Methodological Details

Participants were tested in groups of 32, 34 or 36. All sessions were conducted on a local computer network using z-Tree software (Fischbacher, 2007) at the Institute for Empirical Research in Economics (IEW) at the University of Zürich. Before the experiment began, participants were issued detailed instructions to read. Their understanding of these instructions was checked via a series of control questions.

Punishment Game

To maximize observations, only two participants in each session were assigned the role of Player A. The remaining participants were assigned the role of Player B; half were paired with one Player A and the other half were paired with the other Player A. In a session of 36 participants there were thus two groups – each with a single Player A and 17 Players B. For purposes of determining Player A payoffs, one of the 17 Players B in each Player A’s group was chosen at random.

While Player A chose between the two payoff allocations in the first stage of the game, Player B also made a choice. This choice, however, was simply a meaningless filler task, included only to ensure that participant types were not identifiable in any way (i.e., we did not want participants to be able to identify the role of participants sitting in booths adjacent to them by listening for sounds of activity). Likewise, in the second stage while Player B indicated how many points she wished to spend to reduce Player A’s payoff for each of the two allocation possibilities, Player A also made two meaningless filler choices.

Priming Episode and Visibility Check

Although we were only interested in the effects of the priming manipulation on the game decisions of Players B, all participants (whether A or B) underwent the priming episode and the later visibility check so as to preserve role anonymity and reduce demand effects. Our analysis, however, excluded Players A. As noted in the article proper, we also excluded any Players B who performed significantly above chance on the prime visibility task (i.e., who scored 4 or more correct responses out of 25; approximately 18% of participants were excluded on this basis). Table S1 presents the number of included Players B in each of the four priming treatments. Table S1 also lists the German primes presented in each of these four treatments along with their English translations. Primes were matched across treatments for word length (ANOVA: $F_{3,12} = 1.04, p > .05$) as well as for Mannheim wordform frequency (ANOVA: $F_{3,12} = .20, p > .05$) and Mannheim lemma frequency (ANOVA: $F_{3,12} = 2.21, p > .05$). The latter lexical variables were obtained from the WebCelex site (Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, 2001).
Table S1
Details of the Four Priming Treatments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priming Treatment</th>
<th>Primes</th>
<th>English Translations</th>
<th>No. of Included Players B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Göttlich Heilig Fromm Religiös</td>
<td>Divine Holy Pious Religious</td>
<td>54 (28 females, 26 males; Mean age ± SD = 22.6 years ± 3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>Rache Bestrafen Sanktion Vergeltung</td>
<td>Revenge Punish Penalty Retribution</td>
<td>58 (27 females, 31 males; Mean age ± SD = 22.5 years ± 4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion-Punishment</td>
<td>Göttlich Rache Fromm Bestrafen</td>
<td>Divine Revenge Pious Punish</td>
<td>54 (22 females, 32 males; Mean age ± SD = 21.5 years ± 3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Nordosten Akustisch Traktor Schachtel</td>
<td>Northeast Acoustic Tractor Carton</td>
<td>59 (29 females, 30 males; Mean age ± SD = 21.6 years ± 4.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primes were presented in upper-case white letters in a uniform font (ANDALE MONO) on a black background. Four primes were presented in the priming episode, as per the relevant priming treatment. These four primes were presented in a fixed sequence that was repeated five times (1-2-3-4-1-2-3-4-1-2-3-4-1-2-3-4). Forward and backward masks comprised one of four rectangular fields of fragmented letters (Abrams, 2008). Each mask was randomly drawn from the four, with the constraint that the pre- and post-mask were different for each trial. Participants were informed that there would be twenty such trials. They were told that each trial would begin with a white cross in the centre of the screen, followed by a field of jumbled letter fragments, a very brief presentation of a real word, and finally a second field of jumbled letter fragments that would replace the word. They were asked to attend very closely on each trial, and were informed that later in the experimental session they would complete a similar task in which they would be tested on their ability to identify the presented words.

This second task, the prime visibility check, comprised 25 forced-choice priming episodes, each of which involved five presentations (five trials) of a single prime. All mask and presentation parameters were as per the earlier priming episode, i.e., each of the five trials in an episode involved 500ms fixation, 500ms forward mask, 40ms prime presentation and 500ms backward mask. The 25 primes (one per episode, repeated five times in that episode) included the 12 words in the second column of Table S1, plus a number of orthographically similar distractors. At the end of each priming episode (i.e.,
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1 We thank Richard Abrams for supplying these masks and for valuable advice concerning subliminal priming parameters and procedures.
after the fifth priming trial), participants were presented on the screen with a full list of the 25 primes used in this task, and were required to select the word they thought had been presented in that episode. This task was incentivised, with 25 points awarded for each correct response. Once the 25th episode was complete, participants were informed onscreen of the number of correct responses they had made and their resulting earnings. They were also informed at this stage of their final payoff from the earlier game.
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