

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303988682>

What is the association between religious affiliation and children's altruism?

Article *in* Current Biology · December 2016

DOI: 10.1016/j.cub.2016.06.031

READS
1,789

5 authors, including:



[Azim Shariff](#)

University of California, Irvine

48 PUBLICATIONS 1,768 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



[Aiyana Koka Willard](#)

University of Texas at Austin

12 PUBLICATIONS 152 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



[Stephanie Kramer](#)

Pew Research Center & University of Oregon

3 PUBLICATIONS 3 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Archaeological Trust Curatorial Department for providing access to the samples from Coppergate, England, and Camilla Speller for sampling bones. This project was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (LU 852/7-4).

REFERENCES

1. Andersson, L.S., Larhammar, M., Memic, F., Wootz, H., Schwachow, D., Rubin, C.-J., Patra, K., Arnason, T., Wellbring, L., Hjälm, G., *et al.* (2012). Mutations in *DMRT3* affect locomotion in horses and spinal circuit function in mice. *Nature* **488**, 642–646.
2. Promerová, M., Andersson, L.S., Juras, R., Penedo, M.C.T., Reissmann, M., Tozaki, T., Bellone, R., Dunner, S., Hořín, P., Imsland, F., *et al.* (2014). Worldwide frequency distribution of the ‘Gait keeper’ mutation in the *DMRT3* gene. *Anim. Genet.* **45**, 274–282.
3. Adalsteinsson, S. (1981). Origin and conservation of farm animal populations in Iceland. *J. Anim. Breed. Genet.* **98**, 258–264.
4. Bjørnstad, G., Nilsen, N.Ø., and Røed, K.H. (2003). Genetic relationship between Mongolian and Norwegian horses? *Anim. Genet.* **34**, 55–58.
5. Richards, J.D. (2013). *Viking Age England* (The History Press).
6. Cieslak, M., Pruvost, M., Benecke, N., Hofreiter, M., Morales, A., Reissmann, M., and Ludwig, A. (2010). Origin and history of mitochondrial DNA lineages in domestic horses. *PLoS One* **5**, e15311.
7. Watts, S. (2015). From raiders to traders: The Viking-Arab trade exchange. *Saber and Scroll* **4**, 117–128.
8. Brink, S. and Price, N. (2008). *The Viking World* (Routledge).

¹Department of Evolutionary Genetics, Leibniz Institute for Zoo and Wildlife Research, Alfred-Kowalke-Str. 17, 10315 Berlin, Germany.

²Department of Medical Biochemistry and Microbiology, Uppsala University, 75123 Uppsala, Sweden. ³Department of Animal Breeding and Genetics, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, 75007 Uppsala, Sweden.

⁴German Archaeological Institute, Department of Natural Sciences, Berlin, 14195 Berlin, Germany.

⁵Centro de Ciencias de la Complejidad, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Ciudad de México, Mexico. ⁶University of Potsdam, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Institute for Biochemistry and Biology, Karl-Liebknecht-Str. 24-25, 14476 Potsdam, Germany. ⁷The Agricultural University of Iceland, Faculty of Land and Animal Resources, IS-112 Reykjavik, Iceland. ⁸Archaeological Research Collection, Tallinn University, Rüütli 10, 10130 Tallinn, Estonia. ⁹National Historical Museums, Contract Archaeology, 226 60 Lund, Sweden.

¹⁰Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Laboratory of Archaeozoology, Madrid, Spain. ¹¹Centre for GeoGenetics, Natural History Museum of Denmark, University of Copenhagen, 1350K Copenhagen, Denmark. ¹²Humboldt University Berlin, Faculty of Life Sciences, Albrecht Daniel Thaer-Institute, 10115 Berlin, Germany.

¹³Department of Archaeology, University of York, York, YO10 5DD, United Kingdom. ¹⁴Slovak Academy of Sciences, Institute of Archaeology, 949 21 Nitra, Slovak Republic.

*E-mail: michi@palaeo.eu (M.H.), ludwig@izw-berlin.de (A.L.)

Correspondence

What is the association between religious affiliation and children’s altruism?

Azim F. Shariff^{1,6}, Aiyana K. Willard², Michael Muthukrishna³, Stephanie R. Kramer⁴, and Joseph Henrich⁵

Decety *et al.* [1] examined the relationships between household religiosity and sociality in children sampled from six countries. We were keenly interested in Decety *et al.* [1]’s conclusions about a negative relationship between religiosity and generosity — measured with the Dictator Game — as our team has investigated related questions, often with potentially contrasting findings [2–5]. We argue here that, after addressing peculiarities in their analyses, Decety *et al.* [1]’s data are consistent with a different interpretation.

Given that previous studies (for example [6–8]) have shown cross-national variation in Dictator Game behavior, Decety *et al.* [1]’s approach of aiming to include country-level fixed effects in their analysis, to account for mean differences among countries, is sensible. But when they included their categorically-coded country (1 = US, 2 = Canada, and so on) in their models, it was entered not as fixed effects, with dummy variables for all of the countries except one, but as a continuous measure. This treats the variable as a measure of ‘country-ness’ (for example, Canada is twice as much a country as the US) instead of providing the fixed effects they explicitly intended. We have repeated Decety *et al.* [1]’s intended analysis by using actual fixed effects, along with their model specifications, and then explored other plausible specifications and modelling approaches. Our analyses reveal meaningfully different results from those originally reported.

Decety *et al.* [1] report that children from religious — especially Muslim —

households recommend more punishment of a moral transgressor than do children from non-religious households. Using the same model specification as Decety *et al.* [1], but including dummy-codes for country (with USA as the referent), we find little support for this; no effect of household religious affiliation emerged ($\beta = -0.03$, $t(774) = -0.31$, $p = 0.75$). Because Decety *et al.* [1]’s ordinary least squares (OLS) regression analysis is not ideal for the highly negatively-skewed distribution of punishment ratings, we also estimated a model using the log of the reverse-scored punishment values; this similarly yielded no effect ($\beta = 0.00$, $t(774) = 0.14$, $p = 0.89$).

Conducting Decety *et al.* [1]’s intended analysis also finds no support for their conclusion that more religious parents report their children having more empathy and sensitivity to injustices. When country is entered as fixed, Decety *et al.* [1]’s model specification reveals no relationship between religiosity and either empathy ($\beta = 0.04$, $t(764) = 1.15$, $p = 0.25$) or justice ratings ($\beta = -0.03$, $t(767) = -0.57$, $p = 0.57$; [Table S1](#) in the Supplemental Information).

Decety *et al.* [1]’s primary claims concern children’s altruistic behavior in the Dictator Game. Here again, our reanalysis using Decety *et al.* [1]’s intended specifications calls their conclusions into question. The fixed effects model shows no significant effect for religious affiliation on generosity (OLS Model 2: $p = 0.70$; [Table 1](#)), though we do observe effects for age, country and (marginally) socio-economic status. However, Decety *et al.* [1]’s OLS model is poorly suited for the many zero offers in the data. To address this, we used a zero-inflated negative binomial regression, but still, no relationship with religious affiliation emerged. Indeed, within no single country was household religious affiliation a significant predictor of generosity (though sample sizes, and thus statistical power, are reduced; [Table S2](#)). Finally, given the overlap between country and religious affiliation, we also estimated a random effects model, which yields similar results ([Table 1](#)).

Though generosity appears unrelated to household religious

Table 1. Linear regression models.

	OLS Model 1 β (SE)	OLS Model 2 β (SE)	Random effects Model 3 β (SE)	Zero-inflated Negative Binomial Model 4 β (SE)	Zero-inflated Negative Binomial Model 5 β (SE)
Religious (vs non)	-0.50 (0.17)**	-0.08 (0.21)	-0.13 (0.21)	-0.10 (0.04)*	0.00 (0.06)
Age	0.44 (0.03)***	0.42 (0.03)***	0.42 (0.03)***	0.08 (0.01)***	0.09 (0.01)***
Female	0.21 (0.15)	-0.18 (0.14)	-0.17 (0.14)	-0.06 (0.04)	-0.07 (0.04) [†]
SES	0.21 (0.06)***	0.11 (0.07) [†]	0.12 (0.07) [†]	0.04 (0.02)*	0.03 (0.02)
Country (vs USA)					
Canada		0.29 (0.26)			0.05 (0.08)
South Africa		-1.46 (0.26)***			-0.31 (0.08)***
Turkey		-0.73 (0.24)**			-0.24 (0.07)***
China		-0.04 (0.34)			0.00 (0.08)
Jordan		0.07 (0.27)			-0.08 (0.07)
R ²	0.18**	0.25***	0.23***		

Models 1 and 4 show regression results without controlling for country of origin. Models 2 and 5 control for country. Model 3 includes random intercepts for each country. The R² reported for Model 3 includes variance explained by both fixed and random factors [9,10]. [†] $p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

affiliation, Decety *et al.* [1]'s dataset does reveal generosity to be negatively related to both household religious frequency (OLS: $\beta = -0.26$, $t(789) = -2.38$, $p = 0.02$; zero-inflated: $\beta = -0.07$, $z = -2.13$, $p = 0.03$), and intrinsic religiosity (OLS: $\beta = -0.19$, $t(792) = -1.81$, $p = 0.07$; zero-inflated: $\beta = -0.06$, $z = -2.05$, $p = 0.04$; country-by-country breakdown in Table S2). However, the effect is quite small: an increase in religiosity of 1 SD resulted in 6–7% lower odds of sharing stickers (roughly 0.2 fewer stickers); see also Table S2.

In sum, Decety *et al.* [1] have amassed a large and valuable dataset, but our reanalyses provide different interpretations of the authors' initial conclusions. Most of the associations they observed with religious affiliation appear to be artifacts of between-country differences, driven primarily by low levels of generosity in Turkey and South Africa. However, children from highly religious households do appear slightly less generous than those from moderately religious ones.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Supplemental Information includes two tables and R code and can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2016.06.031>.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Jean Decety for graciously sharing the original dataset.

REFERENCES

- Decety, J., Cowell, J. M., Lee, K., Mahasneh, R., Malcolm-Smith, S., Selcuk, B., and Zhou, X. (2015). The negative association between religiousness and children's altruism across the world. *Curr. Biol.* 25, 2951–2955.
- Norenzayan, A., Shariff, A.F., Gervais, W.M., Willard, A.K., McNamara, R., Slingerland, E., and Henrich, J. (2016). The cultural evolution of prosocial religions. *Behav. Brain Sci.* 39, 1–65.
- Purzycki, B.G., Apicella, C., Atkinson, Q., Cohen, E., McNamara, R.A., Willard, A. K., Xygalatas, D., Norenzayan, A., and Henrich, J. (2016). Moralizing gods, supernatural punishment, and the expansion of human sociality. *Nature* 530, 327–330.
- Shariff, A.F., and Norenzayan, A. (2011). Mean gods make good people. *Int. J. Psychol. Relig.* 21, 85–96.
- Shariff, A.F., Willard, A.K., Andersen, T., and Norenzayan, A. (2016). Religious priming a meta-analysis with a focus on prosociality. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Rev.* 20, 27–48.
- Henrich, J., Ensminger, J., McElreath, R., Barr, A., Barrett, C., Bolyanatz, A., Cardenas, J.C., Gurven, M., Gwako, E., Henrich, N., *et al.* (2010). Markets, religion, community size, and the evolution of fairness and punishment. *Science* 327, 1480–1484.
- House, B.R., Silk, J.B., Henrich, J., Barrett, H.C., Scelza, B.A., Boyette, A.H., Hewlett, B.S., McElreath, R., and Laurence, S. (2013). Ontogeny of prosocial behavior across diverse societies. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*. 110, 14586–14591.
- Rochat, P., Dias, M.D., Liping, G., Broesch, T., Passos-Ferreira, C., Winning, A., and Berg, B. (2009). Fairness in distributive justice by 3- and 5-year-olds across seven cultures. *J. Cross Cult. Psy.* 40, 416–442.

- Nakagawa, S., and Schielzeth, H. (2013). A general and simple method for obtaining R² from generalized linear mixed-effects models. *Meth. Eco. Evo.* 4, 133–142.
- Johnson, P.C.D. (2014). Extension of Nakagawa & Schielzeth's R²GLMM to random slopes models. *Meth. Eco. Evo.* 5, 944–946.

¹Department of Psychology and Social Behavior, University of California, Irvine, Irvine, CA 92697, USA. ²Department of Psychology, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712, USA. ³Department of Social Psychology, London School of Economics, London WC2A 3LJ, UK. ⁴Department of Psychology, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97401, USA. ⁵Department of Human Evolutionary Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA.
E-mail: shariff@uoregon.edu

The editors of Current Biology welcome correspondence on any article in the journal, but reserve the right to reduce the length of any letter to be published. All Correspondence containing data or scientific argument will be refereed. Queries about articles for consideration in this format should be sent by e-mail to cbiol@current-biology.com