which represent the range in which
292 the most credible parameter values lie. This approach is in contrast to frequentist
293 confidence intervals, which only present a range of possible values that would contain the
294 true parameter value a known proportion of the time were this study repeated a very large
295 number of times, although frequentist confidence intervals are often intuitively
296 misunderstood as if they had the properties of Bayesian posterior density intervals³⁸. Our
297 primary inferences are drawn from probing samples from the posterior from a single
298 hierarchical model. In it, we modeled random intercepts of country and modeled effects
299 of target (atheist vs. believer) as random across country, with all other factors fixed
300 across country. Alternative model specifications did not appreciably change inferences.

301 **Data Availability.** Data and code are freely available at <https://osf.io/f0upy/>

302 **Competing Interests.** We declare no competing interests.

303

References

- 304 1 Atkinson, Q. D. & Bourrat, P. Beliefs about God, the afterlife and morality
 305 support the role of supernatural policing in human cooperation. *Evolution and*
 306 *Human Behavior* **32**, 41-49 (2011).
- 307 2 Purzycki, B. G. *et al.* Moralistic gods, supernatural punishment and the expansion
 308 of human sociality. *Nature* (2016).
- 309 3 Graham, J. & Haidt, J. Beyond beliefs: Religions bind individuals into moral
 310 communities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* **14**, 140-150 (2010).
- 311 4 Sosis, R. & Alcorta, C. Signaling, solidarity, and the sacred: The evolution of
 312 religious behavior. *Evolutionary anthropology: issues, news, and reviews* **12**, 264-
 313 274 (2003).
- 314 5 Norenzayan, A. *et al.* The cultural evolution of prosocial religions. *Behavioral*
 315 *and Brain Sciences*, 1-86 (2014).
- 316 6 Xygalatas, D. *et al.* Extreme rituals promote prosociality. *Psychological science*
 317 **24**, 1602-1605 (2013).
- 318 7 Turchin, P. *War and peace and war: the life cycles of imperial nations*. (Pi,
 319 2005).
- 320 8 Botero, C. A. *et al.* The ecology of religious beliefs. *Proceedings of the National*
 321 *Academy of Sciences* **111**, 16784-16789 (2014).
- 322 9 Baumard, N. & Boyer, P. Explaining moral religions. *Trends in Cognitive*
 323 *Sciences* **17**, 272-280 (2013).
- 324 10 Norenzayan, A. *et al.* The cultural evolution of prosocial religions. *Behavioral*
 325 *and Brain Sciences* **39**, 1-65, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X14001356>
 326 (2016).
- 327 11 Atran, S. & Ginges, J. Religious and sacred imperatives in human conflict.
 328 *Science* **336**, 855-857 (2012).
- 329 12 Neuberg, S. L. *et al.* Religion and intergroup conflict findings from the Global
 330 Group Relations Project. *Psychological science* **25**, 198-2016 (2014).
- 331 13 Edgell, P., Gerteis, J. & Hartmann, D. Atheists as “other”: Moral boundaries and
 332 cultural membership in American society. *American Sociological Review* **71**, 211-
 333 234 (2006).
- 334 14 Gervais, W. M., Shariff, A. F. & Norenzayan, A. Do you believe in atheists?
 335 Distrust is central to anti-atheist prejudice. *Journal of personality and social*
 336 *psychology* **101**, 1189 (2011).
- 337 15 Inglehart, R. & Norris, P. *Sacred and secular: Religion and politics worldwide*.
 338 (Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- 339 16 Pew. Worldwide, Many See Belief in God as Essential to Morality. (2014).
- 340 17 Johnston, I. *The Mozi: A complete translation*. (Columbia University Press,
 341 2010).
- 342 18 Plato. *Euthyphro*. (399 BC).
- 343 19 Dostoevsky, F. *The Brothers Karamazov*. 12 edn, (Farrar, Straus, & Giroux,
 344 1880/2002).
- 345 20 Gervais, W. M. Everything is permitted? People intuitively judge immorality as
 346 representative of atheists. *PloS one* **9**, e92302 (2014).

- 347 21 Johnson, D. & Bering, J. Hand of God, mind of man: Punishment and cognition in
 348 the evolution of cooperation. *Evolutionary Psychology* **4**, 147470490600400119
 349 (2006).
- 350 22 Boyd, R., Richerson, P. J. & Henrich, J. The cultural niche: Why social learning is
 351 essential for human adaptation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
 352 **108**, 10918-10925 (2011).
- 353 23 McKay, R. & Whitehouse, H. Religion and Morality. *Psychological Bulletin*
 354 (2014).
- 355 24 Bloom, P. in *Annual Review of Psychology, Vol 63* Vol. 63 *Annual Review of*
 356 *Psychology* (eds S. T. Fiske, D. L. Schacter, & S. E. Taylor) 179-199 (2012).
- 357 25 Hall, D. L., Cohen, A. B., Meyer, K. K., Varley, A. H. & Brewer, G. A. Costly
 358 signaling increases trust, even across religious affiliations. *Psychological science*,
 359 0956797615576473 (2015).
- 360 26 Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The social*
 361 *psychology of intergroup relations* **33**, 74 (1979).
- 362 27 Henrich, J., Heine, S. J. & Norenzayan, A. The weirdest people in the world?
 363 *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* **33**, 61-83 (2010).
- 364 28 Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. Extensional versus intuitive reasoning - the
 365 conjunction fallacy in probability judgment. *Psychological Review* **90**, 293-315,
 366 doi:10.1037/0033-295x.90.4.293 (1983).
- 367 29 McElreath, R. *Statistical Rethinking: A Bayesian Course with Examples in R and*
 368 *Stan*. Vol. 122 (CRC Press, 2016).
- 369 30 Hamlin, J. K., Wynn, K. & Bloom, P. Social evaluation by preverbal infants.
 370 *Nature* **450**, 557-559 (2007).
- 371 31 De Waal, F. B. The antiquity of empathy. *Science* **336**, 874-876 (2012).
- 372 32 Gervais, W. M. & Najle, M. B. How many atheists are there. *Social Psychological*
 373 *and Personality Science* **Preprint available at**
 374 <https://osf.io/preprints/psyarxiv/edzda> (2017).
- 375 33 Shariff, A. F., Willard, A. K., Muthukrishna, M., Kramer, S. R. & Henrich, J.
 376 What is the association between religious affiliation and children's altruism?
 377 *Current Biology* **26**, R699-R700 (2016).
- 378 34 McElreath, R. rethinking: Statistical Rethinking book package. R package version
 379 1.58. ((2015)).
- 380 35 Wagenmakers, E.-J., Morey, R. D. & Lee, M. D. Bayesian benefits for the
 381 pragmatic researcher. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* **25**, 169-176
 382 (2016).
- 383 36 Kruschke, J. K. *Doing Bayesian data analysis: A tutorial introduction with R*.
 384 (Academic Press, 2010).
- 385 37 Gelman, A., Hill, J. & Yajima, M. Why we (usually) don't have to worry about
 386 multiple comparisons. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness* **5**, 189-
 387 211 (2012).
- 388 38 Hoekstra, R., Morey, R. D., Rouder, J. N. & Wagenmakers, E.-J. Robust
 389 misinterpretation of confidence intervals. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* **21**,
 390 1157-1164 (2014).
- 391

392

393 **Supplementary Information** is linked to the online version of the paper at

394 www.nature.com/nature.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by a grant to WMG from the Templeton Foundation (48275). JB was supported by grants from the Templeton World Charity Foundation (0077), and a Royal Society of New Zealand Marsden Grant (VUW1321). DX acknowledges support by the Interacting Minds Centre at Aarhus University. RMcK acknowledges the support of the John Templeton Foundation (52257), and the ARC Centre of Excellence in Cognition and its Disorders at Macquarie University. MvE acknowledges support by a VENI grant (016.135.135) from the Dutch Organization for Scientific Research. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of its funders. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Author Contributions

WMG developed the study design in consultation with all the authors. WMG and JB performed the analyses. WMG, DX, MvE, JB, and RMcK wrote the manuscript with input from all authors. All authors were involved in data collection.

Global evidence of extreme intuitive moral prejudice against atheists

Will M. Gervais¹
Dimitris Xygalatas^{2,3}
Ryan T. McKay⁴
Michiel van Elk⁵
Emma E. Buchtel⁶
Mark Aveyard⁷
Sarah R. Schiavone¹
Ilan Dar-Nimrod⁸
Annika M. Svedholm-Häkkinen⁹
Tapani Riekkö⁹
Eva Kundtová Klocová¹⁰
Jonathan E. Ramsay¹¹
Joseph Bulbulia¹²

¹ University of Kentucky (USA)

² University of Connecticut (USA)

³ Aarhus University (Denmark)

⁴ Royal Holloway, University of London (UK)

⁵ University of Amsterdam (Netherlands)

⁶ Education University of Hong Kong (Hong Kong)

⁷ American University of Sharjah (United Arab Emirates)

⁸ The University of Sydney (Australia)

⁹ University of Helsinki (Finland)

¹⁰ Masaryk University (Czech Republic)

¹¹ Singapore University of Social Sciences (Singapore)

¹² Victoria University of Wellington (New Zealand)

Address correspondence to Will Gervais (will.gervais@uky.edu)

Supplementary Information

SUPPLEMENTARY METHODS	23
BASELINE METHODS	23
SAMPLING AND DEMOGRAPHICS	27
ADDITIONAL MODELING DETAILS	27
ACCESS TO MATERIALS AND DATA	28
SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	29
ATHEIST AND MAXIMUM BELIEF INFERENCES	29
SUPPLEMENTARY STUDIES	30
STUDY S1	30
STUDY S2	31
STUDY S3	32
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES	33
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 1. SAMPLING DETAILS.	33
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 2. RAW DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: PROPORTION CONJUNCTION ERRORS (WITH 95% CIs) FOR ATHEIST AND RELIGIOUS TARGETS	33
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 3. GENERAL DEMOGRAPHICS	34
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 4. RELIGIOUS DEMOGRAPHICS (%).	35
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 5: MODEL SUMMARY AT MINIMUM BELIEF IN GOD (0 OUT OF 100).	36
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 6: MODEL SUMMARY AT MAXIMUM BELIEF IN GOD (100 OUT OF 100).	37
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 7: PREDICTED CONJUNCTION ERROR RATES ACROSS A VARIETY OF SPECIFIC DISBELIEFS	38
SUPPLEMENTARY REFERENCES	39

Supplementary Methods

Baseline Methods

Here is the baseline set of methods. Some countries tweaked elements of this (e.g., used different religious categories, measured political attitudes differently). These differences are noted in their data, translated methods, and in the data summaries.

Methods

The methods are simple: participants answered one representativeness heuristic question, three other logic puzzles that acted as a smokescreen, one item included to ensure people are paying attention (e.g., Oppenheimer, Meyvis, & Davidenko, 2009), and basic demographics.

I. Representativeness Heuristic task.

Participants began with a single representativeness heuristic task with a description of an unambiguously immoral character. Between subjects, we manipulated the contents of Option #2:

When a man was young, he began inflicting harm on animals. It started with just pulling the wings off flies, but eventually progressed to torturing stray cats and other animals in his neighborhood.

As an adult, the man found that he did not get much thrill from harming animals, so he began hurting people instead. He has killed 5 homeless people that he abducted from poor neighborhoods in his home city. Their dismembered bodies are currently buried in his basement.

Which is more probable?

1. The man is a teacher
2. The man is a teacher and [does not believe in any gods. / is a religious believer.]

II. Attention Check.

Here is a different type of question. SKIP THE NEXT QUESTION. It is only included to ensure that you are paying attention and reading directions. Do not leave an answer for the question about US presidents.

Who is the current President of the United States of America?

- a) Barack Obama
- b) Mitt Romney
- c) Steve Perry

d) George Washington

We dropped participants who actually answered this question.

III. Distractor Items

A bat and a ball cost \$1.10 in total. The bat costs \$1.00 more than the ball. How much does the ball cost? ____ cents
If it takes 5 machines 5 minutes to make 5 widgets, how long would it take 100 machines to make 100 widgets? _____ minutes
In a lake, there is a patch of lily pads. Every day, the patch doubles in size. If it takes 48 days for the patch to cover the entire lake, how long would it take for the patch to cover half of the lake? _____ days

IV. Suspicion check

What do you think this study is mainly about so far?

- a) Stereotyping and prejudice
- b) Logic and reasoning
- c) Language fluency
- d) Emotion perception
- e) Memory

V. Demographics

1. How old are you? _____
2. What is your gender?
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
 - c. Other

3. What is your religious affiliation?
 - a. Christian (Catholic)
 - b. Christian (Baptist)
 - c. Christian (Other)
 - d. Hindu
 - e. Buddhist
 - f. Muslim
 - g. Jewish
 - h. Sikh
 - i. None
 - j. Atheist
 - k. Agnostic
 - l. Other (Please specify)

4. How strongly do you believe in God or gods (from 0-100)? To clarify, if you are certain that God (or gods) does not exist, please put "0" and if you are certain that God (or gods) does exist, then put "100." _____

5. How would you describe your race/ethnicity?
 - a. White/Caucasian
 - b. Hispanic/Latino
 - c. Black/African American
 - d. American Indian/Alaskan Native
 - e. Asian
 - f. Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
 - g. Mixed
 - h. Other: _____

6. We are interested in your political beliefs. Would you consider yourself more liberal or conservative? Select an option below:
 - a. Very liberal
 - b. Liberal
 - c. Slightly liberal
 - d. Moderate
 - e. Slightly conservative
 - f. Conservative
 - g. Very conservative

7. We are interested in how you perceive your life. Think of a ladder representing where people stand in [insert country here]. At the top of the ladder are the people who are the best off—those who have the most money, the most education, and the most respected jobs. At the bottom are the people who are the worst off—who have

the least money, least education, and the least respected jobs or no job. The higher up you are on this ladder, the closer you are to the people at the very top; the lower you are, the closer you are to the people at the very bottom. Imagine this rating scale represents the ladder. Where would you place yourself, relative to other people in [insert country here]?

- a. Rating scale from 0 (Bottom) to 10 (Top)

8. Location: City _____ State/Province _____

9. “What is the highest degree of education you have completed?”

- a. Some high school
- b. Completed high school or equivalent
- c. Some university/college
- d. Completed university/college
- e. Some postgraduate work
- f. Completed a postgraduate degree

Sampling and Demographics

Additional sampling and demographic information is presented in Supplementary Tables 1-4

Additional modeling details

All analyses were conducted in R^{34,39-41}.

Overall, 35.9% of the sample made errors in the control condition, whereas 64.1% made errors in the experimental Atheist condition ($X^2=163.512$, $df=1$, $\Phi=.225$, $p<.001$). See Supplementary Table 2.

There was substantial heterogeneity by country in the error rates. Notably, 31.13% of the total sample ($n=993$) were from Finland, where the error rate in the experimental condition was only 28% which is similar to the baseline error rate of 26.7% in this country ($X^2=0.140$, $df=1$, $\Phi=.014$, $p=.709$). Country-level differences are in accordance with our experimental hypothesis that culturally evolved country level differences in anti-atheist prejudice.

The proportion of errors in both experimental conditions for each country are given in Supplementary Table 2.

We next turned to estimate country level differences in religious belief. We first calculated an Interclass Correlation Coefficient for Belief in God by Country using a random coefficient model. This estimates the proportion of within country variation in religious belief relative to between country variation at the level of participants. The $ICC_{\text{Belief}} = 0.335$, indicating high levels of country-level clustering in religious belief, a finding consistent with other studies investigating global variation in religious belief (e.g., the World Values Survey).

Evidence of marked country-level heterogeneity both in experimental outcomes and in religious beliefs suggests the need to appropriately handle country dependencies.

We modelled the expected error rates using a Bayesian multilevel model in R using McElreath's Rethinking package²⁹. Bayesian regression yields results with transparent and intuitive probabilistic interpretations: the posterior distributions that are generated are probabilistic distributions for modelled associations, which are conditional on the data, model, and priors. Priors for the effects modelled as fixed in the current study weakly regularizing, with a mean of zero and standard deviation of 1. Varying slopes and intercepts used adaptively regularizing priors²⁹. The full model code is available at <https://osf.io/f0upy/>

Access to materials and data

All materials and methods (including translated materials for some countries), as well as all raw data, is available at the following link:

<https://osf.io/f0upy/>

Our initial study registration can be found here:

<https://osf.io/f6tcr/>

Our experimental methods were uploaded on November 12, 2013. Due to a technical oversight, formal preregistration did not occur until August 26, 2015. Experimental protocol went unchanged during this time.

Supplementary Notes

Atheist and maximum belief inferences

In the main manuscript, we report some inferences regarding atheist participants. To do so, we used our full model posterior and evaluated predictions at minimum level of belief on God (0 out of 100). Supplementary Table 5 summarizes inferences across all sites.

In the main manuscript, we report some inferences regarding participants at maximum belief in God. To do so, we used our full model posterior and evaluated predictions at maximum level of belief on God (100 out of 100). Supplementary Table 6 summarizes inferences across all sites.

1

2

3

Supplementary Studies

Study S1

Overview. Our primary cross-cultural experiment tested whether, when given a description of someone engaging in animal torture and serial murder, people intuitively assumed that the perpetrator was an atheist. Notably, this experiment focused on a rather extreme moral violation. In addition, the primary experimental contrast across conditions was between someone who “does not believe in any gods” and someone who “is a religious believer.” This phrasing may have led participants to conflate issues of belief in a god with the broader construct of religiosity, which may connote additional norms and behaviors. To simultaneously address both of these concerns, we conducted a study in which we tested whether participants intuitively assume that the perpetrator of a more mundane moral violation is also an atheist. For symmetrical framing, we contrasted conditions in which the conjunction target was framed in terms of either belief or disbelief in God.

Method. We recruited 205 American participants from Amazon Mechanical Turk (Age: $M = 34.4$, $SD = 11.2$; Belief in God [0-100]: $M = 43.4$, $SD = 41.2$; 44% female). We presented participants with the following vignette of a mundane moral violation and conjunction question [experimental conditions in brackets]:

“A 42 year-old woman was out of town on vacation. She had dinner at a restaurant, finished her meal, and left without paying the bill.

Which is more probable?

a) The woman is a teacher

b) The woman is a teacher and [does/ does not] believe in God”

Results. As with main analyses, we utilized Bayesian estimation and present model predicted conjunction error probabilities [with 95% HPDIs]. Given a description of a mundane moral violation, participants were more likely to commit conjunction errors for targets who do not believe in God, .31 [.22, .40], than targets who do believe in God, .19 [.12, .26], posterior probability = .99.

Summary. Study S1 suggests that moral distrust is evident in—but not exclusive to—extreme moral violations. In addition, it appears that inferences about belief in God, rather than religiosity more broadly, are sufficient to generate these effects.

43 **Study S2**

44

45 **Overview.** Our primary cross-cultural experiment suggested that people intuitively
46 assume that the perpetrators are likely to disbelieve in gods. It is possible that this
47 intuition was not driven by an association between religion and moral restraint, but rather
48 by a general disbelief bias: that, if all we know is something someone does not believe,
49 we cannot infer what they do believe, and as such treat them as potential moral wildcards.
50 Study S2 used the same extreme moral violation as the primary analysis and the
51 conjunction task pitted targets who disbelieve in God against disbelievers of other stripes.
52 We chose a disparate assortment of disbeliefs that span the political and religious spectra.

53

54 **Method.** We recruited 394 American participants from Amazon Mechanical Turk (Age:
55 $M = 33.6$, $SD = 10.5$; Belief in God [0-100]: $M = 41.3$, $SD = 40.8$; 45% female). We
56 presented participants with the same moral violation used in the main analysis, and
57 provided potential targets who disbelieve in God, evolution, horoscopes, global warming,
58 or vaccine safety (manipulated between subjects).

59

60 **Results.** As with main analyses, we utilized Bayesian estimation and present model
61 predicted conjunction error probabilities [with 95% HPDIs]. Given a description of a
62 mundane moral violation, participants were more likely to commit conjunction errors for
63 targets who do not believe in God than targets who disbelieve in evolution, horoscopes,
64 vaccine safety, or global warming, see Supplementary Table 7.

65

66

67 **Summary.** Our main study suggests extreme moral distrust of people who do not believe
68 in gods. Study S2 suggests that this effect does not readily generalize to various other
69 specific disbeliefs.

70

71 **Study S3**

72

73 **Overview.** Our primary cross-cultural investigation suggested that extreme moral
 74 violations are intuitively associated with atheists. However, it is possible that other
 75 extreme moral violations might, in fact, suggest a religious perpetrator. Specifically,
 76 given the prominence of sex abuse scandals in the Catholic church, it is possible that
 77 people might intuitively assume that the perpetrators of chronic child molestation might
 78 in fact be men of the cloth. In addition, none of our previous studies explored whether
 79 moral impropriety might outweigh other overt cues that one is religious in people's
 80 intuitive attributions of atheism to moral violators. Study S3 tested whether people would
 81 assume that a serial child molester who also happens to be a priest is, in fact, a priest who
 82 does not believe in God.

83

84 **Method.** We recruited 265 participants from the University of Kentucky campus in
 85 Lexington, KY, USA (Age: $M = 21.7$, $SD = 6.7$; Belief in God [0-100]: $M = 70.8$, $SD =$
 86 34.1 ; 57% female). We presented participants with the following vignette [experimental
 87 conditions in brackets]:

88

89 "Keith is a well-respected figure in his community. All his friends
 90 describe him as a very caring and friendly 60-year-old-man. However,
 91 Keith actually spends most of his free time luring young boys into his
 92 office to molest them. In the past 10 years, Keith has molested over 30
 93 boys.

94

95 Which is more probable?

96

a) Keith is a priest

97

b) Keith is a priest and [**believes/ does not believe**] in God"

98

99 **Results.** As with main analyses, we utilized Bayesian estimation and present model
 100 predicted conjunction error probabilities [with 95% HPDIs]. Given a description of a
 101 serial child molesting priest, participants were more likely to commit conjunction errors
 102 for targets who do not believe in God, .57 [.49, .65], than targets who do believe in God,
 103 .40 [.32, .48], posterior probability = .998.

104

105 **Summary.** Study S3 suggests that intuitive moral distrust extends to moral violations that
 106 could possibly be popularly associated with religious people (child molestation), given
 107 current events. Further, a description of immorality seemingly outweighed even overt
 108 evidence of religiosity, leading people to nonetheless assume that a perpetrator of serial
 109 child molestation does not believe in God, even though he is a priest.

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

Supplementary Tables

117 Supplementary Table 1. Sampling details.

118

Country	Sample	English	Payment	Contact
Australia	student	Y	credit	ilan.dar-nimrod@sydney.edu.au
China	community	N	money	buchtel@eduhk.hk
Czech Rep.	student	N	credit	eva.klocova@gmail.com
Finland	mixed	N	none	tapani.riekki@helsinki.fi annika.svedholm@helsinki.fi
Hong Kong	student	N	lottery	buchtel@eduhk.hk
India	community	Y	money	will.gervais@uky.edu
Mauritius	community	N	none	xygalatas@uconn.com
Netherlands	student	N	credit	M.vanElk@uva.nl
NZ	student	Y	lottery	joseph.bulbulia@gmail.com
Singapore	student	Y	credit	jonathanramsay@unisim.edu.sg
UAE	student	Y	credit	maveyard@aus.edu
UK	student	Y	lottery	Ryan.McKay@rhul.ac.uk
USA	student	Y	candy	will.gervais@uky.edu

119

120

121

122

123 Supplementary Table 2. Raw descriptive statistics: Proportion conjunction errors
 124 (with 95% CIs) for atheist and religious targets.
 125

Site	<i>Atheist Error Rate</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Religious Error Rate</i>	<i>95% CI</i>
Australia	.53	[.42, .65]	.29	[.19, .40]
China	.69	[.59, .78]	.51	[.41, .62]
Czech Rep.	.51	[.40, .61]	.24	[.16, .34]
Finland	.28	[.24, .32]	.26	[.22, .30]
Hong Kong	.67	[.56, .77]	.34	[.23, .46]
India	.80	[.74, .86]	.39	[.32, .46]
Mauritius	.56	[.43, .68]	.27	[.19, .37]
Netherlands	.43	[.34, .53]	.25	[.17, .35]
New Zealand	.38	[.28, .49]	.29	[.20, .40]
Singapore	.78	[.68, .87]	.28	[.19, .39]
UAE	.77	[.66, .86]	.17	[.09, .28]
UK	.47	[.35, .58]	.29	[.19, .41]
USA	.65	[.56, .74]	.25	[.17, .35]
Aggregate	.52	[.50, .54]	.30	[.27, .32]

126

127

128
129
130

131 **Supplementary Table 3. General demographics.**

132
133

Country	Age <i>M</i> [<i>SD</i>]	Female %	Belief <i>M</i> [<i>SD</i>]	Educ. <i>Mdn</i>	SSES <i>M</i> [<i>SD</i>]	Cons. Pol. <i>M</i> [<i>SD</i>]
Australia	20.0 [5.12]	70	53.9 [38.5]	Some univ	6.60 [1.48]	3.53 [1.41]
China	29.8 [5.95]	63	28.7 [35.7]	University	6.84 [1.57]	3.38 [1.43]
Czech Rep.	22.0 [2.08]	68	47.2 [39.8]	--	3.53 [1.15]	4.47 [1.15]
Finland	28.1 [8.22]	73	31.3 [35.3]	University	5.99 [1.59]	--
Hong Kong	21.3 [3.39]	80	63.2 [36.1]	Some univ	4.90 [1.66]	2.89 [1.08]
India	32.3 [9.44]	65	85.0 [26.9]	University	4.93 [1.51]	3.34 [1.41]
Mauritius	21.7 [1.33]	47	76.5 [39.2]	Some univ	4.07 [4.06]	2.86 [1.42]
Netherlands	19.5 [2.14]	75	21.2 [29.9]	University	6.78 [1.45]	4.14 [2.75]
New Zealand	23.1 [7.94]	67	42.0 [39.5]	Some univ	6.01 [1.60]	2.69 [1.60]
Singapore	20.8 [1.69]	68	69.8 [30.3]	HS*	5.53 [1.48]	3.57 [1.30]
UAE	19.9 [1.56]	60	94.3 [18.9]	HS*	6.80 [1.34]	--
UK	25.1 [9.29]	67	35.1 [37.1]	Some univ	6.29 [1.78]	3.24 [1.23]
USA	19.1 [2.33]	80	83.4 [29.2]	Some univ	6.39 [1.50]	3.98 [1.56]
Aggregate	25.2 [7.99]	69	51.2 [41.4]	Some univ	5.58 [2.02]	3.49 [1.63]

134
135
136
137
138

*Median education was listed as “Completed High School” despite the fact that all students were at university (“Some University”). See Methods Packet in this document for disambiguation of items and scoring. SSES = subjective socioeconomic status. Cons. Pol = political attitudes, from 1 (Very liberal) to 7 (very conservative).

139

140 **Supplementary Table 4. Religious demographics (%).**

141

Country	Christian	Hindu	Buddhist	Muslim	None	Atheist	Agnostic	Other
Australia	41	2	4	4	14	15	15	5
China	4	--	18	--	--		75*	3
Czech	36	4	.5	1	3	31	18	6.5
Finland	42			.4	25	18	11	3.6
HK	33	--	3	--	--		60*	4
India	17	69	.2	10	.2	1	1	1.6
Mauritius	25	43	2	22	3	4	.6	.4
Neth.								
NZ	22	.6	3	1	71	2	0	.4
Singapore	28	7	30	5		30*		
UAE	4	4	1	84		.6*		6.4
UK	20	2	0	6	27	22	15	8
USA	79	0	.4	.4	10	4	5	1.2

142

143 * Notes: China and Hong Kong used slightly different religious ID options. Among other
 144 things, Atheist/agnostic was an option, rather than atheist or agnostic as separate choices.
 145 Dashes (--) indicate an option was not provided. Singapore used a “freethinker” category
 146 instead of none, atheist, and agnostic. UAE used “Non-Religious Other philosophy not
 147 listed here” category. Data taken from final data set, after dropping inattentive
 148 participants. Specific denominational demographics for the Netherlands are available in
 149 full posted dataset. Please contact Michiel van Elk for coding information.

150

151

152 **Supplementary Table 5: Model summary at minimum belief in God (0 out of 100).**
 153 Predicted conjunction error probabilities for both atheist and religious targets [with 95%
 154 highest posterior density intervals], along with relative risks [95% HPDI], and posterior
 155 probability of atheist target error rates exceeding religious target error rates, $\text{pr}(A > R)$.
 156 Relative risk = $\text{pr}(\text{atheist target error}) / \text{pr}(\text{religious target error})$. UAE = United Arab
 157 Emirates, UK = the United Kingdom, USA = United States of America.
 158

	Atheist	Religious	Relative Risk	$\text{pr}(A > R)$
Total	0.52 [0.4, 0.64]	0.27 [0.22, 0.33]	1.91 [1.40, 2.45]	> .999
Australia	0.48 [0.35, 0.59]	0.27 [0.19, 0.35]	1.81 [1.16, 2.51]	.999
China	0.65 [0.55, 0.74]	0.40 [0.30, 0.51]	1.63 [1.18, 2.09]	> .999
Czech Rep.	0.46 [0.36, 0.56]	0.25 [0.17, 0.32]	1.90 [1.25, 2.65]	> .999
Finland	0.24 [0.2, 0.28]	0.24 [0.20, 0.28]	1.00 [0.77, 1.24]	.489
Hong Kong	0.55 [0.43, 0.67]	0.31 [0.22, 0.40]	1.83 [1.19, 2.53]	.999
India	0.72 [0.62, 0.8]	0.32 [0.24, 0.40]	2.31 [1.69, 2.95]	> .999
Mauritius	0.49 [0.36, 0.61]	0.26 [0.18, 0.34]	1.92 [1.19, 2.73]	.999
Netherlands	0.43 [0.34, 0.53]	0.26 [0.19, 0.33]	1.70 [1.16, 2.34]	.998
New Zealand	0.36 [0.26, 0.46]	0.28 [0.20, 0.36]	1.33 [0.83, 1.86]	.905
Singapore	0.7 [0.58, 0.81]	0.27 [0.18, 0.36]	2.68 [1.78, 3.79]	> .999
UAE	0.65 [0.52, 0.78]	0.22 [0.13, 0.31]	3.12 [1.81, 4.84]	> .999
UK	0.42 [0.32, 0.53]	0.27 [0.19, 0.35]	1.58 [1, 2.19]	.988
USA	0.58 [0.46, 0.69]	0.23 [0.15, 0.32]	2.56 [1.63, 3.68]	> .999

159

160

161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168

Supplementary Table 6: Model summary at maximum belief in God (100 out of 100). Predicted conjunction error probabilities for both atheist and religious targets [with 95% highest posterior density intervals], along with relative risks [95% HPDI], and posterior probability of atheist target error rates exceeding religious target error rates, $\text{pr}(A > R)$. Relative risk = $\text{pr}(\text{atheist target error}) / \text{pr}(\text{religious target error})$. UAE = United Arab Emirates, UK = the United Kingdom, USA = United States of America.

	Atheist	Religious	Relative Risk	$\text{pr}(A > R)$
Total	0.64 [0.53, 0.74]	0.32 [0.27, 0.38]	1.98 [1.55, 2.41]	> .999
Australia	0.6 [0.49, 0.71]	0.32 [0.24, 0.41]	1.93 [1.32, 2.57]	> .999
China	0.75 [0.66, 0.84]	0.46 [0.35, 0.58]	1.65 [1.25, 2.14]	> .999
Czech Rep.	0.59 [0.48, 0.69]	0.3 [0.22, 0.38]	2.02 [1.41, 2.7]	> .999
Finland	0.35 [0.28, 0.41]	0.29 [0.24, 0.35]	1.21 [0.89, 1.54]	.904
Hong Kong	0.67 [0.56, 0.77]	0.36 [0.27, 0.46]	1.88 [1.31, 2.47]	> .999
India	0.81 [0.75, 0.87]	0.37 [0.30, 0.44]	2.21 [1.81, 2.63]	> .999
Mauritius	0.61 [0.5, 0.72]	0.31 [0.23, 0.39]	2.01 [1.42, 2.65]	> .999
Netherlands	0.55 [0.44, 0.65]	0.31 [0.22, 0.40]	1.84 [1.26, 2.45]	> .999
New Zealand	0.49 [0.37, 0.6]	0.33 [0.24, 0.43]	1.49 [0.97, 2.06]	.977
Singapore	0.79 [0.71, 0.87]	0.32 [0.23, 0.40]	2.56 [1.86, 3.36]	> .999
UAE	0.76 [0.66, 0.84]	0.26 [0.17, 0.35]	2.97 [1.98, 4.17]	> .999
UK	0.54 [0.43, 0.66]	0.32 [0.23, 0.42]	1.73 [1.16, 2.34]	0.997
USA	0.7 [0.61, 0.78]	0.28 [0.20, 0.36]	2.56 [1.85, 3.41]	> .999

169

170 **Supplementary Table 7: Predicted conjunction error rates across a variety of**
 171 **specific disbeliefs**
 172

Specific Disbelief	Point	Low HPDI	High HPDI	Posterior probability (relative to god)
God	0.55	0.43	0.66	---
evolution	0.26	0.15	0.36	>.999
horoscopes	0.32	0.22	0.44	>.999
vaccines	0.25	0.14	0.36	>.999
warming	0.38	0.27	0.50	0.98

173

174

Supplementary References

- 175
176
- 177 1 Atkinson, Q. D. & Bourrat, P. Beliefs about God, the afterlife and morality
178 support the role of supernatural policing in human cooperation. *Evolution*
179 *and Human Behavior* **32**, 41-49 (2011).
- 180 2 Purzycki, B. G. *et al.* Moralistic gods, supernatural punishment and the
181 expansion of human sociality. *Nature* (2016).
- 182 3 Graham, J. & Haidt, J. Beyond beliefs: Religions bind individuals into moral
183 communities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* **14**, 140-150 (2010).
- 184 4 Sosis, R. & Alcorta, C. Signaling, solidarity, and the sacred: The evolution of
185 religious behavior. *Evolutionary anthropology: issues, news, and reviews* **12**,
186 264-274 (2003).
- 187 5 Xygalatas, D. *et al.* Extreme rituals promote prosociality. *Psychological science*
188 **24**, 1602-1605 (2013).
- 189 6 Turchin, P. *War and peace and war: the life cycles of imperial nations.* (Pi,
190 2005).
- 191 7 Botero, C. A. *et al.* The ecology of religious beliefs. *Proceedings of the National*
192 *Academy of Sciences* **111**, 16784-16789 (2014).
- 193 8 Baumard, N. & Boyer, P. Explaining moral religions. *Trends in Cognitive*
194 *Sciences* **17**, 272-280 (2013).
- 195 9 Norenzayan, A. *et al.* The cultural evolution of prosocial religions. *Behavioral*
196 *and Brain Sciences* **39**, 1-65,
197 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X14001356> (2016).
- 198 10 Atran, S. & Ginges, J. Religious and sacred imperatives in human conflict.
199 *Science* **336**, 855-857 (2012).
- 200 11 Neuberg, S. L. *et al.* Religion and intergroup conflict findings from the Global
201 Group Relations Project. *Psychological science* **25**, 198-2016 (2014).
- 202 12 Edgell, P., Gerteis, J. & Hartmann, D. Atheists as "other": Moral boundaries
203 and cultural membership in American society. *American Sociological Review*
204 **71**, 211-234 (2006).
- 205 13 Gervais, W. M., Shariff, A. F. & Norenzayan, A. Do you believe in atheists?
206 Distrust is central to anti-atheist prejudice. *Journal of personality and social*
207 *psychology* **101**, 1189 (2011).
- 208 14 Inglehart, R. & Norris, P. *Sacred and secular: Religion and politics worldwide.*
209 (Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- 210 15 Pew. Worldwide, Many See Belief in God as Essential to Morality. (2014).
- 211 16 Johnston, I. *The Mozi: A complete translation.* (Columbia University Press,
212 2010).
- 213 17 Plato. *Euthyphro.* (399 BC).
- 214 18 Dostoevsky, F. *The Brothers Karamazov.* 12 edn, (Farrar, Straus, & Giroux,
215 1880/2002).
- 216 19 Gervais, W. M. Everything is permitted? People intuitively judge immorality
217 as representative of atheists. *PloS one* **9**, e92302 (2014).
- 218 20 Johnson, D. & Bering, J. Hand of God, mind of man: Punishment and cognition
219 in the evolution of cooperation. *Evolutionary Psychology* **4**,
220 147470490600400119 (2006).

- 221 21 Boyd, R., Richerson, P. J. & Henrich, J. The cultural niche: Why social learning
222 is essential for human adaptation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
223 *Sciences* **108**, 10918-10925 (2011).
- 224 22 Norenzayan, A. *et al.* The cultural evolution of prosocial religions. *Behavioral*
225 *and Brain Sciences*, 1-86 (2014).
- 226 23 McKay, R. & Whitehouse, H. Religion and Morality. *Psychological Bulletin*
227 (2014).
- 228 24 Bloom, P. in *Annual Review of Psychology, Vol 63* Vol. 63 *Annual Review of*
229 *Psychology* (eds S. T. Fiske, D. L. Schacter, & S. E. Taylor) 179-199 (2012).
- 230 25 Hall, D. L., Cohen, A. B., Meyer, K. K., Varley, A. H. & Brewer, G. A. Costly
231 signaling increases trust, even across religious affiliations. *Psychological*
232 *science*, 0956797615576473 (2015).
- 233 26 Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The*
234 *social psychology of intergroup relations* **33**, 74 (1979).
- 235 27 Henrich, J., Heine, S. J. & Norenzayan, A. The weirdest people in the world?
236 *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* **33**, 61-83 (2010).
- 237 28 Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. Extensional versus intuitive reasoning - the
238 conjunction fallacy in probability judgment. *Psychological Review* **90**, 293-
239 315, doi:10.1037/0033-295x.90.4.293 (1983).
- 240 29 McElreath, R. *Statistical Rethinking: A Bayesian Course with Examples in R and*
241 *Stan*. Vol. 122 (CRC Press, 2016).
- 242 30 Hamlin, J. K., Wynn, K. & Bloom, P. Social evaluation by preverbal infants.
243 *Nature* **450**, 557-559 (2007).
- 244 31 De Waal, F. B. The antiquity of empathy. *Science* **336**, 874-876 (2012).
- 245 32 Gervais, W. M. & Najle, M. B. How many atheists are there. *Socia Psychological*
246 *and Personality Science* **Preprint available at**
247 <https://osf.io/preprints/psyarxiv/edzda> (2017).
- 248 33 Shariff, A. F., Willard, A. K., Muthukrishna, M., Kramer, S. R. & Henrich, J. What
249 is the association between religious affiliation and children's altruism?
250 *Current Biology* **26**, R699-R700 (2016).
- 251 34 McElreath, R. rethinking: Statistical Rethinking book
252 package. R package version 1.58. ((2015)).
- 253 35 Wagenmakers, E.-J., Morey, R. D. & Lee, M. D. Bayesian benefits for the
254 pragmatic researcher. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* **25**, 169-176
255 (2016).
- 256 36 Kruschke, J. K. *Doing Bayesian data analysis: A tutorial introduction with R*.
257 (Academic Press, 2010).
- 258 37 Gelman, A., Hill, J. & Yajima, M. Why we (usually) don't have to worry about
259 multiple comparisons. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness* **5**,
260 189-211 (2012).
- 261 38 Hoekstra, R., Morey, R. D., Rouder, J. N. & Wagenmakers, E.-J. Robust
262 misinterpretation of confidence intervals. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* **21**,
263 1157-1164 (2014).
- 264 39 Wickham, H. tidy: Easily Tidy Data with `spread()` and
265 `gather()` Functions. R package version 0.4.1. (2016).
- 266 40 Wickham, H. & Francois, R. dplyr: A Grammar of Data

267 Manipulation. R package version 0.4.3.
268 (2015).
269 41 R Core Team. *R: A language and environment for statistical*
270 *computing*. , <
271 <http://www.r-project.org/>.> (2013).
272
273