

Karma Belief as a Predictor of Prosocial Behavior: A Cross-Sectional Study from India

Mrudula A R¹, Siddhi Melekar¹, Dr. Hunny Kalra^{2*}

ABSTRACT

Background: Karma refers to the belief, often rooted in religious, philosophical, or secular traditions that good actions lead to positive outcomes, potentially encouraging kind behavior. Prosocial behavior involves voluntary actions intended to benefit others, such as helping or sharing. While belief in karma has been theoretically linked to prosocial tendencies, its predictive relationship remains underexplored. **Aim:** This study examined whether belief in karma predicts prosocial behavior. **Methods:** A correlational design was used with 100 participants (62% female, 36% male, 2% non-binary/other) aged 18-40 years completing an online questionnaire. The Karma Belief Scale (White et al., 2019) and Prosocial Behavior Scale (Caprara et al., 2005) were used to measure belief in karma and exhibition of prosocial behavior, respectively. Analysis included descriptive statistics, Pearson's product moment correlation, and linear regression analysis. **Results:** Participants reported moderate levels of both karma belief ($M = 61.81$, $SD = 12.42$) and prosocial behavior ($M = 64.87$, $SD = 8.72$). Analysis revealed a weak but significant positive correlation between the variables ($r = .236$, $p < .05$). Likewise, regression analysis indicated karma belief accounted for 5.6% of the variance in prosocial behavior. **Conclusion:** While results suggest karma belief's weak associations with prosocial actions, the modest effect size implies other factors play substantial roles. These findings suggest that fostering karma-related beliefs alone may not be sufficient to promote prosocial behavior without additional reinforcement from social and psychological factors. Future research should investigate cultural moderators and causal mechanisms through experimental designs.

Keywords: Karma Belief, Pro-Social Behavior, Moral Motivation, Cultural Beliefs

Human behavior is profoundly influenced by personal beliefs, values, and worldviews that shape motivations and social actions. One influential belief system present across cultures is the concept of karma, which posits that an individual's actions bring reciprocal outcomes through a moral cause-and-effect mechanism (White et al., 2019). Though karma originates from Eastern religious and philosophical traditions, its

¹M.Sc. Psychology Student, Department of Psychology and Allied Sciences, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bengaluru, (Karnataka) India

²Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Allied Sciences, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bengaluru, (Karnataka) India

*Corresponding Author

Received: November 02, 2025; Revision Received: March 27, 2026; Accepted: March 31, 2026

Karma Belief as a Predictor of Prosocial Behavior: A Cross-Sectional Study from India

implications extend beyond religious adherents, influencing the ethical conduct of people regardless of faith affiliation (Tayung & Roy, 2025).

Karma's emphasis on fairness, justice, and moral reciprocity suggests that those who strongly believe in its tenets may be more predisposed towards prosocial behavior voluntary actions intended to benefit others, such as helping, sharing, or donating. Early research on moral psychology has established links between religious beliefs and increased prosocial tendencies, yet the specific role of karma, distinct from general religiosity, remains underexplored (White et al., 2019).

Theoretical and empirical studies have investigated various dimensions of karma's influence on human behavior. Karma belief is characterized by the expectation that good actions yield rewards and bad actions result in punishments, forming the basis for individual ethical standards.

Norenzayan and Shariff (2008) demonstrated that priming karma beliefs increases charitable donations, especially in cultures where karmic ideas are deeply rooted. In collectivist societies, individuals who endorse karma display stronger empathy and volunteering behaviors (Ma-Kellams & Blascovich, 2012). Willard et al. (2020) reported that those who believe in karma perceive their actions as having significant long-term moral consequences, which reinforces adherence to social norms and family welfare.

In workplace settings too, employees with strong karma beliefs exhibit enhanced ethical decision-making and are more likely to assist colleagues Krishnakumar and Neck (2002). Aveyard (2014) found that a sense of 'cosmic justice' mediates the relationship between karma belief and increased donations to both religious and secular charities. Environmental behavior is also shaped by karma; for instance, people tend to conserve resources and support sustainability when harming the environment is viewed as morally wrong (Parboteeah et al., 2009).

Psychological mechanisms underlying karma-driven prosociality include heightened self-control (Chen et al., 2019a) and reduced moral licensing, where initial good deeds discourage subsequent unethical actions (Zhong & Liljenquist, 2006). Preston and Ritter (2013) noted that deeper understanding of karma, rather than superficial acceptance, is essential for consistently fostering prosocial attitudes. However, belief in karma can have adverse effects it may justify victim-blaming or reinforce social inequality by attributing suffering to past misdeeds (Callan et al., 2006).

Several psychological theories provide a basis for understanding the relationship between karma belief and prosocial behavior. Social Exchange Theory posits that individuals engage in helping behaviors, anticipating future reciprocation or rewards (Blau, 2017). Thus, karma belief may serve as a motivational framework, encouraging people to help others with the expectation of positive karmic returns. Moral Foundations Theory emphasizes that notions of justice and fairness, rooted in cultural and religious traditions, guide moral conduct across societies (Haidt & Joseph, 2004). Karma encapsulates these concepts, operating as a social norm that reinforces reciprocal altruism and discourages selfishness. Finally, the Theory of Planned Behavior asserts that attitudes, perceived norms, and control beliefs determine behavioral intentions (Ajzen, 1991). The belief in karma likely shapes positive attitudes toward helping, influenced by social reinforcement and expectations of future outcomes. In the present study, these theoretical perspectives collectively suggest that karma belief could

Karma Belief as a Predictor of Prosocial Behavior: A Cross-Sectional Study from India

play a substantial role in motivating and sustaining prosocial behavior among Indian young adults.

Understanding how belief in karma may encourage prosocial acts can illuminate broader questions about the interplay between spiritual beliefs and social behaviors. As societies become more pluralistic and individualistic, examining whether karma belief motivates ethical conduct offers valuable insights for promoting social well-being and cooperation. Furthermore, in contemporary India, where traditional belief systems intersect with modern values, evaluating this relationship has important practical implications for community engagement and behavioral interventions.

The present study aimed to measure the relationship between belief in karma and prosocial tendencies among young adults, specifically examining the strength and direction of this association. Additionally, the study sought to examine the extent to which variance in prosocial behavior could be explained by an individual's level of belief in karma, thereby establishing the predictive utility of karmic beliefs in understanding prosocial conduct.

Based on the theoretical rationale and empirical evidence reviewed, two specific hypotheses were formulated. First, it was hypothesized that there would be a significant positive relationship between karmic belief and prosocial tendencies. Second, it was predicted that higher levels of belief in karma would significantly and positively predict greater prosocial tendencies.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Design

A cross-sectional, correlational study was conducted in March 2025 in Bengaluru, India, to examine the relationship between belief in karma and prosocial tendencies among adults.

Participants

The sample comprised 100 adults aged 18 to 40 years ($M = 28.4$, $SD = 5.7$), recruited through purposive sampling. Eligibility criteria included basic familiarity with the concept of karma and sufficient proficiency in English to complete the questionnaires. Exclusion criteria were cognitive impairments or being outside the specified age range. Ethical principles were strictly adhered to throughout the study. All participants received a detailed information sheet, provided informed consent, and were assured of voluntary participation and the right to withdraw at any point without consequence. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained, with no personal identifiers collected and data presented in aggregate form. Participation involved minimal risk, as all data collection relied solely on self-report measures pertaining to beliefs and social behavior. Data were securely stored and accessible only to the research team.

Measures

- 1. Demographic Questionnaire:** A demographic form was used to collect age, gender, education level, and religious background.
- 2. Belief in Karma Questionnaire (BKQ; White et al., 2019):** The BKQ is a 16-item self-report instrument assessing the conviction that moral actions yield inevitable consequences. Respondents rated items (e.g., "Good deeds eventually lead to positive outcomes") on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree), with higher scores reflecting stronger belief in karma. The BKQ demonstrates excellent internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .92-.94$ across three

international samples), strong item–total correlations (.61–.84), and a unidimensional factor structure with excellent model fit (CFI = .97, TLI = .96, RMSEA = .04). Construct validity has been supported through positive associations with belief in a just world, religiosity, and belief in a moralizing God and minimal relationships with superstition or locus of control. The BKQ has established cross-cultural measurement invariance and predictive validity for prosocial behavior, moral concern, and self-control.

- 3. Prosocialness Scale for Adults (PSA; Caprara et al., 2005):** The PSA is a 16-item self-report measure evaluating the propensity to display prosocial behaviors such as helping, sharing, caring, and comforting others. Items (e.g., “I help immediately those who are in need”) are rated on a 5-point scale from 1 (Never/Almost Never True) to 5 (Almost Always/Always True), with higher scores indicating greater prosocial tendencies. The PSA has demonstrated excellent reliability ($\alpha = .91$), strong item–total correlations ($r = .47-.73$), and clear unidimensionality.

Procedure

Data collection was conducted exclusively online using Google Forms. Participants were recruited via purposive sampling through WhatsApp groups, where they received a description of the study and a survey link. Upon accessing the link, participants encountered an informed consent form outlining the study’s purpose, estimated completion time (10–15 minutes), all procedural details, and assurances of confidentiality and the right to withdraw. Consent was provided by selecting a checkbox, with non-consenting individuals automatically exited from the survey. Upon consenting, participants completed the questionnaire sequence in a fixed order to prevent order effects: demographic form, Belief in Karma Questionnaire, and Prosocialness Scale for Adults, each following standard administration guidelines. After completion, participants were directed to a debriefing page explaining the study’s purpose further and providing contact information for queries.

Data Analysis

Collected data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 21). Descriptive statistics summarized demographic and study variables. The distributions were assessed for normality, with skewness values within ± 2 and kurtosis within ± 7 considered acceptable for parametric analysis. Pearson’s correlation coefficient was used to examine the linear relationship between karma belief and prosocial behavior. Simple linear regression analysis evaluated the predictive power of karma belief on prosocial tendencies, reporting the coefficient of determination (R^2), standardized beta coefficients, and significance values.

RESULTS

The demographic characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1. The participants consisted of 62% women and 38% men. The majority of respondents (86%) were aged between 18 and 25 years, while 14% fell within the 26 to 40 years age group. In terms of educational attainment, 45% of participants were undergraduates, 35% had completed postgraduate education, and 20% had vocational training. Regarding religious background, 68% identified as Hindu, 19% as Buddhist, and 13% reported being either affiliated with other religions or were non-religious.

These characteristics indicate a predominantly young and female sample, with diverse educational backgrounds and a majority affiliation with Hinduism.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of the Sample (N = 100)

Variable	Category	n	%
Gender	Women	62	62%
	Men	38	38%
Age Group (in years)	18–25	86	86%
	26–40	14	14%
Education	Undergraduate	45	45%
	Postgraduate	35	35%
	Vocational Training	20	20%
Religion	Hindu	68	68%
	Buddhism	19	19%
	Other/Non-religious	13	13%

The descriptive statistics for the study variables, karma belief and prosocial tendencies, are presented in Table 2. The karma belief scores had a mean of 61.81 and a standard deviation of 12.42. The prosocial tendencies scores had a slightly higher mean of 64.87 and a smaller standard deviation of 8.72, suggesting that scores for this variable were more tightly clustered around the mean.

Table 2: Frequency distributions of Mean, Standard Deviation, Skewness and Kurtosis (N=100)

Variables	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	KB	PT
KB	61.81	12.42	-0.70	0.34	-	.236*
PT	64.87	8.72	-0.39	-0.34	.236*	-

Note. KB = Karma Belief; PT = Prosocial Tendencies; N = sample size; M = mean; SD = standard deviation
Correlations are Pearson r; *p < .05

Both distributions showed a small degree of negative skewness, indicating the bulk of the scores were concentrated at the higher end of the scale. The kurtosis values were close to zero, suggesting that the distributions were approximately mesokurtic. The values for skewness and kurtosis fell within acceptable ranges for assuming a normal distribution, supporting the use of parametric statistical analyses.

Building upon these preliminary findings, the correlational analysis revealed a statistically significant positive relationship between karma belief and prosocial tendencies ($r = .236, p < .05$). This finding suggests that individuals who hold stronger beliefs in the principle of karma are more likely to engage in behaviors that benefit others. In other words, a greater belief in karmic causation appears to be associated with an enhanced tendency toward prosocial actions. Importantly, this result supports Hypothesis 1, which predicted a significant positive correlation between belief in karma and prosocial tendencies. Moreover, these results align with the theoretical premise that moral or spiritual beliefs can play a motivating role in promoting altruistic and socially constructive behaviors.

Table 3: Results of linear regression analysis (N=100)

Criterion	Predictor	t	β	p-value
Prosocial Tendencies	Karma Belief	2.409	0.236	< .05
R		0.236		
R ²		0.056		

$F = 5.805, p < .05$

Karma Belief as a Predictor of Prosocial Behavior: A Cross-Sectional Study from India

Table 2 presents the results of the simple linear regression analysis conducted to examine the predictive influence of karma belief on prosocial tendencies. The overall model was found to be statistically significant, $F(1, 98) = 5.805, p < .05$, indicating that karma belief significantly predicted prosocial tendencies among participants. The standardized beta coefficient ($\beta = 0.236, t = 2.409, p < .05$) suggests that higher levels of karma belief are associated with higher prosocial tendencies. The model accounted for approximately 5.6% of the variance in prosocial tendencies ($R^2 = 0.056$), indicating a modest but meaningful contribution of karma belief in explaining prosocial behavior. These findings provide support for Hypothesis 2, which proposed that karma belief would be a significant predictor of prosocial tendencies.

Overall, the results indicate that karma belief not only correlates positively with prosocial tendencies but also serves as a significant predictor of prosocial behavior. Although the proportion of variance explained was modest, the findings highlight the psychological relevance of spiritual or moral belief systems in shaping socially beneficial behavior. These results lend empirical support to the proposition that individuals guided by a belief in karmic justice may be more inclined toward acts of kindness, cooperation, and moral responsibility.

DISCUSSION

The present study aimed to examine the relationship between karmic belief and prosocial tendencies, as well as to determine whether karmic belief could significantly predict prosocial behavior. The findings revealed a significant positive correlation between the two constructs, indicating that individuals with stronger beliefs in karma tend to display higher levels of prosocial behavior. The regression analysis further supported this relationship by demonstrating that karmic belief significantly predicted prosocial tendencies, although the amount of variance explained was modest. These results suggest that the belief in karmic causation, a moral framework emphasizing the consequences of one's actions may play an influential role in motivating individuals toward socially desirable behaviors such as helping, sharing, and cooperating with others.

The present findings are consistent with earlier research that has highlighted the moral and behavioral implications of karmic belief systems. Previous studies have demonstrated that individuals who endorse karmic principles often exhibit stronger moral sensitivity, greater empathy, and higher engagement in altruistic or prosocial acts (Chen et al., 2019b; Ma-Kellams & Blascovich, 2012). These studies suggest that belief in karma fosters an internalized sense of moral accountability, wherein individuals expect positive consequences for good deeds and negative outcomes for harmful actions (Krishnakumar & Neck, 2002; Norenzayan & Shariff, 2008). This self-regulatory mechanism, rooted in the concept of moral causation, encourages behaviors that promote social harmony and cooperation.

While the present study found a positive relationship between karma belief and prosocial tendencies, it is noteworthy that karmic belief explained only 5% of the variance in prosocial behavior. This modest contribution suggests that prosocial behavior is not solely dependent on karmic beliefs. Instead, several cultural and psychological mechanisms may have a stronger influence.

For instance, Miller and Bersoff (1992) reported that people in India often emphasize family duties over abstract principles such as fairness, reflecting a collectivist orientation where helping others is viewed as a responsibility to the group rather than a means to earn cosmic rewards. Similarly, helping is frequently framed as a duty (kartavya) or moral service (seva),

Karma Belief as a Predictor of Prosocial Behavior: A Cross-Sectional Study from India

rather than a voluntary action motivated by anticipated karmic consequences (Savani et al., 2011). Parenting practices that emphasize empathy, community values, and emotional connection have also been shown to produce higher prosocial behavior than religious or spiritual rules (Knafo & Galansky, 2008). Even in schools and media targeted at children, prosocial behavior is promoted without explicit reference to karma (Miller & Bersoff, 1992; Savani et al., 2011).

Empirical evidence also suggests that belief in karma alone may not be a strong driver of prosocial behavior. Simpson and Willer (2015) argue that cooperative behavior is often sustained by group-level processes such as social norms, reciprocity, and reputation, rather than solely by internalized moral beliefs. Fehr and Schneider (2010) found that reminders of karma did not significantly increase generosity, whereas reminders of social reputation did, highlighting the importance of external social cues. Similarly, the framing of helping as a duty in the Indian context has been shown to be a more powerful motivator than karma itself (Savani et al., 2011).

Moreover, karmic beliefs can sometimes even inhibit helping behavior. Zaki and Mitchell (2013) noted that people may engage in post-hoc justification, assuming that others “deserve” their suffering, which reduces the likelihood of prosocial action. Similarly, moral licensing effects occur when individuals feel that prior moral behavior exempts them from further helping (Sachdeva et al., 2009). In such cases, belief in karmic causation may unintentionally promote passivity rather than altruism.

The present study’s findings hold important theoretical and practical implications. From a theoretical perspective, the results emphasize the significant role that moral and spiritual belief systems such as karmic belief play in shaping prosocial behavior, while also reflecting the impact of cultural and social influences. On a practical level, these findings suggest that interventions designed to promote prosocial behavior may be more effective when they focus on fostering cultural values, social responsibility, and empathy, rather than relying exclusively on abstract spiritual or moral principles. For educators, parents, and policymakers, creating environments that nurture a sense of duty, empathy, and collective responsibility is likely to encourage helping behaviors more successfully than approaches that center solely on karmic consequences. Additionally, a nuanced understanding of the role of karma belief in prosocial behavior can guide the development of culturally sensitive strategies for community engagement, volunteering programs, and moral education.

However, several limitations must be acknowledged. First, the cross-sectional nature of the study prohibits drawing causal conclusions, making it unclear whether karma belief directly leads to increased prosocial tendencies or whether other unmeasured variables contribute to this association. Second, the sample was drawn from a specific population, which may limit the generalizability of the results to other age groups or cultural backgrounds. Third, the use of self-report questionnaires introduces potential biases, such as social desirability, which may inflate the levels of prosocial behavior reported by participants.

Future research could address these limitations by employing longitudinal or experimental designs to better establish causal pathways and by including more diverse and cross-cultural samples. Additionally, examining the interaction between karma belief and other psychological or situational factors, such as empathy, social norms, personality traits, and real-life opportunities for helping, could provide a more nuanced understanding of the

determinants of prosocial behavior. Investigating these dynamics would further clarify the role of moral and spiritual beliefs in motivating prosocial actions across diverse contexts.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the present study highlights the association between karma belief and prosocial behavior among adults in an Indian context. The findings suggest that individuals who more strongly endorse karma belief tend to report greater prosocial tendencies, underscoring the role of moral and spiritual belief systems in shaping ethical conduct. While the results support theoretical models linking belief systems to social behavior, they also point to the need for culturally sensitive approaches in promoting prosociality. Future research should explore these relationships longitudinally and across diverse populations to better understand causality and broader applicability. Overall, consideration of cultural and psychological factors remains essential for advancing both research and interventions aimed at fostering prosocial behavior in society.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Aveyard, M. E. (2014). A Call to Honesty: Extending Religious Priming of Moral Behavior to Middle Eastern Muslims. *PLoS ONE*, 9(7), e99447. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0099447>
- Blau, P. M. (2017). *Exchange and Power in Social Life* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203792643>
- Callan, M. J., Ellard, J. H., & Nicol, J. E. (2006). The Belief in a Just World and Immanent Justice Reasoning in Adults. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(12), 1646–1658. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167206292236>
- Caprara, G. V., Steca, P., Zelli, A., & Capanna, C. (2005). A New Scale for Measuring Adults' Prosocialness. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 21(2), 77–89. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.21.2.77>
- Chen, S., Wei, H., Meng, L., & Ran, Y. (2019a). Believing in Karma: The Effect of Mortality Salience on Excessive Consumption. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1519. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01519>
- Chen, S., Wei, H., Meng, L., & Ran, Y. (2019b). Believing in Karma: The Effect of Mortality Salience on Excessive Consumption. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1519. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01519>
- Fehr, E., & Schneider, F. (2010). Eyes are on us, but nobody cares: Are eye cues relevant for strong reciprocity? *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 277(1686), 1315–1323. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2009.1900>
- Haidt, J., & Joseph, C. (2004). Intuitive ethics: How innately prepared intuitions generate culturally variable virtues. *Daedalus*, 133(4), 55–66. <https://doi.org/10.1162/0011526042365555>
- Knafo, A., & Galansky, N. (2008). The Influence of Children on Their Parents' Values. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2(3), 1143–1161. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00097.x>
- Krishnakumar, S., & Neck, C. P. (2002). The “what”, “why” and “how” of spirituality in the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17(3), 153–164. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940210423060>
- Ma-Kellams, C., & Blascovich, J. (2012). Enjoying life in the face of death: East–West differences in responses to mortality salience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(5), 773–786. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029366>

Karma Belief as a Predictor of Prosocial Behavior: A Cross-Sectional Study from India

- Miller, J. G., & Bersoff, D. M. (1992). Culture and moral judgment: How are conflicts between justice and interpersonal responsibilities resolved? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62(4), 541–554. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.62.4.541>
- Norenzayan, A., & Shariff, A. F. (2008). The Origin and Evolution of Religious Prosociality. *Science*, 322(5898), 58–62. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1158757>
- Praveen Parboteeah, K., Hoegl, M., & Cullen, J. (2009). Religious dimensions and work obligation: A country institutional profile model. *Human Relations*, 62(1), 119–148. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726708099515>
- Preston, J. L., & Ritter, R. S. (2013). Different Effects of Religion and God on Prosociality with the Ingroup and Outgroup. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39(11), 1471–1483. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167213499937>
- Sachdeva, S., Iliev, R., & Medin, D. L. (2009). Sinning Saints and Saintly Sinners: The Paradox of Moral Self-Regulation. *Psychological Science*, 20(4), 523–528. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02326.x>
- Savani, K., Morris, M. W., Naidu, N. V. R., Kumar, S., & Berlia, N. V. (2011). Cultural conditioning: Understanding interpersonal accommodation in India and the United States in terms of the modal characteristics of interpersonal influence situations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100(1), 84–102. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021083>
- Simpson, B., & Willer, R. (2015). Beyond Altruism: Sociological Foundations of Cooperation and Prosocial Behavior. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41(1), 43–63. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112242>
- Tayung, D. D., & Roy, N. (2025). *The Concept of The Law of Karma and Its Ethical Implications in Present Society*. 15(2).
- White, C. J. M., Norenzayan, A., & Schaller, M. (2019). The Content and Correlates of Belief in Karma Across Cultures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 45(8), 1184–1201. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167218808502>
- Willard, A. K., Baimel, A., Turpin, H., Jong, J., & Whitehouse, H. (2020). Rewarding the good and punishing the bad: The role of karma and afterlife beliefs in shaping moral norms. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 41(5), 385–396. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2020.07.001>
- Zaki, J., & Mitchell, J. P. (2013). Intuitive Prosociality. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 22(6), 466–470. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721413492764>
- Zhong, C.-B., & Liljenquist, K. (2006). Washing Away Your Sins: Threatened Morality and Physical Cleansing. *Science*, 313(5792), 1451–1452. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1130726>

Acknowledgment

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Mrudula, A.R., Melekar, S. & Kalra, H. (2026). Karma Belief as a Predictor of Prosocial Behavior: A Cross-Sectional Study from India. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 14(1), 2646-2654. DIP:18.01.262.20261401, DOI:10.25215/1401.262