## INDEX

Accountability principle, 183 Age, demographics effect, 130–132 Anonymous interaction, grid and group for behavior in, 96 Anthropology, 13, 66 cultural, 91 Apartheid laws, 230 Archetypal analysis (AA), 65, 69, 73 advantages and limitations in comparison with methods, 72 - 73algorithm, 70-71 associating individual cases with archetypes, 71 comparison of AA with methods, 71 - 72determining number of archetypes, 71 measurement of Schwartz values. 74 - 76Schwartz values model, 74 World Values Survey (WVS), 73 Archetypes, 14, 68 culture, 65, 68-69 from data, 69–73 distribution of archetypal cases, 80 - 81for Japan and United States, 82 for Jordan, France, and South Korea, 82 multiple, 69 Archival social history, 28, 37 Backlash-aversion/social capital investment function, 210 Beliefs, 4-5, 30 on luck, 177-180, 201

variable, 173

Blameworthiness, 208 Bonus framing effects, 220-221 Capital, cultural, 28, 30 Capitalism, 41 Case studies, in-depth, 28, 37 Catholic, 34 Chat communications, 57 Citizenship demographics effect, 130-132 experimental participants by, 108 - 109Cluster analysis, 72 Collectivism, 4, 30–31, 91–92 Collectivist culture, 2 Collectivists, cultural type, 97 Computer program matching algorithm, 254 Conceptualization of culture, 29, 38 - 40as form of capital, 30-33Configuration of values, culture as archetypes from data, 69-73 culture archetypes, 68-69 five global archetype profiles, 77 - 78global archetypes, 65 homogenous group, 66-67 illustration of archetypal analysis, 73 - 76Contemporary social anthropology, 90 - 91Content analysis, 58 Convex ultimatum game, 100, 116-119, 126-127, 163 - 164

effects of grid and group alternate measures on behavior, 134 - 135one-role treatment, 152-153 two-role treatment, 158-159 Coordinated social interaction, 74 Corporate culture, 46 Cross-cultural difference, 169, 182-184 experimental studies, 37 experiments, 170 psychology approach, 91, 137 studies. 10 Cross-ethnic difference, 90 Cross-national analysis, 5 Cross-national difference, 90 Cultural capital, intangible, 27-28 Culture patterns, 67 static, 35-36 Culture-related economics literature, 64

Decision-making, 228 heuristics, 3 processes, 64 Decontextualized experiments, 216 Delegated decision-making, 228, 230 Demographics, 241 effect, 130-132 by race group, 254 Desert preferences, 207 Desert-utility function, 209, 210 Dictator game, 8-9, 14, 16, 43, 90-91, 100, 102, 124, 163, 185n11, 207, 212, 216, 242 age effect in meta-analysis, 132 anonymous dictator-game experiment, 210 donations in, 125, 131-132, 140n28 effects of grid and group alternate measures on behavior, 134 - 135experimental design, 101

hypothesis, 54, 102, 105-106 modified. 185 one-role treatment, 150-151 regression estimation of decisions, 114-115 two-person, 175, 183 two-role treatment, 156–157 Differences, cultural, 206 Discrete uniform distribution, 171 Distribution of cultural types, 107-108, 110-111 Distributionists, cultural type, 97 Diverse societies, experiments across, 8 - 10Dividing Rule, 152 Dominance hierarchies, 209 Econometric approaches, 27 studies, 26 Economic(s), 91-93 culture, 6-13, 33, 40, 43 decisions, 206 economists. 3. 64 experimental economists experimentalists, 42-44 phenomena, 40, 64 scenarios, 26-27 theory, 59 See also Experimental economics Egalitarianism, strict, 183 Enculturation process, 26 "Envelope drop" game, 12 Epidemiological approach, 5 Equity, 239 Ethnicity, 229 group, 5-6Ethnographies, 28, 37 European Social Survey, 4 European Values Study (EVS), 4 European Values Systems Study Group, 4 Experimental economics, 232-233 classification of natural messages, 57 - 58

conducting qualitative postexperiment interview, 56–57 language as data, 57 post-experiment interview, 54–56 qualitative methods in, 53–54 Experimental economists, 28–29 Experimentalists, 42–44 Exploratory cluster analysis, 14 Eye-tracking method, 54

Fairness ideals, 183 models, 209–210 Family, 5 Femininity, 91–92 Frame, 54, 57 bonus framing effects culture, 27 Frameworks, cultural, 91–93

Games and hypotheses, 100, 105-106 dictator game. See Dictator game trust games. See Trust games ultimatum game. See Ultimatum game Geertz, Clifford, 25, 46 Geertzian notion of culture, 32 General Social Survey (GSS), 4, 12, 98 - 99Generalized morality, 4–5 Generalized trust, 4 Generosity, 102 Germany's Protestant culture, 34 Gift-exchange game, 229–230 Global archetypes, 65 Globalization role in culture, 10–11 GLOBE study, 64 "Grid-group attributes and behavior in two-person games", 107-108.111-130 Grid-group cultural theory. See Gridgroup model Grid-group model, 91, 93 alternate grid/group questions, 165

cognitive/motivational characteristic, 94 cultural frameworks and economics, 91-93 culturally driven behavior, 95 demographic questions, 165–166 effect of demographics, 130–132 distribution of cultural types, 110-111 experimental participants by citizenship and citizenship clusters, 108-109 games and hypotheses, 100, 102 - 106grid/group survey questions, 147-149 operationalizing grid and group, 96-99 procedures, 104, 107 results. 107 robustness check, 132–134 Group identity in intermediated interactions amounts returned by receivers, 243 - 245demographics, 241, 254 experiment protocol, 232-236 hypotheses, 237 literature, 228-230 modified trust game, 231 results, 241, 248 return decision by receiver, 237 - 238screenshots of decisions in delegation game, 260-264 sender appointment by owner, 239 - 241sender selection. 246–247 sender transfers, 245-246 transfer decision by sender, 239 treatment factors, 232 trust and race in South Africa. 242 - 243Groups in culture. 5-6smooth functioning and survival, 74

Hawthorne effects, 55 High-grid individual, 97 High-group individual, 97 Homogenous culture, 34–35 Homogenous group, 66-67 Human economic behavior, 64-65 Human rights, 223 Hypothetical individual, 68 Identity, 232 Image tagging, 216 In-depth case studies, 28, 37 In-group bias, 229 Income, 168-169, 172 additional analysis, 199-203 beliefs about luck, 177-180 determinants of giving, 175-177 European governments, 167-168 experimental design and procedures, 170-171 and giving, 183-184 income-generating process, 184 individual giving, 172-175 inequality, 168, 183 literature, 169-170 personal characteristics and values, 180 - 182questionnaire, 196-198 Individual giving, 172-175 making decisions, 206 reference-dependent utilities, 210 Individualism, 4, 30-31, 91-92 Individualist cultural type, 97 culture, 2 type, 139 Inductive approach, 90 Inglehart, R., 45n2, 83 traditional vs. secular-rational orientation. 92, 137n5 factor analysis, 18n2 value orientations, 92 Institutional culture, 18 Interviews, 39-40

guide, 56 open-ended, 28, 37, 41 post-experimental, 54–56, 59 postgame, 43

## Knowledge, 232

Lab-in-field experiments, 12 Language as data, 57 Latent class analysis, 72 *Learning from Strangers* (Weiss), 56 Liberal egalitarianism, 183 Libertarianism, 183

Market as cultural phenomenon, 40 - 41Masculinity, 91-92 Materialism, cultural, 64 Matrix algebra, 65 Meaning, pattern of, 38-39, 44-45 Mental models, 1, 7 Messages, 43 pay-off relevant, 58 Migration role in culture, 10 Model culture, 27 Modernization theory, 90 Modified dictator games, 185 Moral blame, 208 Moral dilemmas, 208-209 MTurk, 208 Multistage experiment, 208

Nash equilibrium, 103 "Nation-neutral" effects, 36 Nationality group, 5–6 Natural experiments, 12 Natural messages, 57–58 Nonparametric tests, 172 Norm-consistent behavior, 104

One-role treatment, 150 convex ultimatum game, 152–153 dictator game, 150–151 regular trust game, 154–155

send-all-or-nothing trust game, 153 - 154standard ultimatum game, 151 - 152See also Two-role treatment One-shot trust game, 231 Open-ended interviews, 28, 37, 41 Operationalizing grid and group, 96 grid and group for behavior in anonymous interaction, 96 measuring grid and group via polythetic scale, 96-99 Own-group bias, 230 Owner, 237 business, 28 capital, 15, 231 expectations, 245 sender appointment by, 239-241 Patterns, culture, 67 Pay-off relevant messages, 58 Penalty, 220-221 Personal characteristics and values, 180-182, 202-203 Placation, 217 preferences, 207 Polythetic scale, measuring grid and group via, 96–99 Post-experiment interview, 54-56, 59 "Post-materialistic" values, 92 Postgame interviews, 43 Poverty, 168, 184 Power distance, 91–92 Pre-game exercises, 163-164 testers, 107 Preferences for desert. 207 for placation, 207 Price theory, 45 Priming studies, 11–12 Profession group, 5-6Proposer, 151 reference point manipulation, 217-220

"Protestant Ethic", 40 Psychology approach, cultural, 137 Qualitative methods, 29, 53–54 benefits to the study of culture, 37 - 44classification of natural messages, 57 - 58conceptualize culture as form of capital, 30-33 conducting qualitative post-experiment interview, 56 - 57culture, 25-26 drawbacks to getting at culture, 29 experimental economists, 28-29 experimental techniques, 26-27 importance of culture, 36-37isolating culture, 33-34 language as data, 57 post-experiment interview, 54-56 treating culture as homogenous, 34 - 35treating culture as static, 35-36Quantitative approaches, 28 drawbacks of quantitative approaches to getting at culture, 29-37Race in South Africa, 242–243

Race in South Africa, 242–243 Random shock, 171, 175 Reasoning, 206 Receiver, 237 reference point manipulation, 217 return decision by, 237–238 Reciprocity, 229 Reference point-dependent model of social preferences, 207–208 desert, 210–211, 217–220 expectations, 205–206 experimental design and results, 216–217 experimental games, 206–207 fear of retaliation, 211–212 moral dilemmas, 208–209

penalty vs. bonus framing effects, 220 - 221placation, 217 subject motivation, 221-222 Reference-dependent fairness model, 210 Reference-dependent utilities, 209-211 Regressions, OLS, 172, 173 Regression estimation of amount divided by player 2 conditional on percentage, 116-119 of amount returned by player 2 in regular trust game, 122 - 123of dictator and ultimatum game decisions, 114-115 of trust games decisions, 120-121 Regular trust game, 100, 122-123, 128-130, 164 effects of grid and group alternate measures on behavior, 134 - 135one-role treatment, 154–155 two-role treatment, 160-162 Religion demographics effect, 130–132 group, 5-6 Repugnance markets, 7 Reviewers, independent, 58 Ritualists, cultural type, 97 Schwartz values, 20n22, 64-65, 69, 71,84 archetype A4, 83 model, 65, 68, 73-74 ten motivational values, 75 transnational homogeneity, 81 in World Values Survey Wave Five, 73-79, 81 Scree plots, 71 Self-expression value, 92 Self-interested payoff maximizers, 103 Self-transcendence/conservation, 68

Send-all-or-nothing trust game, 100, 127 - 129effects of grid and group alternate measures on behavior, 134 - 135one-role treatment, 153-154 two-role treatment, 160 Sender, 237 appointment by owner, 239-241 selection, 246-247 transfer decision by, 239 transfers, 245-246 Shareholder, 229-230 Social animals, 209 anthropology, 90-91 capital, 30 capital theory, 90 conventions, 3 incorporation, 93 norms, 207 preferences, 206, 207 Socialization horizontal. 35-36 vertical, 36 Societies, 64, 84-85, 93 experiments across, 8-10 large-scale, 9, 13 small-scale, 6, 8 Sociology, 90 South Africa, trust and race in, 242 - 243"Spirit of Junkanoo", 35 "Spirit of Rabbyism", 35 Standard ultimatum game, 100, 124 - 126one-role treatment, 151–152 two-role treatment, 157-158 Subjectivism, 37 Survival value, 92

Tautological theory, 207 Team culture, 46 Theory-derived value function, 211 Tit-for-tat strategy, 212 Triangulations of experimental evidence and surveys, 12 - 13Trust, 30, 229 in South Africa, 242–243 Trust games, 20n26, 26, 43, 90-91, 103 - 104decisions, 120-121 experimental design, 101 hypothesis, 103-106 modified, 231, 232 one-shot, 231 regression estimation of trust games decisions, 120-121 regular, 100, 122-123, 128-130, 154-155, 160-162, 164 send-all-or-nothing, 100, 127-129, 134-135, 153-154, 160 one-role treatment, 153-154 two-role treatment. 160 Two-person dictator game, 183 Two-person games, 100 behavior across four cultural types, 112-113 convex ultimatum game, 126-127 grid-group attributes and behavior in, 111 send-all-or-nothing trust game, 127-128, 129 standard ultimatum game, 124 - 126Two-role treatment, 156 convex ultimatum game, 158-159 dictator game, 156-157 send-all-or-nothing trust game, 160 standard trust game, 160-162 standard ultimatum game, 157 - 158See also One-role treatment Type I thinking, 222 Type II thinking, 222–223

Ultimatum games, 8-9, 12, 16, 19n11, 20n26, 27, 36-37, 90-91, 102-103, 163, 212 behavior, 8 convex, 100, 126-127, 131-133, 140n28 convex, one-role treatment, 152 - 153convex, two-role treatment, 158 - 159delegation in, 228 effects of grid and group alternate measures on behavior, 134 - 135experimental design, 101 experimental studies in culture, 36-37 hypothesis, 102-103, 105-106 meta-analysis, 92 regression estimation of decisions, 114-115 standard, 100, 124-126, 131-133, 140n28, 151-152, 157-158 Uncertainty avoidance, 91-92 Understanding the Culture of Markets (Storr). 27

Values, 4–5 cultural, 30 orientations, 92 system, 67 *See also* Configuration of values, culture as

Western Educated Industrial Rich Democracies (WEIRD), 6 World Giving Index, 184 World Values Survey (WVS), 29, 34, 45, 65, 73, 92, 169, 183 Wave Five data, 65–66 Worldly asceticism, 46