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Abstract

Contrary to expectations by secularization theory, religion remains socially important and affects politics in many ways, especially regarding conflict risks between religious communities. Theoretically, religion can increase prosociality but the belief in the superiority of one’s faith may also facilitate intergroup discrimination and related conflict. Previous findings remain unclear, however, as specific religious ideas have hardly been tested. In this paper, we argue that the content of religious ideas has causal effects on intergroup discrimination. We hence test the impact of two opposing and prominent religious ideas on altruism and discrimination: the idea of universal love and the idea of only one true religion. Conducting dictator games with Christians and Muslims in Ghana and Tanzania, we find causal effects: While the idea of one true religion increases intergroup discrimination, the idea of universal love fosters equal treatment. Policy implications are obvious: promoting tolerant religious ideas seems indispensable to avoid political conflict.
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Man is a Religious Animal. He is the only Religious Animal. He is the only animal that has the True Religion—several of them. He is the only animal that loves his neighbor as himself and cuts his throat if his theology isn’t straight.

Mark Twain in “The Lowest Animal,” 1896

1. Introduction

Secularization theory argued religion to become less and less important but real world development have not conformed to this expectation (e.g. Fox 2019). As of 2017, more than 80 percent of the world’s population identified with a religious group (Pew Research Center 2017), and the number of Muslim and Christian believers was expected to increase even further in the future (ibid.). Religious ideas, norms and religious identities affect politics in many ways, including political preferences, voting behavior, democratization processes as well as discrimination of religious communities and violent conflicts (e.g. Philpot 2007; Obaidi et al. 2018).

In theoretical terms, the effect of faith on social relations is ambivalent (Appleby 2000; Philpott 2007). Religion shapes norms and values by providing a code of conduct to societies and generates networks among believers, thus fostering prosociality and cohesion (Barro and McCleary 2003). At the same time, religious ideas and identities can be exclusive, imposing faith on others and discriminating against non-believers. As it seems, the number of conflicts with religious overtones and the levels of mistrust between religious communities have been increasing (Basedau, Pfeiffer, and Vüllers 2016; Fox 2019; Obaidi et al. 2018). The question is apparent: Does religion only foster altruism towards members of one’s own religious group (the in-group), while also promoting discriminatory behavior towards members of other religious groups (the out-group)?
In this paper, we argue that the specific content of religious ideas may contribute to answering this question. Focusing on the highly important, yet understudied topic of the “ambivalence of the sacred” (Appleby 2000), we test the impact of two opposing and prominent religious ideas on altruism and intergroup discrimination: the idea of *universal love* and the idea of *one true religion*. Both ideas can be considered as core elements of Abrahamic faiths, especially the world’s biggest religions Christianity and Islam: to make the world believe in the true religion and to love all humankind.

Our study is hence not only politically highly relevant and timely, but is also an important contribution to the existing literature that hardly has considered the important difference between religious ideas, let alone test the causal effect of these prominent ones.

A large body of research has explored the impact of religion on prosocial behavior. Prosocial behavior can be broadly defined as acts that benefit others such as cooperating and sharing (Batson and Powell 2003). Many studies relying on self-reported measures find a positive connection between the two (McCullough and Worthington 1999; Batson, Schoenrade, and Ventis 1993; Power 2017). These studies, however, often lack causal leverage and cannot rule out reverse causality, spurious correlation or omitted variable bias. In addition, Sedikides and Gebauer (2010) and Gervais and Norenzayan (2012) show that religiosity increases socially desirable responding and impression management. Incentivized experimental studies have overcome this shortcoming by paying participants according to their decisions and thus providing them with incentives to truthfully reveal their preferences (Smith 1982). This makes experiments less prone to response biases compared to survey measures (Hoffmann 2012). Participants are randomly assigned into different treatments where one specific factor of interest is varied while the other factors are held constant. In this way, by comparing treatment groups to a control group, causalities can be detected. Studies on religion and
prosocial behavior draw primarily on priming techniques. In the context of religion, priming appears to be a particularly realistic tool as attendance at a religious service can be considered a prime that activates one or more specific religious ideas.

A recent meta-study including 93 experimental studies with more than 11,000 participants reports a small to medium positive effect of religious primes on prosocial behavior (Shariff et al. 2016). Yet, most of the studies included did not differentiate between religious content but instead aimed to make general statements on the effects of religion on behavior. A notable exception is a study by Preston and Ritter (2013), who differentiate between concepts of God and religion in a prisoner’s dilemma game. They find that subliminally priming participants with the word “God” enhances out-group love whereas priming the word “religion” leads to in-group bias compared to a neutrally primed control group. This finding has important implications: as different aspects of religion can lead to different forms of behavior, it is important to research the impact of specific religious ideas to draw meaningful conclusions.

A different, but related, strand of literature focuses on the darker side of religion: the boundaries of religious altruism. Here, discrimination is measured by observing whether or not participants in economic experiments exhibit differences in prosocial behavior depending on the religious group of their interaction partner. While some studies find evidence of religious intergroup discrimination (e.g. Chuah, Fahoum, and Hoffmann 2013; Chuah et al. 2016; Chuah et al. 2014; Chakravarty et al. 2016b), others do not (e.g. Johansson-Stenman, 2012; Basedau, Gobien, and Prediger 2018).

---

1 We focus in the following mainly on experimental studies using priming techniques. For excellent reviews on the economics of religion and the multidimensional effects of religion on socioeconomic development, see Hoffmann (2012) and Basedau, Gobien, and Prediger (2018). Priming goes back to the self-categorization theory: Identity entails a personal component, and several social components. Each category has its own set of behavioral implications. Typical primes in order to activate religious identity and ideas are the sentence-unscrambling tasks used by Shariff and Norenzayan (2007), which contains words such as God or divine; situating players in a religious surrounding such as a temple or church (e.g. Ahmed and Salas 2013); or letting participants listen to a prayer call (Aveyard 2014).
Mahmud, and Martinsson 2009). A metastudy by Lane (2016) finds that 14.3% of their included studies observe (mostly small levels of) religious out-group discrimination (80.9% find none, 4.8% find out-group favoritism). This literature mainly aims at identifying whether or not intergroup discrimination exists but does not focus on differences in discrimination behavior after priming specific contents.

We believe that religious content impacts altruism and discrimination and explain the inconclusive results found in the literature. When priming a general concept of religion, it is impossible to control for the specific religious idea an individual associates with this multidimensional concept. In particular, it is not possible to account for the ambivalence of the sacred, according to which different religious ideas may have opposing effects on behavior. To the best of our knowledge, our study is the first to focus on the impact of ambivalent religious ideas on behavior. We thus unravel the mechanisms that determine how religion influences altruism and out-group discrimination.

Addressing this gap, we conducted artefactual field experiments with non-student Christian and Muslim believers in Accra (Ghana) and Dar es Salaam (Tanzania). In contrast to most previous studies, we drew on a relatively large sample size of 1,254 participants in total. To measure the effect of religious ideas on altruism\(^2\), we used a dictator game and tested in a between-subject design a non-religious control prime versus two treatments: (1) priming the idea that true religion means loving all human beings and (2) priming the idea of the existence of only one true religion. To measure out-group discrimination, we adopted a within-subject design: each participant played the dictator game twice, once with a recipient of the same

\(^2\) Note that we measure altruism as one specific form of prosociality while ruling out potential reciprocity motivations that can be prevalent in other experiments, such as the ultimatum game where one player responds conditional on the behavior of the other.
religion and once with a recipient of a different religious group. With this design, we are able to contrast the two religious ideas and explore whether they have an effect on the general level of altruism as well as on the intensity and occurrence of out-group discrimination.³

We find that neither religious idea has an effect on the general level of altruism. However, religious ideas do matter when it comes to the boundaries of altruism. The idea of universal love leads to a more equal treatment of the religious in-group and the religious out-group: it increases the proportion of participants who transfer the same amount to the religious in- and out-groups by reducing the proportion of participants who send a lower amount to the religious out-group. In contrast, priming the idea of only one true religion leads to more unequal transfers between religious groups. Under this treatment, the religious out-group receives 11.82 percent lower transfers compared to the religious in-group.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: In section 2, we discuss related research on religion, especially its connection with prosocial behavior and discrimination, and subsequently develop our theory and hypotheses. Section 4 outlines the country context for Ghana and Tanzania and presents the experimental procedures. We then discuss our results in section 5. We close the paper by discussing our findings and summarizing their implications.

³ With this differentiation, we take into account that out-group discrimination has two relevant dimensions: the share of the in-group which discriminates and the severity of discrimination (see e.g. Piazza (2009)). Even if, for example, the occurrence of discrimination is low (i.e. only a small number of people discriminate), the intensity of these few people may be high (i.e. these few people make significant distinctions between the religious in- and out-groups) or vice versa. Note that this differentiation is less relevant for altruism. Here the overall size of the transfers is crucial.
2. Related Research, Theorizing and Hypotheses

*Religion and altruism*

Why should religion be connected to prosocial behavior in the first place? Using a lens of cultural evolution, Norenzayan et al. (2016) explain the emergence of religions’ social functions. Those ideas, norms and practices that increased social cohesion, including the collective practice of religious rituals, were favored historically. Aspects of supernaturalism were eventually combined with aspects of morality and altruism in such a way that monitoring and punishment duties were “outsourced” to supernatural agents (Norenzayan et al. 2016). Punishing or rewarding Gods who were concerned about human morality observed the behavior of humans on earth, providing them with an incentive to behave prosocially (Norenzayan and Shariff 2008; Preston and Ritter 2013; Johnson 2015). As such, a connection between religion and altruism is attributed to the belief in supernatural punishment in the case of misbehavior (Purzycki et al. 2016; Galen 2012).

On the other hand, it has been argued that religious practices such as confession, divine forgiveness and absolution may decrease the prosocial behavior of believers. Max Weber elaborated on this argument by referring to the “catholic cycle of sin, repentance, atonement, release, followed by renewed sin” (Weber 1904/1905 [2011]). If one’s sins and misbehaviors are forgiven, one might not have an incentive to behave prosocially, or—to put it to a more extreme way—one might even have an incentive to commit sins whenever it suits one’s interests. Another line of reasoning results from the theological determinism argument: if the world as it is today is created by God, he willingly formed it to be that way. Therefore, if humans are not created as prosocial beings, this is also God’s will (Vihvelin 2017).
This ambiguity is also reflected in the results of the experimental literature. A number of studies show that religious primes increase altruism (Shariff and Norenzayan 2007; Ahmed and Salas 2011; Xygalatas 2013; McKay et al. 2011; Ahmed and Salas 2011), cooperation (Ahmed and Salas 2011; Xygalatas 2013), honesty (Randolph-Seng and Nielsen 2007; Mazar and Ariely 2006), or the costly punishment of actions that are perceived as unfair (McKay et al. 2011). Other studies, however, do not confirm the positive effect of religion on prosocial behavior. Gomes, Cristina M. and McCullough (2015) fail to replicate the results of Shariff and Norenzayan (2007) — the pioneer study in this vein — when conducting dictator games with a larger sample of student and non-student participants from the US. Likewise, a recent large-scale replication of the study by Mazar and Ariely (2006) did not observe positive effects of priming religious concepts on honesty (Verschuere et al. 2018). Similarly, Benjamin, Choi, and Fisher (2016) do not observe any effects of religious primes on prosocial behavior in laboratory dictator games, even though they find a positive effect on contributions in public goods games. In their experimental study in Ghana, Parra, Joseph, and Wodon (2016) observe that priming religious concepts even reduces transfers in dictator games.

These inconclusive results might be explained by the fact that most studies using priming techniques activate concepts of religion per se (see Table A 1 in the appendix for more information on the primes used by different studies): None of the studies uses religious primes that are explicitly connected to altruism. Often, these studies do not provide any specific content but rather use single words or neutral sentences. Here, it is not possible to control which particular religious idea becomes salient to the primed person. Thus, it remains unclear what religion means to the individual believer and which behavior this provokes. Religious scripts include, for example, religious rules for different aspects of life, such as praying behavior or dietary regulations, which are not directly connected to prosocial behavior. Other
ideas such as the Protestant ethic of self-responsibility for earthly matters might even decrease altruism. However, there are also numerous religious ideas that emphasize love, morality and prosociality and they form a key part of their values (e.g. in the Quran, “God loves the doers of the good deeds,” 3:133, or in the Bible, “Whoever does not love does not know God, for God is love,” 1 John 4:8). Such ideas of universal love can be thought of as activating unconditional prosociality towards a third person. We therefore do not expect that activating religion per se increases altruism but rather expect that:

Hypothesis 1: The religious idea of universal love increases unconditional altruism relative to a neutral, non-religious idea.

Religion and discrimination

A growing body of research is concerned with the connection of religion and out-group discrimination. Social identity theory argues that there is a tendency of people to favor their in-group when group identity is made salient (Tajfel et al. 1971). The existence of a religious identity may already result in stereotypes and prejudices towards other religious groups, leading to negative discrimination (Allport 1954). Furthermore, as mobilization theories argue, leaders can capitalize on social identities, such as religious identity, to gain political support, which can, under certain circumstances, lead to violent conflicts (Basedau, Pfeiffer, and Vüllers 2016; Walter 2017). In this sense, even though religion may not be a direct cause of conflict, leaders can misuse it as a mobilization strategy. Here, characteristics such as the size of the religious group, the structure of its hierarchy and individual religious beliefs play a role
While the social cohesion effect of religion may cause greater in-group favoritism on the one hand, it may facilitate out-group discrimination on the other.⁴

Empirically, most studies aim at exploring whether intergroup bias between different identity groups, e.g. religious groups, exist. Previous studies on intergroup bias have observed discrimination in countries that score also high on discrimination indices, i.e. in India, Malaysia, and to a smaller extent in China and the UK (see Table A 2). Thus, religious intergroup discrimination is not observed in all contexts. In their experimental studies, Chuah, Fahoum, and Hoffmann (2013) and Chuah et al. (2016) find out-group biases between Muslims and Hindus in India, China, Malaysia and the UK. Similarly, Chakravarty et al. (2016b) find evidence of out-group biases between these two religious groups in cooperation games in artefactual field experiments in India. At the same time, the authors do not find consistent evidence in non-cooperative games (Chakravarty et al. 2016a) and Johansson-Stenman, Mahmud, and Martinsson (2009) find no significant out-group discrimination among religious groups in Bangladesh. Gupta et al. (2018) conclude that it is minority vs. majority status rather than religious identity that is responsible for out-group bias. We contribute to this literature (1) by exploring religious intergroup bias in two considerably peaceful countries and (2) by exploring under what conditions religious intergroup bias increase and decrease and explain our hypotheses again with the “ambivalence of the sacred”.

Ideas of universal love activate prosociality independently of the religious identity of the receiver and thus prevent out-group discrimination. On the other hand, monotheistic and missionary faith have to as claim to universal validity that comes with a price (Assmann 2009). They differentiate between a religious in-group, which follows the true religion, and an out-

---

⁴ While in-group favoritism does not imply out-group discrimination per se, it can be a driver of out-group discrimination (Alport 1954; Brewer 1999; Balliet, Wu, and De Dreu 2014).
group, which believes in the false faith. Missionary monotheism is a central feature of the world’s biggest faith Christianity and Islam. Examples can be found in the Quran: “O you who believe! Fight those of the unbelievers who are near to you and let them find in you hardness” (9:123). They can also be found in the Bible: “If your very own brother, or your son or daughter, or the wife you love, or your closest friend secretly entices you, saying, “Let us go and worship other gods” ..., do not yield to them or listen to them. Show them no pity. Do not spare them or shield them. You must certainly put them to death” (Deuteronomy: 13). Such religious ideas of only one true religion call for negative behavior towards the religious out-group – in sharp contrast to the idea of universal love. For this reason, we expect that:

**Hypothesis 2a:** The idea of universal love reduces out-group discrimination relative to a neutral, non-religious idea.

**Hypothesis 2b:** The idea of only one true religion increases out-group discrimination relative to a neutral, non-religious idea.

### 3. Research Context and Experimental Design

**Context**

We conducted artefactual field experiments\(^5\) in two countries in sub-Saharan Africa: Ghana and Tanzania. In Ghana, the majority of the population is either Christian (78 percent) or Muslim (16 percent) (Afrobarometer 2014b). The majority of Muslims live in the northern part of the country, while Christianity has spread through the coastal areas in the center and south. Tanzania does not collect census data on the distribution of faiths. However, sources suggest

\(^{5}\) We consider our experiment to be an artefactual field experiment in accordance with Harrison and List (2004) as our subjects are non-students recruited in natural environments who are nonetheless aware that they are participating in an experiment.
that approximately 60 percent of believers are Christian and approximately 35 percent are Muslim (Afrobarometer 2014c). While Islam originally spread from the coastal regions to the inland of the country, a clear geographical separation of predominantly Muslim or Christian regions is not possible anymore: Julius Nyerere’s *Ujamaa* policy of relocating citizens led to a blending of religions and ethnicities in the 1980s.

We conducted experiments in the largest city of each country: Accra in Ghana and Dar es Salaam in Tanzania. In Accra, Christians form the majority while Muslims constitute the biggest minority. In Dar es Salaam, the division is more equal. Both cities can be considered melting pots for the whole country, attracting migrants from more rural areas. While Dar es Salaam’s religious composition has traditionally been characterized by a comparably large number of Muslim believers, in Accra, Muslim believers have mostly migrated to the city. In both countries, religious practice plays a major role in the lives of most people: according to surveys, 77 percent of the population in Ghana and Tanzania attend a religious service at least once a week (Afrobarometer 2014a).

Both country cases represent examples of the rather peaceful coexistence of a Christian majority and a Muslim minority. In Ghana, there have been no major conflicts between Christian and Muslim believers and interactions between the two religious groups work well (Religious Freedom Report 2016). Tanzania’s everyday interaction between the religions can generally also be described as peaceful and tolerant, though there have been recurring conflicts between Muslims and Christians since the 1980s (Heilman and Kaiser 2002). Recently, there has been an increasing number of attacks on churches and mosques (Religious Freedom Report 2016). Findings on religious out-group discrimination in these relatively
peaceful countries can be interpreted as a lower benchmark for more troublesome countries. In addition, relying on data from two countries increases the generalizability of our results.

Experimental design

We used a dictator game to measure altruism. The dictator game is a two-player game in which one person is assigned the role of the dictator and is endowed with a monetary budget. The dictator has to decide how the budget is allocated between him-/herself and the second player (receiver). Under the standard assumption of the *homo oeconomicus model* (i.e. pure self-interest and complete information), rationally acting dictators would keep the entire amount as this maximizes their personal gain. Positive transfers to the receiver are commonly interpreted as altruistic behavior, which is one form of prosocial behavior.

Each participant was randomly assigned to one of three treatments: (1) universal love, (2) one true religion or (3) control. Participants played the role of a “dictator” in the dictator game twice. For one of the two decisions, the receiver\(^6\) belonged to the same religious group as the dictator; for the other decision, she belonged to the religious out-group. The order used for revealing the religious identity of the receiver was randomized, i.e. some participants first decided how much to give to a receiver from the same religious group while others first decided how much to give to a receiver from another religious group (Figure 1). This randomization allowed us to separate order effects (i.e. participants giving more in the first round than in the second) from differences in giving behavior depending on the receiver’s religious group. Decisions were taken directly after the priming and in private.

---

\(^6\) Transfers were randomly assigned to participants of a survey conducted in both countries independently of the experiments.
Two features of our experimental design were crucial: (1) How we primed the religious ideas, and (2) how we revealed the religious identity of the interaction partner.

In line with most research on the behavioral effects of religion, we used priming techniques to make the specific religious ideas salient. The scrambled-sentence task proposed in the pioneer study by Shariff and Norenzayan (2007) is the most frequently used approach (compare Ahmed and Salas 2011; Benjamin, Choi, and Fisher 2016; Laurin, Kay, and Fitzsimons 2012). In this task, participants are exposed to words with either a religious or a neutral meaning and have to form sentences out of these words. In our context, this task proved not to be feasible as many of our participants were illiterate. Instead, we chose to prime religious ideas by verbally reading out three statements with which the participants could agree, disagree, or neither agree nor disagree before taking decisions. The two initial statements conveyed content neutral to religion and prosocial behavior⁷ and were the same across the control and

---

⁷ Independent of their treatment, all participants were asked: “Some people claim that the world is better off because of new technologies. Do you agree, disagree or are you undecided?” and “Some people claim that it is important to think up new ideas and be creative, to do things one’s own way. Do you agree, disagree or are you undecided?”
treatment groups. By contrast, the third statement transmitted the religious idea and varied between treatments:

Universal love treatment: “Some people claim that true religion means loving all human beings. Do you agree, disagree or are you undecided?”

One true religion treatment: “Some people claim that their religion is the only true religion and wish that everyone followed their faith. Do you agree, disagree or are you undecided?”

Control treatment: “Some people claim that everyone is talented at something, but no one is talented at everything. Do you agree, disagree or are you undecided?”

Our priming approach was relatively subtle. We consider this to be a strength: If we observed results when using this subtle prime, the results would potentially be stronger when priming in a more explicit way.

The second relevant design feature was the question of how to reveal the religious identity of the interaction partner. Most studies reveal the interaction partner’s (ethnic or religious) identity by using typical names (Fershtman and Gneezy 2001; Chakravarty et al. 2016b; Chuah, Fahoum, and Hoffmann 2013) or by using names and visual cues at the same time (Chakravarty et al. 2016b). Prior to our research study, we therefore conducted a survey at a large market in Accra to find out more about the connection between religion and names. This survey revealed that Muslim first names are often associated with the respective religious group, but that Christian first names are often unrelated to the religious group. Instead, they are associated with categories such as “Western name” or “friend.” Therefore, we refrained from using this approach. Other studies explicitly inform participants about the interaction partner’s religion by directly stating his/her religious affiliation (Gupta et al. 2018; Chuah et al.
Explicitly providing information about the recipient’s religious group in a within-subject design has the disadvantage that participants can infer what the research study is about and may therefore result in socially desirable behavior. We chose to give visual information about the interaction partner’s religious group by showing photos of large crowds of people praying in a church/in a mosque directly before the participants would take the first, and then again directly before they would take the second decision. The photos were taken from behind in such a way that faces could not be recognized. Examples can be found in Appendix C. While showing the photos, participants were told “The person you can give money to lives in [Accra / Dar Es Salaam] and is someone like on this picture.” This was meant to imply the religious affiliation of the interaction player (“someone like” was meant to refer to the religious group) without explicitly stating that the photo was connected to religion in any way. Possible associations other than the religious affiliation of the interaction player are “religious person” and “religious service”. As the photos of the Muslim crowd shows only men, we control for gender effects in the regression analysis. This prime is, again, relatively subtle and we would expect to find stronger effects with a more explicit identity revelation.

**Experimental procedures**

We ran artefactual field experiments with a total of 627 participants in Accra and 634 participants in Dar es Salaam. Fieldwork in Accra was conducted between March 5, 2017 and March 20, 2017, while fieldwork in Dar es Salaam was conducted between July 2, 2017 and July 22, 2017. During this time period there was no apparent conflict between Christian and Muslim believers in either of the countries.

The session size varied between 20 and 47 participants. In both cities, Muslim participants were recruited in front of mosques after Friday prayers, while Christian participants were
recruited in front of churches on Sundays after church services. They were then invited to the experimental sessions for a different day to avoid possible contagion effects due to their previous attendance at the religious service. Sessions took 2.5 hours\(^8\) on average and were held in neutral (non-religious) schools, community centers or open spaces. Sessions consisted of either only Christian or only Muslim participants. However, participants were informed that their interaction player was not present in the respective session. Note that participants could be affected by the presence of fellow in-group members in a way that they show more in-group favoritism. However, as our participants are randomly assigned into the different treatments, this effect would be constant and would not affect treatment differences. In Accra, participants (in the role of dictators) could decide to give up to GHS 10 (USD 7.19 in PPP terms). In Dar es Salaam, participants could decide to give up to TZS 5,000 to the recipient (USD 7.24 in PPP terms). Thus, participants in both countries had 11 choices (in Accra in steps of GHS 1 and in Dar es Salaam in steps of TZS 500). Figure 1 shows the number of participants per treatment.

The whole experiment was implemented as a pen-and-paper experiment in the local language (Akan/Ga/Hausa in Ghana and Swahili in Tanzania) in order to account for illiteracy. After the experimental games, all participants filled in a post-experimental questionnaire. Those participants who could not read and write received help from our local team. At the end of the experimental procedures, one of the two decisions made in the dictator game was randomly drawn and participants were paid their respective experimental earnings plus a

\(^8\) The whole experimental session consisted of a dictator game, a prisoner’s dilemma and a post-experimental questionnaire in the order noted here.
showing-up fee. Participants in Ghana earned GHS 38 (USD 27.33 in PPP terms) on average, while in Tanzania the average earnings were TZS 14,000 (USD 20.28 in PPP terms).

4. Results

Sample description

Our sample consists of 1,254 experimental participants – 623 from Accra and 631 from Dar es Salaam. On average, 49 percent of the participants were female. The mean age of the participants was 38.5 years. 49 percent of the experimental participants were Muslims. Religion plays a major role in the life of the people: Approximately 37 percent of the participants identified first and foremost with their religious group. The vast majority of participants across all treatments are sure that God/Allah exists, go to church on average once a week, and consider prayer a regular part of their life. They believe in heaven and that God/Allah punishes bad deeds and rewards good deeds. Standard variations for these variables were low, with at least 80 percent of participants choosing the highest category and nearly all observations in the two highest categories. An exception was service attendance, where the two highest categories combined make up only approximately 70 percent of the observations. While it is common in both countries to have friends from other religions, participants are unsure about whether or not interreligious marriage can be considered as acceptable. Our randomization into different treatments worked well (see Table 1). However, we have a significantly lower fraction of participant with some or completed secondary school

---

9 Participants were informed that one of their decisions from the dictator game would be randomly drawn beforehand (see instructions in Appendix C).
10 Complete sociodemographic information was available for 1,102 participants (see Table A 3). In particular, the question about age was problematic for many participants. The results hold if we exclude age from our regressions.
11 The differences across countries can be found in the appendix. As a robustness check, we control for sociodemographic variables in our regression analysis.
12 Other identity groups included in this question are nation, ethnicity, occupation and gender.
in the universal love treatment. Moreover, participants in the one true religion treatment consider interreligious marriage as less acceptable compared to the other two treatments. We control for these sociodemographic factors in the regression analysis.

Figure A 2 in the appendix provides a closer look at the three primes that we used in the dictator game. Approximately 90 percent of the participants agreed with the religious idea of universal love and the control prime. The one true religion prime shows a more diverse picture: 57 percent of the participants agreed that there is only one true religion while 42 percent disagreed.¹³

Table 1: Sample description and randomization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>Test for differences (1)-(2)</th>
<th>Test for differences (1)-(3)</th>
<th>Test for differences (2)-(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.03]</td>
<td>[0.03]</td>
<td>[0.03]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>39.04</td>
<td>38.88</td>
<td>37.34</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.86]</td>
<td>[0.82]</td>
<td>[0.82]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No schooling</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or completed primary school</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.03]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or completed secondary school</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.06*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or completed tertiary school</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived living condition</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.06]</td>
<td>[0.06]</td>
<td>[0.06]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹³ There are no major differences between Accra and Dar es Salaam. Histograms for the two statements prior to the primes are displayed in Figure A 3 in the appendix.
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>Mean 3</th>
<th>Mean Diff</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Std. Error 1</th>
<th>Std. Error 2</th>
<th>Std. Error 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim faith*</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging first and foremost to religious group*</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in God/Allah*</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of religious service*</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice of prayer*</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in heaven*</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in hell*</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God/Allah punishes bad deeds*</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God/Allah rewards good deeds*</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No marriage between different religions*</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends from other religions*</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N**: 370 369 363

**Notes**: Note that we only have complete descriptive characteristics for 1,102 observations. In particular, the question about age exhibits many missing observations.

(a) Dummy variable: 1=Yes, 0=No; (b) 5=I am sure that God/Allah really exists, 4=Although I sometimes question his existence, I do believe in God/Allah, 3=I don’t know if there is a personal God, but I do believe in a higher power of some kind, 2=I don’t know if there is a personal God or a higher power of some kind, 1=I don’t believe in a personal God or in a higher power; (c) 5=a few times a week, 4=once a week, 3=once a month, 2=few times a year, 1=never; (d) 5 = prayer is a regular part of my daily life, 4=I usually pray in times of stress or need but rarely at any other time, 3=I pray only during formal ceremonies, 2=prayer has little importance in my life, 1=never pray; (e) 5=strongly agree, 4=agree, 3=uncertain/neither agree nor disagree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree.

x) We use a test of proportions for dummy variables and a Mann-Whitney test for all other variables. The values displayed for the tests are the differences in the means across the groups. ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent level, respectively.
Religion and altruism

Across all treatments, participants sent, on average, 23 percent of their endowment in Accra and 24 percent in Dar es Salaam. We did not observe significant differences in the general level of altruism between the treatments and between the two locations (see Figure 2). Thus, being reminded of the religious ideas of universal love or one true religion does not promote more altruism as compared to exposure to a neutral, non-religious prime (hypothesis 1).

Figure 2: Average fraction of endowment sent over both rounds

We use random effects GLS regressions for the proportion of endowment sent, as presented in Table 2. Regression (1) shows a basic regression for the treatments, including two dummy variables indicating the one true religion and the universal love prime. Regression (2) adds sociodemographic and religious control variables, as well as interviewer and session dummies. We control for order effects in all regressions. Both treatment dummies turn out to be

---

14 The results hold if we restrict the sample to the first round. We do not find any difference between Christians and Muslims. We observe a small round effect in both locations, with participants sending a higher proportion of their endowment in the first round and a lower proportion in the second round (Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks tests to compare within-participant differences: Accra: 0.24 versus 0.22, p-value=0.00; Dar Es Salaam: 0.24 versus 0.23, p-value=0.02). A detailed overview of the distribution of transfers and the average proportion of endowments sent per treatment, round and location is presented in Figure A 1 and Table A 4 in the appendix.
inexpensive in both regressions. The small coefficients show that there is virtually no difference across treatment conditions. Adding sociodemographic and session controls (regression 2) does not change the results.

Table 2. General level of altruism (random effects GLS regressions for the proportion of endowment sent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of endowment sent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One true religion</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal love</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same religion</td>
<td>0.012***</td>
<td>0.011***</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One true religion * same religion</td>
<td>0.026**</td>
<td>0.022*</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal love * same religion</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>2,216</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>2,216</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>1,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: We control for order effects and include a dummy for Dar es Salaam in all regressions. Regressions (2), (4) and (6) include sociodemographic and religious control variables, as well as interviewer and session dummies. Regressions (5) and (6) restricts the sample to participants who have not given 0 or 100 percent of their endowment in round one. The results are presented in Table A 7 in the appendix. Regression (1) uses standard errors clustered for the experimental sessions. Regression (2) uses robust standard errors. Standard errors in parentheses; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Complete sociodemographic information is available for 1,102 participants only.

Table A 6 in the appendix presents different model specifications that test for interaction effects regarding Ghana and Tanzania (regression (1)), Muslims and Christians (regression (2)),.
religion as identity group (regression (3)), and service attendance (regression (4)). All interaction terms turn out to be insignificant. Affirmation of the religious idea transported in the treatments also has no significant effect on altruism in either treatment (regression (5)). We therefore do not find that religious primes increase the general level of altruism and cannot support hypothesis 1, which expects a positive effect of the universal love prime on altruism compared to the control prime.

**Degree of intergroup discrimination**

Next, we look at the degree of discrimination. Table 3 presents the mean values of the proportion of endowments sent to recipients with the same religion or recipients from a different religious group, as well as tests for differences between these two groups. Considering all treatments and all participants, a significantly lower proportion of endowments was sent to recipients with a different religion. The lower transfers to recipients with a different religion were driven by the one true religion treatment. Here, the difference increases in magnitude and becomes statistically significant at the 1 percent level. We find the same tendency when we separate our sample for the two locations (Accra: same religion= 0.26, other religion= 0.23, p-value=0.001; Dar es Salaam: same religion= 0.24, other religion= 0.22, p-value=0.24). In the universal love and the control treatment, the difference between transfers to recipients with the same religion and a different religion is insignificant and close to zero.16

---

15 We do not observe a significant difference in discrimination between Muslims and Christians.  
16 Note that our results are unlikely to be driven by ethnicity. Participants in the control group who do not receive a religious prime do not discriminate (see Table 3). If ethnicity was the driver of differences in giving behavior, we would also find differences in the control group. For an extensive discussion about ethnicity and religion as drivers of conflict see McCauley (2017).
### Table 3. Intensity of discrimination (proportion of endowment sent to religious in-group and out-group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean/SE</th>
<th>Mean/SE</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Test for differences(^*) (1)-(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All treatments</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.01**</td>
<td>0.01 [0.01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One true religion</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.03***</td>
<td>0.01 [0.01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal love</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01 [0.01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control treatment</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01 [0.01]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: \(^x\) We use Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks tests to test for differences. The values displayed for the tests are the differences in the means across the groups. \(*\**, \(*\*\), and \(*\) indicate significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent level, respectively. Table A 5 in the appendix shows separate figures for Accra and Dar es Salam for both rounds.

The regressions in Table 2 include a dummy variable that becomes 1 if the sender and the recipient in the dictator game have the same religion and 0 otherwise. This dummy is used to test whether participants discriminate with respect to the recipient’s religion. The dummy is positive and significant at the 1 percent level in regressions (1) and (2). A coefficient of 0.012 means that the proportion of the endowment sent to a recipient with the same religion increases by 5.22 percent on average compared to the average proportion of 0.23 sent to recipient with a different religion. Table 2 also presents heterogeneous treatment effects depending on whether the interaction player comes from the same or a different religion (regressions (3) and (4)). Regression (3) shows pure treatment effects while regression (4) adds additional control variables.

The interaction term between the one true religion dummy and the same religion dummy turns out to be positive and significant in specifications (3) and (4). Therefore, the difference
in the proportions sent – that is, the intensity of discrimination – increases under the one true religion treatment, supporting hypothesis 2b. The coefficient of 0.026 in regression (3) means that the difference in the proportion of the endowment sent increases on average by 10.8 percent compared to the average proportion of 0.24 sent in the control treatment. The dummy for the universal love prime shows the expected negative sign but becomes insignificant in both regressions. Thus, we cannot support hypothesis 2a, which states that priming the idea of universal love reduces the intensity of discrimination relative to a neutral prime. As a robustness check, we exclude in regressions (5) and (6) those participants who do not have the possibility to discriminate in their second round due to their decision in the first round: If a participant gives nothing in the first round, she cannot discriminate in the second round because she cannot give less than nothing. Likewise, if a participant gives 100 percent of her endowment in the first round, she cannot discriminate in the second round because she cannot give more than 100 percent. As the sample size is now restricted, the interaction term keeps the expected sign but becomes insignificant. In Table A 8, we explore the impacts of agreeing with the primes. The interaction term between the one true religion treatment, having an interaction player of the same religion and agreement to one true religion becomes – as expected – significant. Thus, our one true religion primes works especially for those participants who agree with it.

Occurrence of intergroup discrimination

We next turn to the occurrence of discrimination. Table 4 shows the percentage of participants who sent a lower transfer (negative discrimination) or a higher transfer (positive discrimination) to recipients with a different religion compared to recipients with the same religion, as well as participants who did not discriminate with regard to the recipient’s religion
(no discrimination). First, we see that the majority of participants over all three treatments did not discriminate. That is, they did not appear to base their willingness to give on the religious identity of the recipient. Second, and somewhat surprisingly, we find a sizeable share of individuals who positively discriminated against the out-group – that is, they sent more to a person of a different faith than to a recipient of the same faith. Across all treatments, 16 percent of all participants engaged in such positive discrimination.

Table 4: Occurrence of discrimination - descriptives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>Test for differences (1)-(3)</th>
<th>Test for differences (2)-(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive discrimination</td>
<td>0.15 [0.02]</td>
<td>0.15 [0.02]</td>
<td>0.19 [0.02]</td>
<td>-0.05*</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No discrimination</td>
<td>0.62 [0.02]</td>
<td>0.68 [0.02]</td>
<td>0.59 [0.02]</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative discrimination</td>
<td>0.23 [0.02]</td>
<td>0.17 [0.02]</td>
<td>0.21 [0.02]</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, and in accordance with hypothesis 2b, positive discrimination occurred significantly less frequently in the case of the one true religion treatment. Third, we observe differences in the occurrence of negative discrimination across treatments. The preferential treatment of people from one’s own religious group (the in-group) vis-à-vis members of the out-group is higher for the one true religion treatment as compared to the control treatment.

We observe a significantly lower occurrence of negative discrimination in the universal love treatment as compared to the control treatment. As we cannot control for round effects when only considering descriptives (i.e. being matched with an interaction player from the other religious group in round one and at the same time giving more in round one than in round...
two), we most likely overestimate positive discrimination in Table 4. We control for round effects in the regression analysis.

Using a multinomial logit regression, we take a closer look at the question of whether the occurrence of discrimination is influenced by the religious treatments (hypothesis 2a and 2b) (see Table 5). Our dependent variable includes three categories: positive, no, or negative discrimination. Regressions (1) to (3) in Table 5 show pure treatment effects, while regressions (4) to (9) add additional control variables.

In accordance with the descriptive results, we find that the one true religion treatment significantly lowers the occurrence of positive discrimination in specifications (1) and (4) as compared to the control treatment. In other words, if the idea of one true religion is made salient to participants, they are less likely to engage in preferential treatment of members of the out-group vis-à-vis people who share their faith. At the same time, however, we only observe an insignificant increase in the occurrence of out-group discrimination with this treatment.

By contrast, the universal love treatment increases equal treatment and tends to counteract both forms of discrimination. The effect is particularly strong for the occurrence of negative discrimination towards the out-group (regression 3 and 6), which significantly declines relative to the control group. Regressions (7), (8) and (9) exclude participants who cannot discriminate due to their decision in the first round and therefore considerably restrict our sample. For the universal love treatment, the coefficients increase in size and confirm the positive significant effect on no discrimination and the significant negative effect on negative discrimination. For the one true religion treatment, the coefficients keep their expected signs but become insignificant.
Table 5. Occurrence of discrimination (multinomial logistic regression for positive, no, or negative discrimination, marginal effects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>(1) Positive</th>
<th>(2) No</th>
<th>(3) Negative</th>
<th>(4) Positive</th>
<th>(5) No</th>
<th>(6) Negative</th>
<th>(7) Positive</th>
<th>(8) No</th>
<th>(9) Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One true religion</td>
<td>-0.042*</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-0.041*</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal love</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.083***</td>
<td>-0.049**</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.105***</td>
<td>-0.073***</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.108**</td>
<td>-0.080**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>-0.195</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>-0.169</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same religion in round one</td>
<td>0.112***</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.072***</td>
<td>-0.128***</td>
<td>0.064**</td>
<td>0.064***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.216***</td>
<td>0.172***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: We include a dummy for Dar es Salaam and a dummy that becomes 1 if the recipient in the first round belongs to the religious in-group in all regressions. Regressions (4)–(6) include sociodemographic and religious control variables, as well as interviewer and session dummies. The results are presented in Table A9 in the appendix. Regressions (1)–(3) use session clustered standard errors. Regressions (4)–(6) use robust standard errors. Standard errors in parentheses; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Differences between Ghana and Tanzania

Finally, we explore the differences between Ghana and Tanzania, as county context may matter. Figure 3 shows a bar graph for the mean proportion of the endowment sent under the one true religion treatment and the control treatment for both locations. In Accra, we can see that recipients from the other religion receive, on average, the same amount as the control group (control=0.23, true religion= 0.23, p-value=0.99). Recipients from the same religion receive a higher proportion of the endowment compared to the control treatment (not statistically significant: control= 0.23, true religion= 0.26, p-value=0.19). In Dar es Salaam, recipients from the other religion receive a significantly smaller proportion of the endowment compared to the control group (control= 0.25, true religion= 0.22, p-value=0.07), while recipients from the same religion receive a similar proportion (control= 0.25, true religion= 0.24, p-value=0.25). This hints at a different discrimination structure in the two locations.
Participants in Accra appear to exhibit positive discrimination against in-group members under the one true religion treatment, while participants in Dar es Salaam exhibit negative discrimination against out-group members.

We suggest the following as a possible reason for these observations: In Tanzania, the number of conflicts between Muslims and Christians has been increasing in different regions of the country in recent decades (Heilman and Kaiser 2002; Rukyaa 2010). We propose that this trend at the macro level may also transfer into negative discriminatory behavior at the micro level as a result of increased prejudice between religious groups in Tanzania. Some support for this reasoning becomes evident when we look at the answers given in the post-experimental questionnaire: Participants in Dar es Salaam considered marriage between different religions less acceptable than participants in Accra. In combination, these aspects hint at a different mindset towards people from other religious groups. However, these possible explanations should be tested in further studies.
5. Conclusion / Discussion

In this paper, we have argued that the specific content of religious ideas affects prosociality and the discrimination against members of a religious out-group. To date, the existing literature has delivered inconclusive results. While Ahmed and Salas (2011), Shariff and Norenzayan (2007) and Benjamin, Choi, and Fisher (2016) find a positive effect of religion on prosocial behavior, Gomes and McCullough (2015) and Parra et al. (2016) find no significant effect. The same holds true for religious out-group discrimination, with Chakravarty et al. (2016b), Chuah et al. (2016) and Chuah, Fahoum, and Hoffmann (2013) finding higher discrimination under religious primes and Chakravarty et al. (2016a) and Johansson-Stenman, Mahmud, and Martinsson (2009) finding no effect. One reason for these inconclusive results is that previous work has primed a general concept of religion. Thus, it is impossible to control for the individual interpretation of religion activated by the prime. Different religious ideas might, however, have different effects on altruism and discrimination. In contrast to these previous studies, we have applied a novel approach. We have used a dictator game with Christians and Muslims in Accra and Dar es Salaam to test the effect of two contradictory and prominent religious ideas – namely, the idea of universal love and the idea of one true religion.

To the best of our knowledge, our study is the first to account for the ambivalence of the sacred and helps to unravel the mechanisms behind how religious ideas influence altruism and interreligious relations.

Our results confirm our assumption. We find that neither religious idea affects the unconditional level of altruism, but that both show significant and distinct effects on discrimination. The idea of universal love leads to a higher share of participants who opt for equal treatment of the religious in- and out-groups. At the same time, we find that the idea of one true religion leads to more intense out-group discrimination.
There are several opportunities for further research. Our sample only includes Christians and Muslims in Christian-majority/Muslim-minority countries. Christianity and Islam are both missionary monotheistic faiths that are particularly prone to the belief in one true religion – and the resulting effects on discrimination and related conflict (e.g. Assmann 2009). Whether these results hold for other faiths such as Buddhism, Hinduism, or traditional beliefs in Africa and elsewhere should be tested further. Moreover, other prominent religious ideas might influence altruistic, discriminatory or other forms of behavior relevant to social capital. Digging deeper in this matter is thus important for policy makers. Further research is also needed to disentangle the effects of religion and ethnicity in a more precise manner.

Although challenges and opportunities for future research abound, our results have concrete implications. We have found substantial and convincing evidence that claims regarding the universal validity of one’s own religion increase out-group discrimination. Such discrimination may have unpleasant effects well beyond the artificial setting of an experiment and holds the potential to fuel tensions between religious communities worldwide. Our findings are closely connected to the debate on the problems of monotheistic faiths (Assmann 2009). To promote peaceful coexistence between religious groups, it seems indispensable to promote religious teachings that are particularly tolerant and that de-emphasize the superiority of one’s own religion, instead emphasizing tolerance towards other faiths and “universal love.”
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### Table A 1: Overview of experimental studies on prosociality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adopted by</th>
<th>Religious prime</th>
<th>How is the prime transported?</th>
<th>Operationalization of prosociality</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preston &amp; Ritter (2013) – Study 3, n=85</td>
<td>God, religion</td>
<td>Participants see the words “God” and “religion” on a computer screen.</td>
<td>Prisoner’s Dilemma (cooperation)</td>
<td>No general effect on cooperation. God prime increases cooperation with the out-group, religion prime increases cooperation with the in-group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parra, Joseph, Wodon (2016), n=393</td>
<td>Photos of Christian/Muslim believers praying; religious symbols</td>
<td>Participants see photos of praying believers and religious symbols.</td>
<td>Dictator Game (altruism)</td>
<td>Religious primes reduce general prosociality. Priming for religion reduces the allocations to participants with a different religious affiliation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shariff &amp; Norenzayan (2007), n=50 in S1, n=78 in S2</td>
<td>Spirit, divine, God, sacred, and prophet</td>
<td>Participants unscramble sentences involving the religious words.</td>
<td>Dictator Game (altruism)</td>
<td>Religious primes increase general prosociality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed and Salas (2011), n=224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dictator Game + Prisoner’s Dilemma (altruism and cooperation)</td>
<td>Religious primes increase general prosociality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gomes and McCullough (2015), n=650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dictator Game (altruism)</td>
<td>No effect on general prosociality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin et al. (2016), n=817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Goods Game + Dictator Game (cooperation and altruism)</td>
<td>No effect on general prosociality in DG, more contributions in PGG (not for Catholics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xygalatas (2013), n=62</td>
<td>Environment (inside a temple vs. outside in a restaurant)</td>
<td>Participants either play in a temple or in a restaurant</td>
<td>Bargaining game</td>
<td>Participants in the temple are more prosocial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>T1 (religious prime): Divine, holy, pious, religious; T2 (religious punishment prime): Divine, revenge, pious, punish</td>
<td>Words appear on a computer screen.</td>
<td>Punishment of unfair behavior</td>
<td>Religious primes strongly increased the costly punishment of unfair behaviors for those participants who had previously donated to a religious organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKay et al. (2011), n=304</td>
<td>T1 (positive religion): e.g. heaven, miracle, salvation, soul T2 (neutral religion): e.g. monk, bishop, sacrament, apostle</td>
<td>Lexical decision task</td>
<td>Cheating</td>
<td>Effect of religious primes on prosociality only true for positive words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pichon et al. (2007), n=91 in S1, n=75 in S2</td>
<td>Lexical decision task</td>
<td>Cheating</td>
<td>Participants unscramble sentences involving the religious words.</td>
<td>Religiously primed group cheats less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph-Seng and Nielsen (2007), n=52 in Study 1, n=54 in Study 2</td>
<td>Study 1: Heaven, bless, gospel, cross, faith, prayer, salvation, saved, holy, and worship Study 2: Baptism, amen, church, resurrection, commandments, communion, saint, prophet, sabbath, and preacher</td>
<td>Participants unscramble sentences involving the religious words.</td>
<td>Cheating</td>
<td>Religiously primed group cheats less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazar and Ariely (2006), n=229 in Study 1</td>
<td>10 Commandments</td>
<td>Cheating</td>
<td>Religious prime significantly reduces cheating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verschuere et al. (2018), n=5,786</td>
<td>10 Commandments</td>
<td>Cheating</td>
<td>No effect of religious prime (even rather in opposite direction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A 2: Overview of experimental studies on discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors/Year</th>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Religious Minority Discrimination Index (Fox)</th>
<th>Identity revelation</th>
<th>Discrimination between in-group and out-group in baseline?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parra et al. (2016), n=393</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Assistants read out profiles (name, gender, age, religion, marital status, ethnicity, education, and area of residence)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuah et al. (2014), n=96</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Background profiles (age, ethnicity, religion) profiles.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuah et al. (2016), n=545</td>
<td>China, Malaysia, UK</td>
<td>High Medium</td>
<td>Displayed on a screen (e.g. religiosity high/medium/low)</td>
<td>Yes (small effects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuah et al. (2013), n=129</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Surnames (Shah, Sheik)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakravarty et al. (2016), n=516</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Hindu/Muslim names plus additionally visual identification</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakravarty et al. (2016), n=516</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Hindu/Muslim names plus additionally visual identification</td>
<td>Yes (but only for Hindus, not for Muslims)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gupta et al. (2018)</td>
<td>Bangladesh, India</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
<td>The number of Hindus/Muslims is stated.</td>
<td>Yes (but smaller effects in Bangladesh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johansson-Stenman et al. (2009), n=256</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>It is directly stated that the other person is Hindu/Muslim</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table A 3: Characteristics of experimental participants in Accra and in Dar Es Salaam**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean/SE</th>
<th>Mean/SE</th>
<th>Mean/SE</th>
<th>Test for differences (2)-(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All participants</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender, 1=female(^a)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>38.43</td>
<td>40.26</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td>3.76***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.48]</td>
<td>[0.73]</td>
<td>[0.62]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No schooling(^a)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or completed primary school(^a)</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.13***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or completed secondary school(^a)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.16***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or completed tertiary school(^a)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived living condition(^b)</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.63***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.03]</td>
<td>[0.05]</td>
<td>[0.04]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim faith(^a)</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.09***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging first and foremost to religious group(^a)</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in God/Allah(^c)</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean 1</td>
<td>Mean 2</td>
<td>Mean 3</td>
<td>Mean 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of religious service $d$</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.03]</td>
<td>[0.05]</td>
<td>[0.05]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice of prayer $e$</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.11***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td>[0.03]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in heaven $a$</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.07***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td>[0.00]</td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in hell $a$</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.10***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God/Allah punishes bad deeds $f$</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God/Allah rewards good deeds $f$</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.12***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.03]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No marriage between different religions $f$</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>-0.52***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.04]</td>
<td>[0.06]</td>
<td>[0.06]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends from other religions $a$</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (a) Dummy variable: 1= yes, 0= no; (b) In general, how do you rate your living conditions compared to those of other people in your country? 1=Much worse, 2=Worse, 3=Same, 4=Better, 5=Much better; (c) 5=I am sure that God/Allah really exists, 4=Although I sometimes question his existence, I do believe in God/Allah, 3=I don’t know if there is a personal God, but I do believe in a higher power of some kind, 2=I don’t know if there is a personal God or a higher power of some kind, 1=I don’t believe in a personal God or in a higher power; (d) 5=prayer is a regular part of my daily life, 4=I usually pray in times of stress or need but rarely at any other time, 3=I pray only during formal ceremonies, 2=prayer has little importance in my life, 1=never; (e) 5=I pray a few times a week, 4=once a week, 3=once a month, 2=few times a year, 1=never; (f) 5=Strongly agree, 4=agree, 3=uncertain/neither agree nor disagree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree. The value displayed for the tests are the differences in the means across the groups. ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent critical level. (x) We use a test of proportions for dummy variables and a Mann-Whitney test for all other variables. The value displayed for the tests are the differences in the means across the groups. ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent level, respectively.
Figure A 1: Histograms for share of endowment sent in Accra and Dar Es Salaam
Table A 4: General level of altruism (share of endowment sent per treatment, round and country)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Both rounds</th>
<th>First round</th>
<th>Second round</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both locations</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>425</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accra</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: x) We use Mann-Whitney test for all differences; The value displayed for the tests are the differences in the means across the groups. ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent level.
Notes: One true religion: “Some people claim that their religion is the only true religion and wish that everyone followed their faith. Do you agree, disagree or are you undecided?”; Universal love: “Some people claim that true religion means loving all human beings. Do you agree, disagree or are you undecided?” Control: “Some people claim that everyone is talented at something, but no one is talented at everything. Do you agree, disagree or are you undecided?”

Notes: Upper histogram: “Some people claim that the world is better off because of new technologies. Do you agree, disagree or are you undecided?”; Lower histogram: “Some people claim that it is important to think up new ideas and be creative; to do things one’s own way. Do you agree, disagree or are you undecided?”
Table A 5: Intensity of discrimination (share of endowment sent to religious in-group and out-group in Accra and Dar es Salaam in both rounds)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Other religion</th>
<th>Same religion</th>
<th>Test for differences* (1)-(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean/SE</td>
<td>Mean/SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All treatments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accra</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One true religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accra</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.03***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accra</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accra</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td>[0.01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td>[0.02]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (x) We use Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks tests to test for differences. The value displayed for the tests are the differences in the means across the groups. ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent level.
Table A 6: General level of altruism (heterogeneous treatment effects for fraction of endowment sent, random effects GLS regressions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>(1) Share of endowment sent</th>
<th>(2) Share of endowment sent</th>
<th>(3) Share of endowment sent</th>
<th>(4) Share of endowment sent</th>
<th>(5) Share of endowment sent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One true religion</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.055)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal love</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.052)</td>
<td>(0.066)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same religion</td>
<td>0.012***</td>
<td>0.012***</td>
<td>0.012***</td>
<td>0.012***</td>
<td>0.012***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy round 2</td>
<td>-0.015***</td>
<td>-0.015***</td>
<td>-0.015***</td>
<td>-0.015***</td>
<td>-0.015***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy for Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One true religion * Dummy for Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal love * Dummy for Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One true religion * Muslim faith</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal love * Muslim faith</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim faith</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One true religion * Belonging first and foremost to religious group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal love * Belonging first and foremost to religious group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging first and foremost to religious group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One true religion * Attendance of religious service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal love * Attendance of religious service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of religious service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree to one true religion*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree to universal love*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.250***</td>
<td>0.267***</td>
<td>0.269***</td>
<td>0.283***</td>
<td>0.255***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.043)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>2,478</td>
<td>2,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of id</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>1,254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: a) Only participants who are allocated to the respective treatment provided answers to these statements. Regressions (1)-(5) use session clustered standard errors. Standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>(1) Share of endowment sent</th>
<th>(2) Share of endowment sent</th>
<th>(3) Share of endowment sent</th>
<th>(4) Share of endowment sent</th>
<th>(5) Share of endowment sent</th>
<th>(6) Share of endowment sent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dummy for Dar es Salaam(^a)</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.113**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.060)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.060)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy round 2(^a)</td>
<td>-0.015(^{***})</td>
<td>-0.015(^{***})</td>
<td>-0.015(^{***})</td>
<td>-0.015(^{***})</td>
<td>-0.030(^{***})</td>
<td>-0.032(^{***})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender(^b), 1=female</td>
<td>-0.029(^{**})</td>
<td>-0.029(^{**})</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No schooling(^a)</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.071)</td>
<td>(0.071)</td>
<td>(0.071)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or completed primary school(^a)</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
<td>(0.070)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or completed secondary school(^b)</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.071)</td>
<td>(0.071)</td>
<td>(0.070)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or completed tertiary school(^b)</td>
<td>0.126(^*)</td>
<td>0.126(^*)</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.071)</td>
<td>(0.071)</td>
<td>(0.071)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived living condition(^b)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim faith(^a)</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging first and foremost to religious group(^a)</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in God/Allah(^c)</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.023(^*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attendance of religious service</strong>&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practice of prayer</strong>&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.026**</td>
<td>-0.026**</td>
<td>-0.022*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belief in heaven</strong>&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belief in hell</strong>&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.045**</td>
<td>0.045**</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>God/Allah punishes bad deeds</strong>&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>God/Allah rewards good deeds</strong>&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No marriage between different religions</strong>&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friends from other religions</strong>&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Constant</strong></th>
<th>0.255***</th>
<th>0.204</th>
<th>0.260***</th>
<th>0.206</th>
<th>0.320***</th>
<th>0.315**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.155)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.155)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session dummies</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviewer dummies</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Observations** | 2,508 | 2,216 | 2,508 | 2,216 | 1,882 | 1,664 |
| **Number of individuals** | 1,254 | 1,108 | 1,254 | 1,108 | 941 | 832 |

Notes: (a) Dummy variable: 1 = yes, 0 = no; (b) In general, how do you rate your living conditions compared to those of other people in your country? 1 = Much worse, 2 = Worse, 3 = Same, 4 = Better, 5 = Much better; (c) 5 = I am sure that God/Allah really exists, 4 = Although I sometimes question his existence, I do believe in God/Allah, 3 = I don’t know if there is a personal God, but I do believe in a higher power of some kind, 2 = I don’t know if there is a personal God or a higher power of some kind, 1 = I don’t believe in a personal God or in a higher power; (d) 5 = few times a week, 4 = once a week, 3 = once a month, 2 = few times a year, 1 = never; (e) 5 = prayer is a regular part of my daily life, 4 = I usually pray in times of stress or need but rarely at any other time, 3 = I pray only during formal ceremonies, 2 = prayer has little importance in my life, 1 = I never pray; (f) 5 = strongly agree, 4 = agree, 3 = uncertain/neither agree nor disagree, 2 = disagree, 1 = strongly disagree. Standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, respectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>(1) Fraction of endowment sent</th>
<th>(2) Fraction of endowment sent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One true religion</td>
<td>-0.013 (0.029)</td>
<td>-0.022 (0.029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal love</td>
<td>-0.040 (0.065)</td>
<td>-0.012 (0.074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same religion</td>
<td>0.004 (0.007)</td>
<td>0.006 (0.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One true religion * same religion</td>
<td>-0.000 (0.019)</td>
<td>-0.011 (0.020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal love * same religion</td>
<td>0.013 (0.043)</td>
<td>0.026 (0.046)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree to one true religion</td>
<td>-0.001 (0.011)</td>
<td>0.007 (0.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One true religion * same religion * agree to prime</td>
<td>0.012* (0.007)</td>
<td>0.015** (0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree to universal love</td>
<td>0.010 (0.022)</td>
<td>0.006 (0.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal love * same religion * agree to prime</td>
<td>-0.005 (0.014)</td>
<td>-0.012 (0.015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy for Dar es Salaam*a</td>
<td>0.005 (0.021)</td>
<td>-0.011 (0.033)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy round 2a</td>
<td>-0.015*** (0.004)</td>
<td>-0.015*** (0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*, 1=female</td>
<td>-0.001* (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.028* (0.017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.001* (0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No schooling a</td>
<td>0.063 (0.066)</td>
<td>0.063 (0.066)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or completed primary school a</td>
<td>0.090 (0.070)</td>
<td>0.090 (0.070)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or completed secondary school a</td>
<td>0.108 (0.070)</td>
<td>0.108 (0.070)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or completed tertiary school a</td>
<td>0.126* (0.074)</td>
<td>0.126* (0.074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived living condition b</td>
<td>0.002 (0.005)</td>
<td>0.002 (0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim faith a</td>
<td>-0.011 (0.023)</td>
<td>-0.011 (0.023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging first and foremost to religious group a</td>
<td>-0.018 (0.011)</td>
<td>-0.018 (0.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in God/Allah c</td>
<td>0.023 (0.017)</td>
<td>0.023 (0.017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of religious service d</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice of prayer(a)</td>
<td>-0.026**</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in heaven(a)</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in hell(a)</td>
<td>0.044***</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God/Allah punishes bad deeds(f)</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God/Allah rewards good deeds(f)</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No marriage between different religions(f)</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends from other religions(a)</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.260***</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer controls</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session controls</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>2,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of id</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>1,108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (a) Dummy variable: 1= yes, 0= no; (b) In general, how do you rate your living conditions compared to those of other people in your country? 1=Much worse, 2=Worse, 3=Same, 4=Better, 5=Much better; (c) 5=I am sure that God/Allah really exists, 4=Although I sometimes question his existence, I do believe in God/Allah, 3=I don’t know if there is a personal God, but I do believe in a higher power of some kind, 2=I don’t know if there is a personal God or a higher power of some kind, 1=I don’t believe in a personal God or in a higher power; (d) 5=few times a week, 4=once a week, 3=once a month, 2=few times a year, 1=never; (e) 5=prayer is a regular part of my daily life, 4=I usually pray in times of stress or need but rarely at any other time, 3=I pray only during formal ceremonies, 2=prayer has little importance in my life, 1=I never pray; (f) 5=strongly agree, 4=agree, 3=uncertain/neither agree nor disagree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree. Standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, respectively.
### Table A 9: Occurrence of discrimination: Control variables for the regressions in Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>(1) Positive</th>
<th>(2) No</th>
<th>(3) Negative</th>
<th>(4) Positive</th>
<th>(5) No</th>
<th>(6) Negative</th>
<th>(7) Positive</th>
<th>(8) No</th>
<th>(9) Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recipient round 1 from religious in-group&lt;br&gt;dummy</td>
<td>0.112***</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.072***</td>
<td>0.064***</td>
<td>0.064***</td>
<td>-0.216***</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.172***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy for Dar es Salaam&lt;br&gt;dummy</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>-0.195</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>-0.169</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.108)</td>
<td>(0.131)</td>
<td>(0.105)</td>
<td>(0.136)</td>
<td>(0.162)</td>
<td>(0.133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender, 1=female</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.002**</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No schooling&lt;br&gt;dummy</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.295***</td>
<td>0.791***</td>
<td>-0.496***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.122)</td>
<td>(0.154)</td>
<td>(0.062)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or completed primary school&lt;br&gt;dummy</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>-0.209*</td>
<td>-0.238***</td>
<td>0.990***</td>
<td>-0.752***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.110)</td>
<td>(0.183)</td>
<td>(0.122)</td>
<td>(0.082)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.082)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or completed secondary school&lt;br&gt;dummy</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.310**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.251***</td>
<td>0.983***</td>
<td>-0.732***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.093)</td>
<td>(0.152)</td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>(0.070)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.071)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or completed tertiary school&lt;br&gt;dummy</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>-0.191**</td>
<td>-0.296***</td>
<td>0.915***</td>
<td>-0.619***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.097)</td>
<td>(0.146)</td>
<td>(0.083)</td>
<td>(0.052)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.056)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived living condition&lt;br&gt;dummy</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>-0.029**</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.030*</td>
<td>-0.042***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim faith&lt;br&gt;dummy</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>-0.071*</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>0.110*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.053)</td>
<td>(0.042)</td>
<td>(0.043)</td>
<td>(0.068)</td>
<td>(0.058)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging first and foremost to religious group&lt;br&gt;dummy</td>
<td>0.047*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>-0.066*</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.071**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in God/Allah</td>
<td>Attendance of religious service</td>
<td>Practice of prayer</td>
<td>Belief in heaven</td>
<td>Belief in hell</td>
<td>God/Allah punishes bad deeds</td>
<td>God/Allah rewards good deeds</td>
<td>No marriage between different religions</td>
<td>Friends from other religions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.199*</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.108)</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.105)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.160**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.094*</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.051)</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.094*</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.205*</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
<td>(0.124)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.137*</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.039)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td>(0.042)</td>
<td>(0.122)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.131**</td>
<td>-0.171**</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.044)</td>
<td>(0.056)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (a) Dummy variable: 1= yes, 0= no; (b) In general, how do you rate your living conditions compared to those of other people in your country? 1=Much worse, 2=Worse, 3=Same, 4=Better, 5=Much better; (c) 5=I am sure that God/Allah really exists, 4=Although I sometimes question his existence, I do believe in God/Allah, 3=I don’t know if there is a personal God, but I do believe in a higher power of some kind, 2=I don’t know if there is a personal God or a higher power of some kind, 1=I don’t believe in a personal God or in a higher power; (d) 5=few times a week, 4=once a week, 3=once a month, 2=few times a year, 1=never; (e) 5 = prayer is a regular part of my daily life, 4=I usually pray in times of stress or need but rarely at any other time, 3=I pray only during formal ceremonies, 2=prayer has little importance in my life, 1=I never pray; (f) 5=strongly agree, 4=agree, 3=uncertain/neither agree nor disagree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree. Standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, respectively.
Appendix B

Experimental Instructions

Thank you all for coming today and welcome to our session. My name is [NAME INTERVIEWER] and I am a member of a research team from [name of local partner] and GIGA Institute of African Affairs, a research institute in Germany. Today’s activities may take about two to three hours. The purpose of the study is to understand how people make decisions in [GHANA / TANZANIA] and elsewhere. Similar studies are conducted with people like you and me all over the world.

Before we begin I want to make some general comments on what we are doing here today and explain the rules you must follow.

1. We will ask each of you to make a series of decisions and to answer a few questions. The decisions you will make are not a test of your knowledge. There is no right or wrong way to decide.

2. When making your decisions, you can earn a considerable amount of money. Whatever money you earn during the activities will be yours to keep and take home. The money will be given to you in private at the end of all activities. This money was given to us by the GIGA to use for research and it is not our own personal money.

3. Throughout the activities today, your identity will be kept anonymous. This means that except for the researcher calculating your earnings, no one will come to know the decisions you made or the money you earned. Instead of using your name, we assigned you a number. Please do not lose this card.

4. Before we proceed further, please let me stress something that is very important. If at any time you find that this is something that you do not wish to participate in for any reason, you are free to leave. But if you already know that you will not be able to stay for 2-3 hours, then you should not try to participate, because otherwise we cannot use the results.

5. If you have heard anything about these types of activities, you should try to forget about that because each activity can be completely different. It is important that you listen as carefully as possible.

6. We will run through some examples of how the activities work. You cannot ask questions or talk while here in the group. This is very important. Please be sure that you obey this rule, because it is possible for one person to spoil the activities for everyone. If one person talks about the activities while others can hear it, we would not be able to carry out the activities today. Each of you will have a chance to ask questions in private to be sure that you understand how the activities work.

7. You will receive a show-up fee of [20 GHS / 5000 TZS] for your participation.

Is there anyone who does not want to participate? [WAIT]
Are there any questions? [WAIT]

Thank you in advance for your effort and time. We will now begin with the instructions for the first activity.
In this activity you are matched with another person who is not in this room today. You will not learn the whole identity of this person, and the other person will never learn about your identity. The only thing you will know about the other person is that he or she lives in [Accra / Dar Es Salaam] as well.

You get an amount of [10 GHS / 5000 TZS] and the other person gets [0 GHS / 0 TZS]. You can decide if you want to keep all of the money for yourself or if you want to give something to this person. You may give an amount between [0 and 10 GHS / 0 and 5000 TZS] to this person. You can also keep everything. The amount that you give to the person must be a number between [0 and 10, i.e. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 / 0 and 5000, i.e. 0, 500, 1000, 1500, 2000, 2500, 3000, 3500, 4000, 4500 or 5000]. At the end of the game, you receive [10 GHS / 5000 TZS] less the amount that you give to the person.

You will engage in this activity two times – each time with a different person. In both activities, you are the one who decides how to share the money. One of these two decisions will be later randomly chosen for the final payout.

Thus, you have to take each decision seriously on its own, because it might be the one that is paid to you. The amount you kept in the chosen decision will be given to you at the end of today’s session, the amount you decided to give to the other person in the chosen decision will be paid out to him or her.

In order to make your choice, you will receive such a card [SHOW CARD DG1] where you have to circle the amount you would like to give.

EX1: If you decide to give [5 from your initial 10 GHS / 2500 from your initial 5000 TZS] the other person will receive [5 GHS / 2500 TZS and you will receive 5 GHS / 2500 TZS].

EX2: If you decide to give [0 from your initial 10 GHS / 0 from your initial 5000 TZS] the other person will receive 0 and you will receive [10 GHS / 5000 TZS].

EX3: If you decide to give [10 from your initial 10 GHS / 5000 from your initial 5000 TZS] the other person will receive [10 GHS / 5000 TZS and you will receive 0].

EX4: If you decide to give [3 from your initial 10 GHS / 1500 from your initial 5000 TZS] the other person will receive [3 GHS / 1500 TZS and you will receive 7 GHS / 3500 TZS].

Do you need another example? [SHORT BREAK]

[READ OUT:] Recall, these were just examples. You can decide to give an amount between [0 and 10 GHS / 0 and 5000 TZS] to the other person.

We will now start with the activity. We will call up each of you individually to enter the next room where you will have the chance to ask questions and where you will take your decisions. Recall that there is no wrong or right way to decide, and that except for LISA calculating your earnings, no one will come to know the decisions you made or the money you earned.

[GUIDELINES FOR DECISION TAKING IN ACTIVITY 1]

[TAKE RANDOMIZATION PROTOCOL, CALL PEOPLE BY THEIR PLAYER NUMBERS]

Please take a seat. Do you have any questions? [ANSWER QUESTION]
I would like to make sure that you fully understood the instructions and ask you three questions on the game
[TAKE “QUESTION DG” FOR PERSON, WRITE DOWN PLAYER NUMBER AND RECORD FOR EACH PROBE QUESTION WHETHER ANSWER WAS CORRECT]:

PROBE QUESTION 1: How much money do you get at the beginning of this game?
PROBE QUESTION 2: Are you obliged to give anything to the other person?
PROBE QUESTION 3: If you give [4 GHS / 2000 TZS] to the other person, how much will you earn and how much will the other person?

Very good, before we start I would like to ask you about your opinion on a few statements. You are asked to tell me whether you, agree, disagree, or are undecided with the statement:

1. Some people claim that the world is better off because of new technologies. Do you agree, disagree or are you undecided?

2. Some people claim that it is important to think up new ideas and be creative; to do things one’s own way? Do you agree, disagree or are you undecided?

[only one true religion] 3. Some people claim that their religion is the only true religion, and wish that everyone followed their faith. Do you agree, disagree or are you undecided?

[universal love] 3. Some people claim that true religion means loving all human beings. Do you agree, disagree or are you undecided?

[control] 3. Some people claim that everyone is talented at something, but no one is talented at everything. Do you agree, disagree or are you undecided?

Thank you. You are now asked to take your first decision in this activity. The person you can give money to lives in [Accra / Dar Es Salaam] and is someone like on this picture. [SHOW PICTURE ACCORDING TO RANDOMIZATION PROTOCOL]

Please take now this sheet [GIVE CARD DG1] and decide which amount between [0 and 10 GHS / 0 and 5000 TZS] you would like to give to the person, by circling the respective amount. I will turn my back to you, so that I cannot see your decision. When you have taken your decision, please put the sheet in the envelope and let me know.

[INTERVIEWER: TURN YOUR BACK TO PARTICIPANT IN ORDER TO ENSURE HIS PRIVACY WHILE HE/SHE TAKES HIS/HER DECISION.]

[TAKE CARD DG2]

Okay. You are now asked to take your second decision in this activity. The person you can give money to lives in [Accra / Dar Es Salaam] and is someone like on this picture. [SHOW PICTURE ACCORDING TO RANDOMIZATION PROTOCOL]

Please take now this sheet [GIVE CARD DG2] and decide which amount between [0 and 10 GHS / 0 and 5000 TZS] you would like to give to this person, by circling the respective amount. I will turn my back to you, so that I cannot see your decision. When you have taken your decision, please put the sheet in the envelope and let me know.

[INTERVIEWER: TURN YOUR BACK TO PARTICIPANT IN ORDER TO ENSURE HIS PRIVACY WHILE HE/SHE TAKES HIS/HER DECISION]

Thank you. Please now go back to the room. Recall that you are not allowed to talk about the game to anyone else. This is very important, because otherwise you may spoil the activity for the others.
Appendix C

Pictures

Pictures shown to inform about the religious identity of Christian recipients:

Pictures shown to inform about the religious identity of Muslim recipients:
### Appendix D

**Post-experimental questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 How old are you? ______ (years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 What is your highest level of education?</td>
<td>0. No schooling O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Some primary schooling O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Primary school completed O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Some secondary school O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Secondary school completed O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Some post-secondary qualifications O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Completed post-secondary education (e.g. university degree, polytechnic) O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Post-graduate O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Gender of interviewee</td>
<td>1. Male O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Female O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Are you employed now or not?</td>
<td><strong>YES I HAVE EMPLOYMENT</strong> 1. Employee, private firm O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Employee, public sector O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Self-employed, running a business O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NO, I DON’T HAVE EMPLOYMENT</strong> 4. Retired/pensioned O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Housework, not otherwise employed O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Student O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Unemployed O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Other, specify: ____________________________________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 In general, how do you rate your living conditions compared to those</td>
<td>1. Much worse O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of other Ghanaians / Tanzanians?</td>
<td>2. Worse O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Same O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Better O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Much better O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5b Considering all sources of income of all household members, what is</td>
<td>1. 0-150,000 TZS O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your monthly household income?</td>
<td>2. 150,001-300,000 TZS O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 300,001-500,000 TZS O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. 500,001-700,000 TZS O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. 700,001-900,000 TZS O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. More than 900,000 TZS O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5c Including yourself, how many people currently live in your</td>
<td>1 O 2 O 3 O 4 O 5 O 6 O 7 O 8 O 9 O More than 9, specify:____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>household?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 Since when have you been living in Accra / Dar Es Salaam?</td>
<td>1. All my life O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Since ______(YEARS) O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I do not live in Dar Es Salaam O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7 What is your ethnic community, cultural group or tribe?</td>
<td>1. Sukuma O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Ha O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Chaga O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Haya O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Hehe O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Other, specify: ____________________________________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7. Don’t know/Refuse

**A8 Which religion or religious denomination do you belong to?**
1. Pentecostal
2. Roman Catholic
3. Muslim
4. Evangelical-Lutheran
5. Methodist
6. Anglican
7. Baptist
8. Seventh Day Adventist
9. Traditional/ethnic religion
10. Other, please specify:

**A9 Which of the following groups do you feel to belong to first and foremost?**
1. Tanzanians/Ghanians
2. My religious group
3. My ethnic group
4. My occupational group
5. My gender identity
6. Other, please specify:

**B1 Aside from weddings and funerals, how often do you personally attend a religious service or meeting of a religious group?**
1. Never
2. A few times a year
3. About once a month
4. About once a week
5. A few times a week

**B2 When was the last time that you attended a religious service?**
1. Today
2. Yesterday
3. The day before yesterday
4. Longer ago than the day before yesterday

**B3 Which of the following best describes your practice of prayer or religious meditation?**
1. Prayer is a regular part of my daily life
2. I usually pray in times of stress or need but rarely at any other time
3. I pray only during formal ceremonies
4. Prayer has little importance in my life
5. I never pray

**B4 Which of the following statements comes closest to your belief in God/Allah?**
1. I am sure that God/Allah really exists
2. Although I sometimes question his existence, I do believe in God/Allah
3. I don’t know if there is a personal God, but I do believe in a higher power of some kind
4. I don’t know if there is a personal god or a higher power of some kind
5. I don’t believe in a personal God or in a higher power

**B5 Do you believe in heaven?**
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know/not sure

**B6 Do you believe in hell?**
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know/not sure

Please indicate for each of the following statements whether you strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree.

**B7 Religion gives me a great amount of comfort and security in life.**
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Uncertain /neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

**B8 When I do bad deeds on earth, God/Allah will punish me.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strongly agree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Uncertain /neither agree nor disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strongly disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9 When I do good deeds on earth, God/Allah will reward me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Strongly agree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Uncertain /neither agree nor disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strongly disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10 God/Allah wants us to love our fellow human beings and to treat them accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Strongly agree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Uncertain /neither agree nor disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strongly disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11 I am convinced that my own religion is the only true religion; and I wish that all mankind followed this faith.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Strongly agree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Uncertain /neither agree nor disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strongly disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12 Following the prescriptions of my religion is more important to me than following the laws of this country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Strongly agree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Uncertain /neither agree nor disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strongly disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13 The marriage between partners from different religious groups is not acceptable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Strongly agree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Uncertain /neither agree nor disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strongly disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14 I care much about what others think of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Strongly agree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Uncertain /neither agree nor disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strongly disagree O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15 Do you have close friends from other religious groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>