

Experiments and Economic Development: Lessons from field labs in the developing world

Juan Camilo Cardenas* Jeffrey P. Carpenter†

May 12, 2005

Abstract

Along with the traditional primitives of economic development (material preferences, technology, and endowments), there is a growing interest in exploring how psychological and sociological factors (e.g., bounded rationality, norms, or social preferences) also influence economic decisions, the evolution of institutions, and outcomes. Simultaneously, a vast literature has arisen arguing that economic experiments are important tools in identifying and quantifying the role of institutions, social norms and preferences on behavior and outcomes. Reflecting on our experience conducting experiments in the field over more than five years, we survey the growing literature at the intersection of these two research areas. Our review has four components. In the introduction we set the stage identifying a set of behavioral factors that seem to be central for understanding growth and economic development. We then divide the existing literature in two piles: standard experiments conducted in developing countries, and experiments that have been conducted to answer specific questions about economic development. We then offer methodological advice concerning the design of experiments conducted in the field and on how to econometrically identify sociological factors in experimental data. We conclude by suggesting topics for future research.

JEL Codes: C9, O1

Keywords: Experimental economics, Behavioral economics, Institutions, Social Preferences, Poverty, Development.

*Facultad de Economía - CEDE, Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia, jccarden@uniandes.edu.co.

†Department of Economics, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vermont and IZA, jpc@middlebury.edu.

1 Introduction¹

Modern theories of economic development posit interactions where: information asymmetries and expectations matter, agents act strategically but may face cognitive limitations, preferences can involve elements of fairness, altruism or reciprocity, and social norms constrain choices. Our purpose is to contribute to this body of literature by showing how economic experiments have been (and can be) used to measure the reactions of people in developing economies to these decision-making environments. These experiments are potentially powerful because they can test the degree to which institutions matter and whether institutions have the intended effects.

We focus on decision-making experiments in field labs, but the experimental methodology itself is powerful because it allows researchers to separate confounding factors and/or cross-effects, attribute causation, and calibrate policy-oriented programs for development.² Armed with these tools, experimenters have recently left labs on campuses in the developed world and have begun to pay attention to the local conditions in which experiments are conducted to understand behavior within different economic, political, cultural or ecological contexts.

Like economists in many other fields, development economists have been influenced by the sudden flood of experimental evidence which has begun to change the way economists model and understand interactions. We begin by highlighting pleas by leading development economists to incorporate behavioral factors into standard models of development. To be more specific we list a number of areas in which we feel that experiments would generate valuable insights for development studies and policies. Based on this list, we review the small, but growing, literature describing experiments that have been conducted in developing countries. We sort this literature by purpose. We first consider a large stack of studies in which standard economic experiments have been conducted in developing countries. These experiments, while interesting, were usually not conducted to solve any specific development puzzle. Rather, they are typically part of cross-national comparisons or have exploited the fact that small amounts of money provide relatively large incentives for people in poorer economies.

However, there is a smaller stack of experiments that have been run with development questions in mind. We spend, relatively, more time on this stack. We then outline a number of methodological and econometric issues that should be considered for future work in this area and conclude by making recommendations for future research on the, as of now, unconsidered areas.

¹We thank Hans Binswanger, Sam Bowles, Karla Hoff and Duncan Thomas for thoughtful comments on previous drafts. We also acknowledge the financial support of a Research and Writing grant from the MacArthur Foundation, the MacArthur Foundation's Norms and Preferences Working Group, and the National Science Foundation (SES-CAREER 0092953). Cardenas thanks the International Fellowship program at the Santa Fe Institute, and Natalia Candelo for keeping the tables up to date.

²For an example of a different sort of experiment see the policy intervention of Chattopadhyay and Duflo (2004).

1.1 On the Behavioral Foundations of Development

Experimental economics may offer methods to test many behavioral hypotheses at the core of why, after decades of attempts to induce development with interventions through markets, the state, and self-governance, a few countries have escaped poverty while others remain desperately poor. How institutions interact with behavioral predispositions and economic decision-making heuristics is now central to modern theories of development. Bardhan and Udry (1999), inspired by the wealth of new developments in mainstream economics, explore theoretical models that incorporate many new aspects of decision-making that behavioral and new institutional economist are exploring through experiments. As they argue, *[d]evelopment economics is full of examples of apparently irrational behavior that may be successfully explained as an outcome of more complex exercises in rationality, particularly with deeper probes into the nature of the feasibility constraints or the preference patterns* (page 5). These models are constructed with boundedly rational agents whose preferences are more complex than *homo economicus*, and who interact within a haze of asymmetric information, market imperfections, and self-reinforcing mechanisms. Inspired by experimental results, these models are simultaneously more complicated and more realistic, but, more importantly, they provide reasonable microfoundations that help explain economic success, or failure.

Duflo (2003), concerned with the overly simplistic “poor but neo-classical” approach to poverty and development, where agents have unbounded capacity to gather, remember and process information, argues that poverty itself not only constrains the poor, it also alters the way they evaluate options and make decisions. This, in turn, induces the poor to make decisions that are not in their interest in the long run. Her work using random trials and interventions to study, for instance, whether farmers adopt new technologies and how poverty is determining these choices is complementary to the methodological approaches discussed here. Similarly, Mullainathan and Thaler (2001) discuss arguments and evidence on how humans’ decisions on savings and consumption do not follow the standard model of economic behavior, but a pattern of behavior in which judgment and beliefs override rationality.

Hoff and Stiglitz (2001) provide another example of the role that behavioral issues play in rethinking development policy. They write, *[S]uppose that a person who punishes someone for violating a social norm risks confrontation or revenge but that this risk falls as the proportion of people willing to punish increases. [...This] may cause the individual to believe that other individuals will enforce the norm, and the expectation can be self-fulfilling.” They go on to state, [e]nactment of the law can thus “pull in” private activity rather than “crowding it out” (as occurs in traditional analysis of government provision of public goods). By extension, a state governed by laws that mirror social norms (a “rule of law state”) tends to be one that is hard to corrupt, whereas a state in which law is imposed and enforced from above (the “rule of state law”) tends to be costly, ineffective, and easily corrupted* (page 417). This claim is supported by recent experimental work which indicates that humans have a propensity to

punish free riders, even at some personal cost, and that such a trait can induce cooperative behavior among individuals (Fehr and Gaechter, 2000; Carpenter, 2004a; Carpenter and Matthews, 2005). There is even neurological evidence for this propensity based on economic experiments (de Quervain et al., 2004).

Hoff and Stiglitz (2001) go on to summarize their view of the modern theory of development in terms of three broad factors: behavior, institutions, and “ecology”, the latter referring to a setting where spillover effects among agents are important. This view overlaps with the Smith (2003) concept of ecological rationality.³ Hoff and Stiglitz argue that these factors are important for studying development because they highlight the need for changes in existing models. One primary direction for change is in the application of the economics of information to the role of institutions in determining or constraining economic choices, as summarized in Stiglitz (1989) Stiglitz (1989:27) who summarizing comments that *[M]odels focusing on fully informed rational peasants working within ‘rational’ and efficient institutions are likely to be not only inadequate, but seriously misleading, just as models that simply hypothesize that peasants are rule (tradition)-bound, irrational, and non-economic are almost certainly misleading. Peasants are rational, but they are not fully informed. And imperfect information (as well as a variety of other transaction costs), besides limiting the effective degree of competition, creates institutional rigidities, allowing the persistence of seemingly inefficient institutions.*

Hoff and Stiglitz (2001) also stress that this approach to development means that externalities play a fundamental role. Externalities may be mediated by altering a number of proven behavior determinants such as beliefs, information, search costs, and institutional rules. Because externalities can affect the rewards achieved by agents in strategic interactions, they can also lead to the existence of multiple equilibria, including poverty traps. We contend that many of the factors that regulate the importance of externalities can easily be examined in the laboratory to measure their effects.

Although economic agents remain rational in most economic theories of development, researchers now view human behavior as “socially embedded and mediated by social relations” (Bardhan and Udry, 1999). Further, these authors draw attention to the “systematic cognitive errors and biases in judgment (particularly under uncertainty) that arise in individual decision-making” which can be crucial for the analysis of not only household but also aggregate outcomes and the policies aimed at improving them. Examples of these cognitive issues include the recent theoretical developments in hyperbolic discounting inspired by experimental regularities which change and complicate the standard cost-benefit calculus of policy making (e.g., Benabou and Tirole, 2003 or Harris and Laibson, 2002) or the implications of loss aversion (Kahneman and Tversky, 2000)

³“Ecological rationality uses reason—rational reconstruction—to examine the behavior of individuals based on their experience and folk knowledge, who are “naive” in their ability to apply constructivist tools to the decisions they make; to understand the emergent order in human cultures; to discover the possible intelligence embodied in the rules, norms, and institutions of our cultural and biological heritage that are created from human interactions but not by deliberate human design”. Smith (2003): page 470.

for the compensation of indigenous peoples who tend to lose from development projects with environmental consequences.

Ray (1998) opens his widely used textbook highlighting several arguments that in fact are related to a number of the experimental designs we survey below, including our own. He states, *[T]he story of economic underdevelopment is, in many ways, a story of how informal, imaginative institutions replace the formal constructs we are accustomed to in industrialized economies. The landlord lends to his tenant farmer, accepting labor as collateral, but a formal credit market is missing. Villagers insure each other against idiosyncratic shocks using their greater information and their ability to impose social sanctions, but a formal insurance market is missing. Institutions as diverse as tied labor, credit cooperatives, and extended families can be seen as responses to market failure of some sort, precipitated in most cases by missing information or by the inability of the legal system to swiftly and efficiently enforce contracts.* What experimental data has already offered, we argue, is a set of behavioral and psychological regularities on which one can build theories of why these forms of exchange happen and persist, or why certain institutions and (lack of) information generate the observed outcomes.

1.2 Specific Research Areas Amenable to Experimentation

One need only flip through the pages of the most popular textbooks in development economics to get a sense of the areas where, we believe, experimental economics might offer valuable insights.⁴ Some areas are part of the core of development economics, such as the social losses resulting from externalities and the need for intervention through markets, states, or communities while other areas include more recent topics in development such as the role of norms and networks (a.k.a., social capital). With regard to the core issues, the arguments that Smith (1994) offers as reasons for economists, in general, to conduct experiments apply just as well to the study of development. Experiments are particularly useful for testing theories and exploring the behavioral determinants of failed theories, for looking at empirical regularities as the basis for new theories, for comparing environments and institutions, for evaluating policies, or for designing institutions. These objectives are all fundamental to the study of development.

Considering more recent themes, the burgeoning literature on the role of social capital and community governance as an engine for development has spawned a “retooling” of many standard experiments to measure norms of trust, fairness, reciprocity and cooperation. Even more recently, these experimental tools have been used to understand how norms interact with institutions that are both naturally occurring and artificially implemented.

To be as specific as possible, we think that experiments could be applied

⁴In addition to Ray (1998), see Todaro and Smith (2002), or Chenery and Srinivasan (1988).

to the list of issues collected in Table 1. The typology that we offer is just one possible way of classifying these topics although the list highlights areas of overlap between standard economic experiments and the recent development literature. In the left column are important themes emerging in new theories of economic development, and in the right column we list a set of sub-topics that are currently being studied experimentally, however mostly in university labs in developed countries.

A great share of the work we survey here with applications in developing countries or with development in mind has focused on the first two rows of Table 1 (Preferences & Norms and Social Dilemmas) and to a lesser extent on a few topics which fall under “Biases, Heuristics & Decision Making.” The last row in Table 1 represents the co-evolution of institutions and behavior. This area is particularly ripe because the literature is disperse and not particularly systematic despite its central relevance.

Despite the research holes associated with Table 1, the studies we have identified provide valuable information regarding patterns of behavior in institutions of social exchange that are central to the problem of development. For example, we have found a considerable amount of work examining collective action and the associated problems of cooperation (specifically: prisoners’ dilemmas, voluntary contributions to a public good, and the extraction from a common-pool resource). In addition, there is now plenty of research on situations where other-regarding preferences, trust and reciprocity are critical elements in the likelihood of transactions and the degree of social efficiency achieved.

Another potentially rich research area would be applications of existing experiments to the problems of asymmetric information and contracting which could have applications to the credit, land or labor markets where norms of reciprocity and gift-exchange may affect the outcomes. The work of Ernst Fehr is central here, including a recent paper with John List (Fehr and List, 2004) where the authors recruited Costa Rican CEOs to participate in an experiment that involved a labor contract which relied on trust and potential retaliation.

2 Standard Experiments Conducted in Developing Countries

In this section we briefly review the literature on relatively general economic experiments conducted in developing countries to measure the “social preferences” (e.g., trust, reciprocity, cooperation, fairness), risk preferences and time preferences of the participants. This contrasts with section 3 in which we highlight experiments that have been conducted with some particular development issue in mind. To further organize the review we sort the research by experimental design, categorizing papers as trust-, cooperation-, and fairness-related games under the social preferences heading followed by a discussion of risk and time preference experiments. Tables 2 through 4 contain summary statistics from many of the papers we have discovered.

Although we begin by cataloguing experimental research conducted in developing countries that was not designed to advance economic development, this does not imply that development economists will not learn something from these results. We think that, at a minimum, comparing behavioral propensities across cultures may be particularly interesting when trying to explain the correlation between growth and individual propensities to act prosocially (e.g., the literature discussed in Durlauf, 2002).⁵

There has been a large amount of research recording cooperation within developing countries and comparing this behavior with more developed nations. Three experiments are typically used in this context: the prisoner’s dilemma, the voluntary contribution mechanism, and the common pool resource game. Each game sets up a *social dilemma* for the participants in which one strategy leads to the social optimum while the dominant strategy (or best response function) leads to a socially inefficient outcome. The *prisoner’s dilemma* (PD) is typically conducted as a symmetric two-person game with two strategies: cooperate and defect, where defect strictly dominates cooperate. The *voluntary contribution mechanism* (VCM) allows players to contribute to a public good, despite the dominant strategy of free-riding on the contributions of others, and in this way has the incentive structure of an n-person prisoners’ dilemma. Lastly, in the *common pool resource game* (CPR) players cooperate by not extracting too much from a resource that is accessible to all players but subtractible (i.e., one player’s extraction reduces the benefits accruing to the others).

2.1 Cooperation

We begin by offering summary statistics from Cooper et al. (1996) as a benchmark of PD play in the United States with undergraduates; we then discuss two examples of work done using the PD to measure social propensities. As one can see in Table 2, 22% of participants cooperated in the PD in the U.S. Hemesath and Pomponio (1998) compare the play of Chinese undergraduates with the play of undergraduates from the United States. Their experiment, like Cooper et al., uses the *strangers* treatment in which players are randomly reassigned new partners at the beginning of each of four rounds and they find that Chinese participants cooperate approximately twice as often as their counterparts in the U.S.⁶ The authors conclude that this is evidence that the Chinese are more cooperatively predisposed. The reason, they state, is that Chinese youth are socialized differently than youth in the U.S. In particular, the authors attribute the high rate of cooperation to the fact that the Chinese are more sheltered from markets and note that Chinese students studying in the U.S. were less cooperative than other Chinese students but more cooperative than students

⁵However, we stress that comparisons across experiments should be guarded due to differences in procedures and payoffs. We say more on this point in section 4.

⁶Also notice that Hemesath and Pomponio replicate the cooperation rate found by Cooper et al. in the U.S.

from the U.S.⁷

In a different “spin” on the prisoners’ dilemma, Tyson et al. (1988) find evidence of reverse discrimination among South African participants who are more cooperative towards black counterparts. As listed in Table 2, participants (half from each racial category) cooperate 45% of the time with a black confederate in the repeated PD while only 37% of the time with a white confederate. Correlating play with other factors that suggest motivation, the authors attribute this behavior to paternalism. While these results are interesting, they are slightly less compelling because both studies are conducted only with students. The external validity of the results could be tested by conducting the experiment in the field with participants for whom cooperation is an important dilemma faced each day.

Through some eyes, the VCM is an improved measure of cooperation because it allows players to select from a larger strategy set than the PD and therefore allows participants to choose actions along a finer gradient. In the standard version of the game players have ten experimental dollars that can be contributed to the public good or kept. Here our benchmark comes from Carpenter and Matthews (2002) who report that student players in the U.S. contribute 42% of their endowments, on average, in a standard 10 round VCM game, and 64% when players can punish free riders at some material cost to themselves.⁸

By comparison, Barr (2001) shows that rural communities in Zimbabwe elicit overall contribution rates that are similar to those of students in the U.S. A key difference in the Barr experiment, however, is that the game is paused after three repetitions to allow players to criticize each other. Post-criticism, contributions increase significantly and increase highest among players who were not directly criticized themselves, but witnessed the criticism of other free-riders. Further, Barr and Kinsey (2002) illustrate that contributing and shaming in this culture is a gendered phenomenon. Women cooperate slightly more, men attract more criticism controlling for how badly they free-ride, men are as responsive as women are to criticism, but women are more effective as critics.⁹

Carpenter et al. (2004b) use a VCM game in urban slums in Thailand and Vietnam and report high average contribution rates that actually increase over

⁷Of course this could just be a selection issue. However, Carpenter (2005) demonstrates that key elements of markets (repeated interactions and competition) do affect the social preferences of participants in a bargaining experiment.

⁸Another important factor in contributions that we will not say much about is the productivity of the public good (i.e., how much benefit do contributions generate for the group). In general, despite the dominant strategy to free ride, as the productivity of the public good increases, so do contributions (see Ledyard, 1995). The standard measure of the productivity of the public good is the marginal per capita return from a contribution. In table 2 the experiments conducted by Abigail Barr had a MPCR of 2/5, and all the others had MPCRs equal to 1/2.

⁹The analysis controls for a number of demographic characteristics. The general sense that non-pecuniary sanctions increase contributions has recently been documented with western students too. In France and the U.S., Masclet et al. (2003) show that non-monetary sanctions have a positive and significant effect on contributions, despite inflicting no material harm on the target.

the initial five rounds of the baseline treatment in both countries. In addition, like Barr (2001), Carpenter et al. show that a form of social sanctioning further increases contributions from 72% in Vietnam to 76%, and from 61% to 73% in Thailand, on average. With reference to the Hemesath and Pomponio (1998) PD study, Carpenter et al. (2004a) find higher initial contribution rates in Vietnam than in Thailand, which might be due to the collectivist culture advanced by the governments of China and Vietnam compared to the individualism reinforced in the United States and Thailand.¹⁰

Ensminger (2000) reports playing the VCM (along with the trust, dictator, and ultimatum games) with the Orma who are nomadic cattle herders in Northeast Kenya. Participants quickly understood the incentives of the VCM and nicknamed it ‘harambee’ which refers to contributing to community projects in Swahili. The overall contribution rate of the Orma was 58% which is on the high side of the range typically seen in the industrialized West. Ensminger suggests that the high contribution rate might be accounted for by the fact that sharing among these nomads is institutionalized within tribes and taken very seriously.

In Eastern Europe, Gaechter et al. (2004) conducted a one-shot VCM in the field with 630 Russian and Byelorussian participants to try to understand the demographic and sociological determinants of cooperation in these developing economies. Although their regression analysis turns up little in terms of demographic correlates, what is interesting is the differences they find between student and non-student behavior. In a nutshell, students appear to provide us with the lower bound of trust and cooperation because non-students both contributed more and had more trusting attitudes.

Henrich and Smith (2004) report similar VCM games played by the Machiguenga of the Peruvian part of Amazonia and the Mapuche agriculturalists of southern Chile. Although the sample sizes are small, the Machiguenga are very uncooperative and the Mapuche appear less cooperative than their neighbors the Huinca who are descendants of the Spanish colonizers. Henrich and Smith suggest that this uncooperativeness of the Machiguenga and Mapuche is a reflection of their culture which can be described as fragmented; households are largely independent and therefore cooperation among strangers is as uncommon in real life as it is in the VCM.

Lastly, Karlan (2004) conducts a threshold public goods game with members of a local credit association in Peru. In this game, players are given a coin that represents a third of a days wages and allowed to contribute the coin to a public good. If at least 80% of the people contribute the public good is provided and everyone is paid two coins. Karlan’s data reveal very high contribution levels: 81% of people cooperate, but it is not clear that his participants are more cooperative than participants in other cultures because his experiment is different than the others. Changing the rules by adding a provision point adds

¹⁰In fact, Kachelmeier and Shehata (1992) show that behavior in market experiments with very asymmetric equilibrium payoffs converges to the competitive equilibrium slower in China than in the U.S. The authors attribute this result to differences in competitiveness across the two cultures.

equilibria in which there are just enough contributions to provide the public good.

Finally, field work in the CPR game was pioneered in Cardenas et al. (2000) who examined how people in Colombia, who actually face extraction decisions on a daily basis, react in the experiment. Extraction levels hover just below the symmetric Nash equilibrium prediction, indicating that participants extract slightly less than selfish maximizers should, but not much less than Colombian students playing a similar game (see Cardenas and Carpenter, 2004). What is particularly interesting is the fact that after eight rounds, the researchers change the rules by allowing half the groups to communicate before another eight rounds, while the other half faced external regulation of their extraction levels. External regulation works very well early on, but over time regulation crowds out the other-regardingness of participants and payoffs soon fall below those of the groups who successfully reduce extraction through “cheap talk.” This result is important because it indicates that external regulators can actually make CPR situations worse by crowding out evolved prosocial norms that have already led to effective self-regulating schemes.

In two additional variations on the standard CPR game, Cardenas et al. (2002) and Cardenas (2003b), Cardenas and his coauthors find that induced asymmetries in the payoff matrices used to model the CPR have a significant effect on the behavior of rural participants. Those with better outside options put less pressure on the resource, but still extract more as a fraction of their Nash extraction level than the relatively poorer participants who have less attractive outside options. However, as in the first CPR game, communication attenuates the extraction problem even though, in theory, it is cheap talk.

2.2 Trust and Reciprocity

In the Berg et al. (1995) investment or “trust” game (TG), both a first-mover and a second-mover are allocated an amount of money as a show-up fee. This amount is typically around ten dollars. The first-mover is then given the chance to send as much of her endowment to an anonymous second-mover as she wishes. The experimenter triples the amount of money sent before it reaches the second-mover; hence sending money is potentially socially efficient. The second-mover is then allowed to send back as much money as he wishes.¹¹

The subgame perfect prediction is straight-forward. The second-mover has no incentive to send any money back and therefore, realizing this, the first-mover should not invest anything in the partnership. This is a social dilemma, however, because the players can jointly do much better if money is sent, because the experimenter triples any transfers. Despite the subgame perfect prediction, Table 3 shows that Berg et al. (1995) find that first-movers send an average of half of their endowment and second-movers return 30% of what they receive, on

¹¹This is how Berg et al. ran the game, but other variations have been seen. For example, Glaeser et al. (2000) do not give an endowment to the second-mover and double, rather than triple, the transfer. Bolle (1998) also doubles the transfer, but makes the first-mover's decision all or nothing.

average. While this is significantly different than the game theoretic prediction, sending money is still a bad investment for first-movers because, on average, they recover only 90% of what they send. In a replication at an institution with a significantly smaller and more homogenous student population, however, Burks et al. (2003) find that investing pays off. Students send 65% of their endowment and return 40% of what they receive which translates into a 31% return on investment for first-movers, on average.

There have been a number of replications of this game with students in developing and transitioning countries (see Table 3). A few of these studies also run their own U.S. baseline experiments to control for protocol and experimenter effects. Ashraf et al. (2003) play a version of the TG with students in the U.S., Russia and South Africa. The U.S. replication of Berg et al. results in worse outcomes from a social efficiency point of view. Only 41% of the endowment is transferred by first-movers in the U.S. and only 23% of the amount received by second-movers is sent back.¹² These results are similar to what they find in Russia and South Africa. In each case, it does not appear that trusting pays off.

By contrast, Buchan et al. (2003) find more trusting behavior among students in east Asia. Their U.S. replication generates data that is similar to the Burks et al. data; however their students are slightly more trustworthy. Outside the U.S., the Chinese appear to be the most trusting, sending an average of 73% of their endowments as first-movers. In general, the amount sent (73% in China, 68% in Japan, 64% in South Korea) exceeds what is seen in many U.S. experiments.¹³ The authors have no explanation for the slight differences between countries, but do point out that the results are contrary to many of the current theories about cross-national differences in trust including Fukuyama (1995) who believes that the U.S. and Japan have high levels of generalized trust compared to South Korea and China. Perhaps the more interesting fact is that trusting pays well in Asia where first-movers receive around 50% on their investments.

In a slightly more exotic location, Holm and Danielson (2005) conduct TGs in Tanzania with students at the University of Dar es Salaam in addition to Swedish control experiments. In many respects, this paper is an African and Swedish replication of Glaeser et al. (2000). The authors conduct a survey of demographic factors and behavioral factors to correlate with behavior in the TG. The Tanzanian students send an average of 53% of their endowment, which is close to the original study of Berg et al. and to their Swedish replication (51%). In fact, the Swedish and Tanzanian amounts sent are not statistically different. On average, Tanzanian students return 37% of what they receive and Swedes

¹²This, however, may be the result of having participants play a number of games in addition to the TG. Burks et al. (2003) show that, with prior knowledge, having players respond to both roles reduces TG first-mover transfers from 65% to 47% and reduces the amount sent back from 40% to 14%. A number of participants said they felt less responsible for the payoff of their partner when this person had multiple ways to make money. The authors call this the "Reduced Responsibility" hypothesis.

¹³However, only the Chinese send significantly more than their U.S. counterparts ($p < 0.10$).

return 35% which results in a positive expected return for first-movers. In Tanzania they also find that none of the survey factors predict behavior in either role of the experiment. These results run contrary to Glaeser et al. who find that questions about specific trusting situations and past trusting do predict behavior. However, the survey does have some predictive power in Sweden. Specifically, an index of trusting behavior based on three questions¹⁴ predicts the amount sent and the amount returned, and the standard GSS trust question, “Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted/you can’t be too careful in dealing with people.” predicts how much is sent back. Lastly, Danielson and Holm show that altruistic behavior in the dictator game predicts trustworthiness in both locations indicating that first-mover behavior in the TG might be confounded by altruism.

The last two student games we consider are Koford (2001), who conducted the TG in Bulgaria and Lazzarini et al. (2004) who conduct the TG in Brazil. In his replication of Berg et al., Koford’s participants send significantly more and reciprocate significantly more than in the original paper, but exhibit behavior that is almost identical to that described above in Burks et al. Students at Sofia University and Varna University behave similarly to students at Middlebury College. This result (as well as the Russian data from Ashraf et al., 2003 and Wilson and Bahry, 2002) is interesting given that one might expect low levels of trust in transition countries because of a history of oppression and/or because of the vacuum left by the collapsed state.

In Brazil, Lazzarini et al conduct a number of treatments including what they call a *single-blind* game in which participants know whom they are paired with, their *double-blind* game similar to the standard TG, and an *envelope-drop* game in which participants allow the experimenters to place some of their earnings in a stamped, addressed envelope that they then drop somewhere in town to see if it will be returned. Considering only the game that resembles the other experiments we have discussed, first-movers transfer 56% of their endowment, but end up losing 20% of this investment (on average) because second-movers only return 34% of the *doubled* amount that they receive.

We also found a number of recent experiments conducted in developing countries that do not use students as participants. Barr (1999b) and Barr (2003b) are good examples. Barr visited twenty-four villages in Zimbabwe to play TGs with two subject populations that have been sorted into two treatments by government policy in the 1980s. The government resettled many villages shortly after independence was granted in 1982. While the overall level of trust is in line with many of the other experiments, perhaps the most interesting result is that trust is higher in the traditional villages than in the resettled villages, however it is hard to tell whether this is a result of resettlement or selection into resettled villages by more risk-averse families who trust less.

Moving south, Carter and Castillo (2002) play the TG with 283 villagers in

¹⁴“Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful/are mostly looking out for themselves;” “Do you think that most people try to be fair/take advantage of you if they get the chance;” “Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted/you can’t be too careful in dealing with people.”

14 communities in South Africa. They find that participants send an average of 53% of their endowment and receive 38% in return. The implied return ratio at the average is 1.14, indicating that trusting pays in South Africa. Also in South Africa, Burns (2004) conducts the TG with high school children to examine mistrust among ethnic groups. Overall, she finds very low levels of trust (33% sent, on average) and trustworthiness (23% returned, on average). Additionally, her data reveal a systematic pattern of distrust toward back second movers. Moving north, Danielson and Holm (2003) show that members of a Tanzanian church send slightly more than the South Africans (56%) and are more trustworthy returning 46% of what they are sent.

Moving across the border and into the bush, Ensminger (2000) finds that Orma herders trust rather little, sending only 44% of their endowment, and are the least reciprocal people among the sample we found, returning only 18% of what they receive. Ensminger remarks that this result is puzzling given the fact that the Orma have strict rules about food sharing. Also in Kenya, in the slums of Nairobi, Greig and Bohnet (2004) report the lowest level of trust that we have found. First movers send only 30% of their endowment getting only 41% of the doubled amount back.¹⁵ This translates in to a -18% rate of return, on average. Our last stop in Africa is Uganda where Mosley and Verschoor (2003) report the trust behavior of 134 eastern villagers. Like the Orma, these villagers send slightly less than half their endowment (49%) and return only a third of the total they receive. As a result, first-movers break even, on average.

Karlan (2004) plays the TG (in addition to the provision point VCM) with people in Ayacucho, Peru. His experiment indicates that Peruvian villagers send 46% of their endowment, which is close to the average of the behavior we have surveyed, but are on the high side with respect to trustworthiness, sending back 43% of what is received. This result may also be driven by selection because all the participants are members of a group credit association and therefore might be more trustworthy than the average citizen (at least one would hope). In any case, trusting pays in the group; at the average, first-movers make 12% on their investment in less than a few hours.

Elsewhere in Latin America, Castillo and Carter (2003) play the TG with Honduran villagers. What is noteworthy about this experiment is that the authors gather a very large sample ($n=389$), especially considering the game is played in the field where recruitment is usually more difficult. Castillo and Carter calculate that the average fraction of the endowment (equivalent to two days wage) sent to the second-mover is 49% and, on average, second-movers send back 42% which translates into a 26% return on investment for the first-movers. In nearby Paraguay, Schechter (2004) conducts the TG and a risky lottery game with rural villagers to disentangle trust from risk-taking. As mentioned above, many have noted that altruists might send money in the TG with no expectation of getting anything in return, but it might also be the case that thrill seekers send money in the TG because they enjoy taking risks. In addition to the TG, Schechter asks participants to bet on the roll of a die in a gamble with

¹⁵In this case the amount sent was doubled not tripled before it got to the second party.

positive expected return (one should expect to earn 25 cents for each dollar gambled). The more one bets, the more risk-seeking they are. She shows that risk-taking predicts first-mover behavior indicating that part of what is typically attributed to trust in the TG is actually risk-seeking. Finally, Fehr and List (2004) recruited 126 undergraduate students and 76 CEOs from the coffee agro-industrial sector in Costa Rica and find that the CEOs sent and sent back more than the student control group.

In rural Bangladesh, Johansson-Stenman et al. (2004) measure trust using surveys and experiments. In the experiment they find that their non-student participants transfer an average of 46% of their endowment in each direction. First-movers send 46% to second-movers and second-movers return 46% of the total they receive, on average. The relatively high amount sent back assures that most first-movers earned money by trusting; the average rate of return was 38%. When comparing surveyed trust and behavior in the experiment, the authors find that there is a positive association between one's answer to whether "most people can be trusted" and the amount that first-movers send, but the association is twice as high when one looks at the relationship between surveyed trust and trustworthiness in the experiment.

Lastly, Wilson and Bahry (2002) conduct the TG in two remote parts of Russia, Tartarstan and Sakha, because these regions are characterized by strong independence movements and therefore may be sites of inter-ethnic unrest between locals and ethnically Russian settlers. The idea was to use the TG to measure this unrest. On average, 51% of the endowment was transferred to the second-mover. The amount was a little higher in Sakha and a little lower in Tartarstan. The average fraction returned was 38%, which means that trusting should have paid off for many participants. The nationality of the first-mover does not affect the amount sent, and therefore there is little correlation between trust and obvious evidence of ethnic differences.

Figure 1 summarizes our survey of trust game behavior. We separate the data between student experiments and non-student experiments and graph the average fraction sent versus the average rate of return for first-movers. The first two letters indicate the country in which the experiment was conducted and the name in parentheses indicates the first author of the study. In general, we see that the collection of studies indicates that there is an upward sloping relationship between trust and reciprocity suggesting the possibility of multiple trust-trustworthiness equilibria. At one extreme, the South African students in the Ashraf et al. study do not send very much as the first-mover and return significantly less than what is sent to them as second-movers. At the other extreme, the South Korean students in the Buchan et al. study send a lot and send back half of what they receive, on average.

Comparing laboratory experiments with students and field experiments with non-students, one notices that, without the Kenyan outlier, the non-students seem to demonstrate more trustworthiness. Indeed, the simple regression of the rate of return on the fraction sent, a student dummy, and the interaction of the two shows that the student intercept is significantly lower ($p < 0.05$) and the student gradient is steeper ($p < 0.10$). This seems to indicate (as noted in Russia

by Gaechter et al., 2004) that student trust experiments should be seen as lower bounds on prosocial behavior.

Perhaps the biggest difference is between the student data collected by Ashraf et al. and the non-student data collected by Carter and Castillo which use nearly identical protocols. In this case, non-students send approximately 10% more and yield approximately 90% more in return. This pattern is repeated to a lesser degree in Russia (compare the Ashraf et al. student data to the Wilson and Bahry non-student data) and Tanzania (compare the two Danielson and Holm data points). While these differences seem to suggest that students tend to be less trusting and less trustworthy than non-students, differences in protocols could explain part of these differences, especially when one considers the variation we see in behavior from U.S. students.

A number of these trust studies (Ashraf et al., 2003; Burns, 2004; Carter and Castillo, 2002; and Holm and Danielson, 2005) also control for the fact that in the TG trust may be confounded by altruism. That is, people may send money in the TG as much because they are altruistic and expect no return as because they trust the second-mover to share the larger pie. Cox (2004) offers a clever way to control for the altruism of players in the TG, and each of these other experiments adopt his methodology to one degree or another. Along with the standard game, participants also play what is called a *Dictator Game* (DG) in which one player, the dictator, is given an amount of money that she can share with a second player. The game is anonymous, so player one should feel no direct social pressure to transfer any money and selfish maximizers will surely not, but altruists will send an amount and the amount will depend on how altruistic they feel towards player two (e.g., Eckel and Grossman, 1996 or Branas-Garza, 2003). Regressing trust and trustworthiness on transfers in the DG allow us to control for the altruistic intentions of players in the TG.

Ashraf et al. (2003) show that altruism is significantly correlated with both trust and trustworthiness, and that any small differences that exist between Russian, American and South African students vanish when one controls for altruism. Likewise, Carter and Castillo (2002) show that behavior in the DG predicts both trustor and the trustee behavior, but they also note that because expectations of what the second-mover will return are also significant, altruism is not the only motive behind sending money.¹⁶ In their Honduran data, Castillo and Carter (2003) do not regress TG decisions on DG decisions but do note that transfers in the DG are correlated with TG play in both roles at the 10% level or better. Last, Holm and Danielson (2005) only find that dictator choices correlate with second-mover behavior. Their first-movers seem to not be motivated by altruism.

2.3 Fairness and Altruism

There are two games that have been used to measure fairness norms in different societies. One game, the Dictator Game, was defined in the previous section.

¹⁶Ashraf et al. (2003) also find this result.

The second game is the Ultimatum Game or UG. In the *Ultimatum Game* two players are provisionally allocated a pie to split. The first-mover (proposer) offers a share to the second-mover (responder) who accepts or rejects the offer. Accepted propositions are implemented by the experimenter and rejected offers result in the pie being taken back and both players receiving nothing. Any division is a Nash equilibrium because a strategy for the responder is a rejection threshold (i.e., proposers could not deviate down and do better when paired with a responder who's lowest acceptable offer is just being met). There is only one subgame perfect equilibrium, however. No responder will choose a rejection threshold larger than zero, because she could do better by accepting lower offers. That is, rejecting is an empty threat. Knowing this, proposers need not offer more than some small amount. This game has been played hundreds of times in developed countries and while there is some variation in behavior across countries (see Roth et al., 1991), most behavior deviates from the subgame perfect equilibrium in systematic ways. Most proposers offer half the pie for two reasons: either they are fair-minded or they fear smaller offers will be rejected, and many responders do, indeed, reject small offers.

Recently the UG and DG have been played at substantial stakes in a number of places outside the industrialized west. Behavior in the UG and DG is summarized in Table 4. To establish benchmarks however, we will first consider the Carpenter et al. (2005) games run with \$100 pies using students and workers at a Midwestern distribution center as participants. Behavior among students and workers is similar in the UG but much different in the DG. UG offers average 41% of the pie in the student games and 45% in the worker games while the rejection rates are 5% among students and 7% among workers. In the DG, students offer 25% of the pie, on average, while worker behavior is the same as in the UG; workers offer 45% of the pie in the DG too. Much of this difference is attributed to the difference in social framing between the classroom and the shop floor; in this case the workplace seems to elicit more altruistic feelings between players.

Beginning with the UG, Cameron (1999) conducted experiments with students in Indonesia in which the pie was approximately three months average expenditures. The results are very similar to what we have already seen, on average, 42% of the pie is offered and the rejection rate was 10%. Using her own controls, Cameron shows that there is no difference in proposer behavior between the low stakes game and the high stakes game, however responders are sensitive to stakes. Responders are more likely to accept as the stakes increase.

Gowdy et al. (2003) study the behavior of Nigerian villagers in both the UG and the DG. Their UG data is similar to that found in other areas of Africa (see below) in that most people offer half and there was only 1 rejection in 73 instances. The authors note that fairness and sharing were the primary motives stated by the first-movers in post experiment debriefings.

Henrich et al. (2001) summarize the results of an ambitious collection of UG data from 15 different undeveloped societies. For our purposes, it is interesting to note that, using the standard one-shot protocol, variation in first mover behavior only comes from an analysis of very diverse cultures. At one

extreme, proposer behavior comes closest to the theoretical prediction among the Machiguenga slash and burn horticulturalists in Peru. Here proposers offer an average of 26% of the pie and almost no one rejects. At the other extreme, the Lamelara whale fishermen of Indonesia offer more than half the pie, 58% on average. Henrich et al. attribute the variation in behavior to two sources: the payoffs to cooperating in the participants' daily lives and the degree to which the participants rely on market exchange in their daily lives. Together, these two variables capture 68% of the variation in proposer behavior. The idea is that cooperative work norms are measured by proposals such that the relatively isolated Machiguenga offer little because they are mostly self-sufficient while catching a whale in Indonesia requires team work. Additionally, those populations that interact frequently with strangers in markets offer more because they are accustomed to dealing cooperatively with strangers. These results are important because they link behavior to institutions that are relevant for economic development.¹⁷ A second round of the 15 small-scale societies project is currently underway, including a few new sites that provide greater variation in the degree of integration to the market. The focus of this round is standardized protocol of Dictator, Ultimatum and Third Party Punishment games.¹⁸

As mentioned above, there are two reasons to be "fair" in the UG. The DG controls for one of these and therefore allows us to focus attention on the other. Because second-movers in the DG have no say in the distribution of the pie, they get whatever they are given, dictators need not be fair out of a fear of having their offers rejected. Hence, the DG measures true "fairness" or altruism in a population. A number of the experiments already mentioned have DG components which are interesting on their own.

The student data in Ashraf et al. (2003) look very similar to the student data in Carpenter et al. (2005) indicating that little cultural difference in altruism exists between college students in the U.S., Russia, and South Africa. Holm and Danielson (2005) replicate transfers of about a quarter of the pie using Tanzanian students. The procedure in Cardenas and Carpenter (2004) is different because students earn their endowment in a first stage CPR experiment and then are asked to donate any amount to a conservation charity (the protocol is similar to Eckel and Grossman (1996)). While there are confounds that preclude comparing the Cardenas and Carpenter data with other DGs (e.g., the possible endowment effect of earning the money and the fact that the recipient is a charity), it is interesting to compare Colombian students to American students. As table 4 illustrates, Colombians donate less than Americans. In addition, Cardenas and Carpenter find that Colombians disproportionately give to a local charity and Americans give more to a globally-minded charity, indicating Colombians focus their altruism locally compared to Americans.

¹⁷It is also interesting that the Indonesian students of Cameron's study were less fair than the Indonesian fisherman reported in Henrich et al. That is, markets may not be a panacea – forcing strangers to interact cooperatively may support prosocial sharing and fairness norms, but competition may also degrade these norms. See Carpenter (2005) for evidence supporting this view.

¹⁸See more at: <http://www.hss.caltech.edu/roots-of-sociality>.

It is, however, interesting to compare the Gowdy et al. (2003) study of Nigerian villagers to the Carpenter et al. (2005) study of distribution center workers because both protocols include the UG and the DG, the experiments seem to have been conducted similarly, and the games are played with non-students. In both cases, the UG distributions are not significantly different than the DG distributions indicating that UG proposals in these two circumstances are motivated by fairness or altruism and not strategy. Triangulating this comparison with the Carpenter et al. student data provides us with more evidence that the behavior we see in the lab with students should be considered as a lower bound of prosocial tendencies in a population because students tend to behave more strategically than “normal” people.

The highest DG allocations are found among non-students in South Africa. Carter and Castillo (2002) find average transfers of 42% which is close to the level seen in Carpenter et al. (2005). In Castillo and Carter (2003), this pair of researchers reports an average transfer of 42% among villagers in Honduras. However, this experiment is noticeably different from the other DGs because any money sent to the recipient was tripled, which means the cost of transferring money for an altruist was a third of what it is in the standard game. Ensminger (2000) also reports on DGs in Kenya. The average amount transferred to the recipient here is 31%, which is also larger than within student populations. Interestingly, the three DGs conducted with non-students have average allocations that are considerable higher indicating the relationship between social framing and generosity might generalize across cultures.

2.4 Risk and Time Preferences

An old fable in the development literature can be paraphrased as follows: people in underdeveloped countries are poor partially because they have preferences that are inconsistent with growth. They have high discount rates and are risk averse enough so that it is impossible for them to save and take the risks necessary to begin to accumulate capital. One of the earliest expressions of this viewpoint comes from Irving Fisher who wrote, [A] *small income, other things being equal, tends to produce a high rate of impatience, partly from the thought that provision for the present is necessary both for the present itself and for the future as well, and partly from lack of foresight and self-control* Fisher (1930:73).¹⁹ In his innovative field study, Binswanger (1980) also noted that risk preference differences are important because policy makers can do something about hindrances to the access of capital, but can do little about the risk attitudes of those whom capital would help. In this subsection we consider some of the evidence on this topic and catalogue the experiments that have been done to measure the risk and time preferences of people in developing countries.

Risk experiments fall into two classes which essentially differ only in the way that participants register their choices. The top of Table 5 lists the risk aversion

¹⁹More recently this fable has been discussed in Lawrance (1991), Moseley (2001), Neilsen (2001), and Ogaki and Atkeson (1977).

studies we consider. One class is based on what we call the *Accept/Reject Lotteries* experiment. The most important methodological contribution in this class is Holt and Laury (2002). In this experiment, participants are presented two columns of pair-wise lottery choices and they must accept one lottery per line and reject the other. Initially, the first column dominates the second in terms of expected payoff and variance in the payoffs, but eventually, as the probability of the high outcome in the second column increases, the expected value of the second column starts to dominate. This means that the interesting statistic in this experiment is the point at which participants switch from the first column to the second. A risk neutral person, who only needs to calculate the expected value of each lottery, will switch after four choices of the first column. Those who are more risk averse will choose the first column longer than those who are more risk seeking. Because this experiment forces participants to choose between two discrete options, their preferences can only be estimated on an interval.²⁰ On average, Holt and Laury find that student participants exhibit levels of constant relative risk aversion between 0.68 and 0.97 when they ratchet up the size of the possible payouts which, in the context of the lotteries offered, is very risk averse behavior.²¹

The second class of risk experiments is what we refer to as the *Choose Lottery* experiment in which participants are also presented a series of lotteries, but in this case they are asked to pick one from a list which controls for the probability of winning a large prize (i.e., they are all determined by the toss of a coin) but varies the high and low payouts and, in doing so, the expected payoff. Depending on how risk averse a participant is, he should trade off expected return for less variability. Binswanger (1980) was the first to conduct this sort of risk analysis and what is at least as interesting as his protocol is the fact that he conducted his experiment in rural India with peasant farmers. While, he does hypothesize that increases in wealth will be associated with lower risk aversion (remember the fable) this result is not borne out in the regression analysis. For our purposes, what is interesting is that, despite the differences in the protocols, Binswanger's average estimate of constant relative risk aversion fits within the bounds of the estimate calculated by Holt and Laury. This comparison does not support the fable.

However, before we conclude that the risk component of the fable is not true, we should discuss the other evidence that we have found in the literature. We start the review by looking for cross-country variation in the risk attitudes of students within the industrialized world. Jimenez (2003) conducts a slight variation of the Holt and Laury (2002) experiment with Spanish students. Overall, she finds bounds on the coefficient of risk aversion that are very similar to the original study conducted in the U.S. ($0.40 < CRRA < 1.25$) which strengthens

²⁰Actually, there is one problem with this design. The authors focus on the number of "safe" or first column choices because there are a small but not vanishingly small number of participants who flip back and forth between columns.

²¹Holt and Laury (2002) actually vary the stakes of the experiment in a number of treatments but we focus on the results of the highest stakes game because all the field studies we will consider are conducted at relatively high stakes.

the use of Holt and Laury as a benchmark of the industrialized world. This experiment is also interesting because Jimenez collects demographic data from her participants and asks whether the children of olive farmers are more or less risk averse than other children. This question is important because the families which the students come from tend to operate small scale olive farms and therefore the analysis relates to our fable about peasant farmers being more risk averse than large corporate farmers. In fact, she finds no significant difference between the two groups of children.

In addition to the Binswanger study, we can discuss two other risk aversion experiments that were conducted in the developing world. In a two-stage experiment, Barr (2003a) uses the Binswanger protocol to elicit risk attitudes from villagers in Zimbabwe. In both stages participants choose a risky lottery but the second stage differs from the first because Barr allows participants to pool their risk by sharing the total gains from the group equally. While it is interesting that she finds that when participants have to publicly break their promises to the group, fewer people join groups but when participants are not allowed to back out of commitments to their groups, more people join groups, we focus on the risk measures she gathers in the first stage of the game. Barr finds that the average level of risk aversion is between 0.32 and 0.81 which matches with the earlier estimate from India of Binswanger and fits precisely within the estimates of our two student experiments from industrialized countries.

Neilsen (2001) also conducts a lottery choice risk experiment in the field. Many of his participants are slash and burn horticulturalists from Madagascar. The participants choose one of six high stakes lotteries (the stakes averaged eight times the daily wage) with implied CRRA values between 0 and 1. Compared to the other experiments we have discussed, the participants from Madagascar exhibit rather low levels of risk aversion (mean CRRA=0.32) but his econometric analysis indicates that wealthy villagers exhibit more risk aversion and people who live in areas where deforestation is particularly extreme exhibit less risk aversion. The first finding is contrary to most models of concave expected utility and the author offers no intuition for the second result other than the fact that his risk aversion measures are strongly correlated with discount rate data he also collects (see below).

Comparing the risk aversion results from the experiments that are roughly comparable (Holt and Laury, Binswanger, Barr, Jimenez, and Nielsen) will give us an idea of whether there are differences between people in developed countries and those in developing countries. As one can see, there is not a lot of variation in the results and where there is variation, it is not explained by development. In fact, the upper bounds on the Holt and Laury and Jimenez data are larger than the mean values found in the developing world. Overall, there does not appear to be much support for the idea that poor people in lower developed countries are more risk averse than richer people in more developed countries.

Before we conclude our discussion of risk aversion, we point out two other studies that do not fit neatly into our two categories of risk experiments. First, Barr and Packard (2000) adopt the Schubert and et al. (1999) method for measuring the risk preferences of Chilean adults who are either employed or

are self-employed to determine if the self-employed are less risk averse. In this experiment participants are presented with a choice between a binary lottery or a certain payoff. The experimenters would gradually increase the value of the certain payoff until each participant flipped from the lottery to the certain payoff to elicit each participant's *certainty equivalent*.²² Those people with lower certainty equivalents were more risk averse than those who required more money to avoid the gamble. The authors find that, overall, the self-employed are not more risk-seeking, but that self-employed contributors to the Chilean pension system are significantly less risk averse than either the people who are self-employed but do not contribute to the pension system or the people who contribute but work for someone else.

Second, Schechter (2005) has people in rural Paraguay bet on the roll of a die to test their attitudes towards risk. There is a one-sixth chance that a person will lose her entire bet, a one-sixth chance that she will lose half her bet, a one-sixth chance she will break even, a one-sixth chance she will gain 50% on her bet, a one-sixth chance she will double her bet, and a one-sixth chance she will increase her bet by two and a half times. Because the expected net return is positive, risk neutral players should bet their endowments, but the outcome might not be enough for a sufficiently risk averse person to bet much. Perhaps because the protocol is sufficiently different, Schechter finds rather high levels of risk aversion (the average CRRA was 2.57). Additionally, she finds that risk-seeking is concave in age, that women are more risk averse, but she does not find any relationship between education attainment, wealth or past experiences with theft and her risk measure. Again, given the correlation between income and betting behavior is insignificant, we suspect that the high levels of CRRA reported in this paper are due to framing or protocol differences and not due to the fact that the participants are from the developing world.

The bottom of table 5 lists the experiments on time preferences that we will consider.²³ Even more so that with risk, time preference experiments come in many shapes and sizes. Not only is it difficult to compare different studies because of slight (or major) differences in their protocols, there are other issues that confound the comparison of time preference data. First, the reported discount rates are very sensitive to how interval choices are interpreted. For example, most studies use exponential discounting, but Kirby et al. (2002) decide that hyperbolic discounting is more relevant. Further, even if researchers stick to exponential discounting, the number of times that interest is assumed to be compounded per year (obviously) affects the implied discount rate although this assumption is rarely mentioned. Second, many of these experiments are confounded by the credibility of the researcher. In most experiments participants are paid on the spot, but by their very nature, time preference experiments must often ask people to wait for their payments. Normally the researchers are

²²Henrich and McElreath (2002) also conduct a certainty equivalent field experiment in Chile and Tanzania and find values similar to Barr and Packard (2000).

²³Our list is not exhaustive. For those interested in a survey of the time preferences literature that includes methods, surveys, and experiments conducted in developed countries see Frederick et al. (2002).

strangers to the participants and therefore, the experimental data may be biased towards higher discount rates because the participants have two reasons, a preference for the present and not trusting the experimenter, for choosing a payment today versus a promised payment in the future. Third, the delays between payments vary with each study which adds one more factor to be controlled for in any analysis.

As our developed country benchmarks, we will consider the estimates of individual discount rates (IDRs) gathered by Collier and Williams (1999) and Harrison et al. (2002). The nice thing about these estimates is that the experimenters have learned from the past and conduct their experiments carefully. For example, to control (at least partially) for the credibility problem of many experiments, these two papers employ, *front end delays* which simply means that there is no promise of money today. Instead, people choose, for example, between money tomorrow and more money in a week. If participants think there is some chance that the experimenters will welch on promises to pay in the future, they should not expect for them to be more likely to welch on a payment one week from today than on one that is due tomorrow. Because of the asymmetry of their data, Collier and Williams (1999) report median IDRs between 17% and 20% using student data while Harrison et al. (2002), using data from a large sample of Danes, report mean overall IDRs that control for many demographic factors of 28% which should be seen as a lower bound because the mean IDR of Danish students is 34%.

Along with their risk aversion experiment, Barr and Packard (2000) gather IDRs using a hypothetical questionnaire. To avoid the problem of interval estimates, Barr and Truman ask participants a series of questions starting with a baseline tradeoff between an amount now and some future amount that is meant to get the participant to wait. If the participant does wait, the researcher asks how much the participant would need to receive now to be indifferent. The mean IDR reported in this study is 43% which, is in the ballpark of the other estimates. In their fuller analysis, Barr and Truman go on to show that only income is marginally significantly associated with discount rates ($p < 0.10$). Specifically, those with larger incomes do appear more patient.

In their experiment, Kirby et al. (2002) go deeper into the field than most to gather data on the time preferences of Tsimane' horticulturalists of the Bolivian rainforest. The Tsimane' are interesting because they have little contact with western culture and institutions (e.g., credit markets) and therefore allow the authors to study the time preferences of a group in a more naive setting. Kirby et al. report median discount rates from their paid experiment of 12% which seem a little low compared to our other estimates, but this estimate is based on a hyperbolic discount function, $PV = A/(1 + kD)$ where A is the monetary prize, k is the discount rate and D is the delay in days. The equivalent interest rate using the more standard exponential discounting (assuming interest is compounded quarterly) yields an interest rate over 1000%.²⁴ Setting aside this problem, the authors show that discount rates are correlated with age (posi-

²⁴Furthermore, the lowest exponential discount rate a participant could choose was 14%.

tively), education (negatively), and income (negatively), but that they are not correlated significantly with wealth which clouds our test of the development fable more than it sheds light on it.

In addition to collecting risk attitude data on Madagascar, Neilsen (2001) also collects discount rate data using a mechanism that is similar to his risk experiment in which participants chose a hypothetical trade off between a current amount and a future amount. As with the Kirby et al. (2002) experiment, one problem with the Neilsen options is that the lowest IDR interval is between 0 and 20%. Another problem is that the intervals are so wide that little precision can be expected. Despite these shortcomings, Neilsen's data reveal a mean IDR of 117% which, if taken at face value, indicates that his participants discount future outcomes very heavily. While this result is hard to accept, looking as we did with the Kirby et al data at the variance in responses, reveals an interesting fact. Regressing discount rates on demographics, Neilsen finds that people who report living in areas in which a lot of deforestation has occurred have significantly higher discount rates.

The last discount rate experiment we will review is the careful study of Pender (1996) who conducts discount rate experiments in the same Indian villages that Binswanger (1980) conducted his risk aversion study. His experiment is particularly careful because it included front end delays to control for the credibility of the experimenters. Pender offered participants eight or ten binary choices between 10kg of rice now or a larger amount of rice in the future. The delay is always the same (7 months) but the amount of future rice increases from 9kg to 20kg. Pender reports that discount rates are somewhat dependent on the framing of the experiment, but are never below 50% which also indicates substantial discounting.

The value of time preference data is more questionable than the other data we have considered because protocols are so different and the variation in behavior is so great. In their review of much of the discounting literature that has used participants from the developing world, Frederick et al. (2002) plot the reported mean IDRs from 42 different experiments (including a few of the ones we have reviewed) against the date of their publication to make three important points that resonate in our review. First, the range of elicited discount rates considered by Frederick et al. is between -6% and infinity and it is between 17% and over 1000% in our review indicating a large role for framing and protocol effects. Second, there appears to be no convergence in the estimates of discount rates. According to Frederick et al. the variation in estimates is just as high in 2002 as it was in 1980. Based on this evidence, it would be hard to conclude one way or another about the existence of differences in time preferences between people interacting in economies at different stages of development. We return to this problem in section 4.

3 Experiments Conducted with Development Issues in Mind

In this section we highlight a subset of the papers reviewed in section 2 and a handful of other papers that did not fit neatly into the categories of section 2. We have chosen to highlight these papers because the experiments were either run with economic development issues in mind or run in the field with participants who face the problems of development on a daily basis. This section is divided into two sub-sections: In sub-section 3.1 we discuss the use of social preference experiments as a tool in gathering behavioral data on the social capital of individuals and communities. In sub-section 3.2 we discuss the importance for development policy of experiments that are designed to gather information other than social preferences.

3.1 Social Preferences, Social Capital, and Economic Development

Clearly, social capital, which we distinguish as either *associational social capital* (network connections and their density) or *behavioral social capital* (norms of trust, cooperation, and mutual monitoring) has taken hold of the development literature. For instance the influential paper of Knack and Keefer (1997) set off a debate over the importance of sociological factors in economic development in addition to the classical economic factors of technology, endowments, and preferences. At the center of this debate is measurement. As mentioned in Durlauf (2002), it is hard to get past the hypothetical nature of measures of behavioral social capital such as the World Values Survey used by Knack and Keefer. In the first part of this section we illustrate the use of social preference experiments as an alternative measure of behavioral social capital.²⁵

In Barr (2001) and Barr and Kinsey (2002) we learn that villagers in Zimbabwe understand the problems associated with free riding and are able to control free-riding through the use of social sanctions and criticism. Those players who deviate from the group norm by contributing too little are criticized and, subsequently, contribute more, as do those who simply witness the criticism of low contributors. However, the data from these experiments also suggest a potential problem. Not only are low contributors sanctioned, in many case those players who contribute a lot are also criticized. In a sense we see conformity to some sort of group norm, but the problem is that the norm that evolves does not maximize group welfare. This sort of “perverse” punishment is endemic to punishment experiments (see Page and Putterman, 2000 or Carpenter and Matthews, 2005) and might represent a tendency to conform towards the center of the strategy space.²⁶ Additionally, Barr demonstrates that men and women react differently to the possibility of social sanctions. Specifically, women are more responsive to sanctions and better at getting free riders to contribute.

²⁵This argument is more fully developed in Carpenter (2002) and Camerer and Fehr (2004).

²⁶See Carpenter (2004b) for more evidence of conformity in public goods experiments.

This, argues Barr, has implications for microcredit programs which rely on mutual monitoring at the village level. Her results suggest a reason why programs targeted at women are more effective.

Barr's trust game results are also interesting. In Barr (1999a) and Barr (2003b), the author shows that resettlement has implications for the amount of trust villagers have in each other. Specifically, as one might expect, those people who are resettled into new, larger villages trust their neighbors less than those who are left in their traditional villages. While the main result is not particularly surprising and selection might affect the result (i.e., the less trusting may be more likely to accept resettlement), it is the methodology that is important. Barr has been able to empirically estimate the effect of resettlement on trust.

We also believe that our work in Cardenas et al. (2000), Cardenas et al. (2002), Cardenas (2003b), Carpenter et al. (2004b), and Carpenter et al. (2004a) has relevance for economic development. Our CPR and VCM games (along with a number of the other studies mentioned above) are relevant because they take the lab to the field and examine how people who face social dilemmas on a daily basis react to economic incentives. In this sense our experiments are (at least slightly) more externally valid than those conducted with students at universities. In addition, our CPR games have provided behavioral evidence that external regulation can crowd out local intrinsic motivation to act environmentally responsible, and that inequality (both real and induced) can attenuate cooperative predispositions among people who actually extract from a commons.

Our VCM data have shown that participants from urban slums contribute at high levels to an experimental public good. These contribution levels are at odds with what we see from students in the West who typically start contributing at levels of approximately 50% of the endowment and then contributions decline over the course of the experiment while our participants contribute at higher levels initially, and their contributions grow over time (even without the ability to sanction free riders). Like our CPR results, the observed cooperation in the VCM suggests that, absent external forces, cooperative norms evolve in communities that face social dilemmas and policy makers should invest in ways to foster them rather than in policies that assume cooperation does not exist.

Lastly, we draw attention to three papers because they take, what we think is, one of the next steps in social capital research. Instead of running experiments only to discover the determinants of behavior, these research projects extend the use of experiments to gather behavioral data that can be used as inputs into other analyses. While we have developed this idea more fully elsewhere (Cardenas and Carpenter, 2005), we think it is important enough to restate these contributions here.

Henrich et al. (2001) take a small step toward analyzing the association between cooperative norms (as measured by first-mover behavior in the UG) and the importance of cooperation in production and the influence of markets on communities. As part of their analysis of cooperative norms in 15 "small-scale" societies, the authors regress the average community offer in the UG on two variables of economic importance that account for 68% of the variation in

behavior between communities. The first variable, the returns to cooperation in production, is a ranking of which communities rely more on cooperation in daily production tasks (e.g., compare the Lamelara whale fishermen to the isolated subsistence horticulturalists, the Machiguenga) and the second variable is the extent to which a community is influenced by market activity. While it is interesting that societies that contribute more are associated with cooperation being more important in production and being more influenced by markets, it may be important to think of the relationships as going in the other direction. It may be that the establishment of cooperative norms allow markets to take hold and allow cooperative ventures to occur. This is the sort of causality we believe would be important to identify if social capital is a valuable concept.

While Henrich et al. (2001) link behavior to economic variables, the great leap forward comes from designing experiments (or using the appropriate econometric specifications) that allow one to attribute causation to norms and social preferences. Karlan (2004) is a good example of designing an experiment to assure causation runs in the intended direction and Carter and Castillo (2003) is a good example of disentangling causation using the correct econometric specification.

Karlan (2004) records the experimental behavior of members of a group lending association in Peru and uses this behavior to predict the participant's default and savings rate one year later. This time lag gives the author some leverage in attributing causation to the behavioral social capital captured in his experimental data. In his analysis, Karlan shows that association members who are more trustworthy in the TG repay their loans at significantly higher rates one year later and save more voluntarily over the course of the year than people who are not very trustworthy. This relationship is economically significant. Doubling a second-mover's trustworthiness (from 25% to 50% returned) reduces one's default rate by 7%. At the same time however, he shows that people who "trust" more in the TG save less and drop out of the credit association more often, indicating that the trust component of the trust game may actually be a better measure of risk-seeking than trust. That is, people who send more end up using borrowed money for more risky ventures and therefore default more often and have less to save.

Carter and Castillo (2003) adopt a different approach to controlling for the possible endogenous nature of social norms and individual behavior and estimating the effect of trust and trustworthiness on economic outcomes. They use their data from South African TGs and DGs in two novel applications. First, they test for the existence of peer effects that constitute social norms using the methodology of Manski (1993) and second, they examine whether these norms of altruism, trust and trustworthiness have any economic impact on the individuals residing in the communities in which they evolve.

From a practical point of view, the Manski (1993) *reflection problem* exists when researchers try to regress individual group member behavior on, let's say, the group average behavior and infer from a significant association that the individual's actions reflect a social norm generated within the group. The problem is that we can not tell whether the individual's behavior is influenced by

some norm, or whether it simply reflects the individual characteristics shared by all the group members. Put differently, we might see a correlation between the group average behavior and individual behavior even if no norm exists because there is some unobservable that links all the group members in a way that appears normative, but really isn't. In our context, an example might be the difference between trusting norms that develop among closely linked community members and the fact that all the experimental participants are members of a rotating credit association in the community. People in this community might appear more trusting in an experiment, but in fact the observed trust is either due to the selection of trusting people into the association or due to the institutional relationship that links the participants and it is not due to the fact that their interactions have endogenously generated a trusting norm.

In their analysis, Carter and Castillo (2003) use survey responses (that should be orthogonal to the other institutional factors that determine trustworthy behavior in addition to being orthogonal to the error term) to instrument group average levels of behavior in the experiment for the 14 communities for which they have data.²⁷ They then show that the predicted group averages significantly affect individual behavior in all three roles of the experiment (trustor, returner, and dictator) which is a clean demonstration of the presence of social norms that affect individual behavior.

Because we can tell plausible stories in which economic outcomes determine the evolution of social norms just as easily as researchers now discuss the effects of social capital and norms on economic outcomes, Carter and Castillo have a second use for their instrumented group average behavior variables (i.e., to assess the validity of the second link). They show that there are significant links between experimental measures of community norms of altruism and trustworthiness and household per capita expenditures in South Africa. However, these associations carry the opposite sign of what we might expect given the previous work of Narayan and Pritchett (1999), for example. They find that the more altruistic ($p > 0.10$) and trustworthy ($p < 0.05$) a participant's community is, the lower is this person's per capita expenditures. Contrary to all the survey-based studies that come before this one, these paradoxical results suggest that prosocial community norms might actually reduce the wellbeing of the community members.

While we do not want to delve too much deeper into the implications of Carter and Castillo's results, we will offer one thought and stress that the important part of this paper is the careful statistical methodology that is employed. These results might simply alert us to the fact that social capital is a messier business than we first thought. While the sociological story in which norms restrict selfish behavior and the resulting prosocial predispositions allow more economic transactions to occur is compelling, the fact is that most communities (like the behaviors in most experiments) are heterogeneous and this heterogeneity may muddy the waters.

²⁷One can think of the Henrich et al. (2001) regression mentioned above as a similar regression.

For example, suppose equilibria exist in which both trustworthy types and untrustworthy types are in a group. These polymorphisms could be supported by the probabilistic punishment of untrustworthy types. If selection occurs over material payoffs, then the two types within any group that is in equilibrium must have the same payoff. We can assume that these payoffs correlate highly with expenditures. To complete the standard social capital scenario, we can also assume that the group-level equilibria are Pareto-rankable based on the frequency of trustworthy people. Starting with such a model, one would hypothesize that the regression of household expenditures on the frequency of trustworthy agents, *ceteris paribus*, would yield a significantly positive coefficient.

The paradox is that Carter and Castillo find that the members of groups with more trustworthy types actually do worse, not better. There might be many complications to this standard model that could produce such a result. For example, our model has not allowed for the fact that, in reality, people interact both within groups and between groups. There are at least two ways to incorporate this fact. First, it could be that the interactions that directly affect material wellbeing, like being employed, occur mostly between groups (or classes) and in these interactions people behave differently towards outgroup members.²⁸ Or, secondly, even if people maintain their types in between group encounters, groups with more untrustworthy types might do better materially, by finding and exploiting groups that are more trustworthy.

Again, there are two “take home” messages from Karlan (2004) and Carter and Castillo (2003): analyzing the effect of social norms requires one to think seriously about experimental design and/or econometric methodology to deal with possible endogeneities and there should be no expectation that using better tools will make the interpretation of results simpler.

3.2 Risk, Time, and Expectations

Binswanger (1980) points out that at first glance it is not obvious whether people in developing countries are poor because there are constraints on their access to capital or because they are more risk averse. Either cause could have the effect of lower investment, accumulation, and growth. Further, institutional problems may be easier to address than trying to change the risk attitudes of poor farmers. The same argument applies to time preferences and, indirectly, to the expectations society holds for differing groups of individuals (e.g., the idea of a “culture of poverty”). The point is that preferences, norms, and expectations may be harder to change using standard policy tools and may change much slower than the more traditional view of policy as a tool for changing or implementing institutions. For this reason alone, it is important to quantify attitudes towards time, risk, and each other and test their influence on economic performance in the developing world. In this sub-section we highlight a few papers that deal with risk and time preferences and expectations.

²⁸There is numerous evidence of this including Komorita and Lapworth (1982), Kramer and Brewer (1984), and Cardenas and Carpenter (2004).

To continue with Binswanger (1980), the author's basic results are that Indian peasant farmer risk attitudes are widely distributed when the stakes of the gambling experiment are low, but when the stakes are increased to a month's labor income, the distribution starts to become more concentrated in the range of intermediate or moderate aversion to risk. So behavior seems to be sensitive to stakes, a finding recently corroborated by Holt and Laury (2002) in the lab with students. However, the more important implication of the clustering of risk attitudes at high stakes is that when Binswanger regresses gamble choice on the personal characteristics of his participants, he finds no correlation between wealth or farm size and risk attitudes.

The implication of these results are that one can not explain the variation in farm performance (i.e., an element of development and growth) by the risk attitudes of the farmers in charge. While he does not run it, perhaps a more interesting regression would have been to regress farm performance on an instrumented measure of risk attitudes (to break any endogeneity) and measures of individual and community access to capital (e.g., whether or not a farmer has borrowed or tried to borrow and the fraction of small scale loans in the community's total portfolio). Showing that risk attitudes did not matter while access to capital did, would be important.

Risk is important for other reasons too. In communities where formal institutions that provide insurance do not exist, individuals have an incentive to pool their risk and self-insure against unforeseeable events (e.g., crop failures). However, while we do know that these arrangements are rare (Townsend, 1994; Ligon, 1998), we know next to nothing about the behavioral determinants of joining risk pooling associations. In her brief review of the theoretical treatments of risk-sharing, Barr (2003a) identifies two factors that should affect one's likelihood of entering a risk pooling arrangement. For either extrinsic reasons (e.g., lack of credible monitoring) or intrinsic reasons (e.g., weak social preferences), risk sharing arrangements might not evolve because of limited commitment on part of the potential members. Secondly, theory also predicts that information asymmetries may hinder risk pooling for the standard moral hazard and adverse selection reasons.

To test the behavioral implications of these hypotheses, Barr (2003a) runs an experiment (mentioned above) in Zimbabwe with villagers and compares here experimental results to more informal survey and interview network data from people in the same villages. As one might imagine, she finds in the experiment that when extrinsic commitment is limited (i.e., people could renege on pooling agreements once they knew what their payoff would be) and information is asymmetric (people could renege privately), less risk pooling occurs. Further, as a nice test of the external validity of her experimental results, Barr also shows that in three of her five villages there is a significant correlation between one's likelihood of pooling risk in the experiment and one's reported frequency of giving or receiving assistance from others in one's village. The results are interesting because they tell us something that theorists often just assumed about risk pooling and they show that the behavioral data gathered in the experiment has some relationship to actual risk pooling activities.

We briefly revisit the Pender (1996) paper because, although he conducts a standard time preference experiment, the purpose of his investigation is to test three prominent models used in the development literature to explain access to credit. Since all three models require that agents discount future outcomes, his experimental data is an integral part of the analysis. His results, however, are not entirely conclusive because he is only able to outright reject a permanent income model because he finds individual discount rates that are higher than the market interest rate. At the same time, the fact that his estimated discount rate is higher than the prevalent market rate indicates credit market imperfections which are more in line with both a model of individually upward sloping credit supply and constrained credit due to imperfect enforcement. As Binswanger concludes, Pender also states, effectively, that preferences are not the hindrance to development, institutional problems are.

We conclude this discussion with an example of using experiments to quantify the effects of expectations. Hoff and Pandey (2003) conduct a novel experiment in Uttar Pradesh, India in which grade school children are paid to solve puzzles. So far this doesn't sound too interesting, but the twist on this experiment is that there are a number of information treatments that the authors use to examine the effect of knowing the caste of the other participants on the productivity of puzzle solving. These treatments are interesting because, despite being legislated out of existence in the 1950s, the *caste* system, in which people are born into what amount to economic classes, still determines many economic exchanges. The authors hypothesize that part of the reason class still matters is because it alters the expectations of people, particularly of those from the lower classes who often expect that the system is tilted against them.

In their baseline treatment an experimenter announces the name, village, father, grandfather, and caste of each participant. The idea is that knowing the caste of the other participants will affect the expectations of success of individual participants. The authors anticipate that all the participants will perform the worst in mixed groups because the lower caste participants will expect that the experiment is tilted in favor of the higher caste participants and the higher caste individuals will become less attached to the task when interacting with lower caste members. When caste is not announced, high and low caste children perform equally well, but when caste is announced, low caste children do much worse and high caste children perform about the same.

This experiment is much more comprehensive than most. To examine the performance difference more fully, Hoff and Pandey explore three possible explanations for the lower performance of the low caste children: expectations that the experiment is "rigged" against low caste players, loss of self-confidence, and loss of intrinsic motivation to do well. Children from lower caste might expect that the world is tilted against them when they interact with high caste members and this expectation might be present in the experiment as well. To test for this effect (by controlling for it), the authors introduce a treatment in which one "winner" is chosen randomly from the group to be paid. Because this procedure has the appearance of being objective, the authors hypothesize that low caste players should now do no worse than high caste players. Indeed

the random winner treatment closes the caste gap in performance such that the difference is now insignificant.²⁹

To test for a loss of self confidence of lower caste members, Hoff and Pandey introduce a treatment in which participants can choose the skill level of the puzzles they will try to solve. To keep the incentives straight, everyone earns more when they solve harder puzzles, but what is telling is if higher caste members choose harder puzzles than lower caste members. Self confidence does not explain the worse performance of the lower castes because there is no significant difference in the skill level chosen by the participants.

Finally, to examine the intrinsic motivation to do well in the experiment, the authors exacerbate the historical salience of caste by segregating students by caste. The idea here is that low caste students will feel particularly bad about themselves when they know that their caste status is what determines the group they will be in. Indeed segregating the students worsens the performance of the lower caste participants. However, interestingly, segregation also reduces the performance of the high caste students. The authors hypothesize that this reduction in performance may be because high caste students expect that they are intrinsically worthy of higher rewards despite lower effort just because they are in the high caste.

No economist views expectations as unimportant, However, expectations are rarely included in empirical investigations because they are so hard to measure meaningfully. This experiment is important because it introduces an empirical methodology that allows researchers to measure the impact of expectations in a controlled setting in which participants are provided monetary incentives. In this case, we see that the caste system in India may still be the cause of numerous inefficiencies because lower caste members reduce effort when they expect to be discriminated against and higher caste member may lower their effort because they believe they are owed more just because of the caste they are born into.

4 Methods and a Look to the Future

We conclude by addressing a few methodological issues that have arisen since experiments have started to be run in developing countries and by pointing out a few areas that we think are ripe for future research. Our methodological concerns are mostly design and econometric related. Our view of the future envisions a number of concurrent large scale projects to study the evolution of the relationship between social preferences and other behavioral traits of individuals and communities on one hand and economic performance at the community level on the other.

²⁹Although it was not done, the authors could have examined this hypothesis even further by adding the famous locus of control inventory of Rotter (1966) which measures the degree to which respondents believe life happens to them (external locus of control) or is determined by them (internal locus of control). It would be interesting to know if lower caste students are disproportionately externally oriented.

4.1 Methodological Problems and Suggestions

Throughout this survey we have pointed out country-level differences in behavior while cautioning against doing so because of differences in instructions, protocols, and experimenters. Indeed, we will make these comparisons again in the next section. Although there has been a lot of caution about comparability, we (and their referees) tend to give researchers who conduct experiments in the field a little more leeway because of the logistical problems they face. Implicitly, a tradeoff has been established in the economic profession between control over the data generation process and the external validity of the results. Laboratory experiments are seen as low in external validity but high in control while the sort of field experiments often conducted in developing countries sacrifice some control to gain access to a participant population whose responses are more externally valid. This trade-off does not need to exist.

Roth et al. (1991) set the current standard for conducting experiments in multiple locations; however their attention to detail has not been closely adhered to. Roth and his coauthors identify three major problems with doing multi-site experiments: experimenter effects, translations, and currency differences. The experimenter effect is simply the observation that the person running a session may have an effect on the outcome by virtue of how they read the instructions, answer questions, etc. So, when possible one would like to have the same person run each session and if this is not possible, one should control for the experimenter in the analysis (if possible in a way that does not make the experimenter collinear with the country fixed effects). With respect to the second problem, the standard procedure for cross-country studies is to have a standard protocol translated into each language and then back-translated into the original language to identify any problems with interpretations. Lastly, paying participants can be difficult because one doesn't know whether every session should be conducted at the same stakes or whether the stakes should be varied so as to maintain purchasing power parity. It appears that the latter method is perhaps the most common procedure.

All this seems obvious but our first methodological point (also discussed in Ortmann, 2005) is that previous field studies in developing countries have been looser on experimental control than was warranted. The result of this lack of control is that comparisons that have been made should not have been made and each data point now stands alone as an isolated island. Most importantly, other researchers can do little to bridge the islands.

In some cases the experiments have been standardized and there has been a lot of recent work comparing experimental results across “cultures”, meaning small samples within a country but not necessarily random samples representative of the country's population. First, cultures often transcend national boundaries (e.g., Hispanic culture) and there is often considerable cultural difference within a country (e.g., China or Russia) so that it can be meaningless to examine the cultural determinants of behavior by comparing student populations in different countries. For example, we have found data on six trust games played in the United States (Glaeser et al., 2000; Cox, 2004 and the four in Table 2).

Comparing the variation in behavior within this sample to the variation between all the other experiments conducted in a variety of locations in Table 2, we see that the standard deviation of the fraction of the endowment sent in the U.S. is 0.14 compared only 0.09 in the non-U.S. sample. There is more behavioral variation within the U.S. than there is between many different countries of the world. Second, many of these experiments are conducted without much of an exit survey or the demographic information in the exit survey is often not included in the analysis. As a result, the variation in behavior is often attributed to cultural or national differences when it can actually be better explained by the demographic differences in the participant populations (see Botelho et al., 2005 or Cardenas, 2003a for examples).

Instead of cross-national research, we anticipate an increase in what might be called *cross-community* research. In cross-community research the experimenter identifies an important social phenomenon that varies by community (e.g., local systems for administering a common pool resource, or ecological conditions) and runs experiments and collects demographics designed to uncover the behavioral determinants of this variation. The methodological point is that differences in student behavior may not be that interesting; when one conducts experiments across populations one should have a well-formulated hypothesis as to why differences in the populations may exist.

We now turn to econometric issues. We have already spoken briefly about the Manski (1993) reflection problem, but two other papers deserve attention because they are important for the proper estimation of the effect of behavioral propensities on economic performance. Durlauf (2002) points out two major problems with much of the existing social capital literature: identification and exchangeability. Identification is the essence of the reflection problem, and therefore has already been discussed, but exchangeability usually manifests itself as omitted variable bias or a selection problem because the residuals (or dependent variables) in an equation that solves either or both of these problems can not be “exchanged” with an equation that suffers from one of these problems. Durlauf’s silver bullet is randomization. Randomization allows the researcher to be sure that the residuals will not be correlated with either omitted variables or selection processes because the observations placed in the sample were chosen randomly. Furthermore, randomization may solve the identification/reflection problem because it is highly unlikely that individuals with the same (perhaps unobservable) individual characteristics will wind up in the same group. This fact mitigates the strength of what Manski refers to as *correlated effects* (recall section 3.1).

The literature on the identification of endogenous social interactions has recently been advanced by Castillo and Carter (2003) who point out that, while experiments have made enormous strides in measuring social preferences and expectations, the econometric sophistication of the analysis of these variable has lagged behind. Specifically, without strong assumptions and a lot of demographic data and variation at the session level within a population, it is difficult to assign importance to preferences, social interactions, background or context. The major problem in many cross-population analyses that seek to identify the

effect of “culture” is that without variation at the session level within a population, unobserved correlates prevent the separation of the effects of population level norms or predispositions from the effect of the group-level manifestation of individual characteristics. That is, without session-level variation within a population one cannot separately measure the effect of individual characteristics (e.g., income, age, education) within a population to separate this effect at the group level from differences in the norms or culture of the populations.

4.2 Some Suggestions for Future Research

Interest in the effects of social capital and self-governance on economic outcomes has grown in the past decade. A more recent development in this field is the use and the call for the use of experiments to control for problems of measurement and identification we have already discussed. The project that we think would be a major contribution would be a large-scale longitudinal study of social preferences. In fact, a mini version of what we have in mind is currently under way in Germany. Fehr et al. (2003) have recently finished the first wave of a survey that incorporates a version of the trust game in which participants play the game simultaneously, and therefore, allows the collection of a large amount of observations in the form of a survey. Furthermore, this project is important because they plan to implement multiple waves of the survey to construct a true panel of data.³⁰ The project we have in mind is slightly different. Although it would be longitudinal and focus on experimental measures of trust and trustworthiness, it would also include controls for risk aversion and altruism (see the end of section 2.2).

Such a data set would allow economists to revisit the analysis conducted by Knack and Keefer (1997) in which the authors showed that countries with higher growth rates also had higher levels of trust measured by the World Values Survey/GSS trust question: “Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you need to be very careful in dealing with people?” We preview such an analysis using the trust data we have collected.³¹ Again, although the trust experiments we consider mostly use a fairly standardized protocol, there are differences, and therefore what follows is only meant to provoke a more elaborate and properly controlled future research project.

Using information from the World Fact Book (2001) and the World Values Survey (WVS), we gathered economic data (GPD per capita, GDP growth rate,

³⁰Repeated experiments generate panels of sorts. The problem is that experimenters are forced to rely on random effects estimators because the individual characteristics do not change over the course of the experiment. The panel that this project will generate is truly longitudinal because individual demographics will change from observation to observation.

³¹Originally, we planned to redo the Knack and Keefer analysis with behavioral measures of trust. However, after some thought, we realized substituting experimental measures for World Values Survey measures of trust would not be much of a contribution, given, as mentioned above, the within country variance in trust measures is probably as large as that in the between country measures. Until we have a large enough sample of behavioral trust measures and can solve the other econometric problems discussed by Durlauf and his co-authors, there is little point in conducting such an analysis.

percent of the population in poverty, Gini coefficients, and unemployment rates) and mean responses to the trust question from as many of the eighteen countries represented in Table 2 as possible. Using this data we tested whether there was any correlation between our measures of trust and economic performance. The first step was to see if there are any links between the WVS measure of trust used by Knack and Keefer and the experimental measures of trust. Because the WVS does not cover six of the countries in the sample, the correlation is based on only 12 observations. However, the result is encouraging; the correlation is positive, $\rho=0.51$ and is significant at the 10% level indicating that countries with more trust measured by the WVS also demonstrate more trust (i.e., send more), on average, in the TG.

The second step is to look for correlations between our experimental measures of trust and the economic indicators. In addition to plotting the relationship between the average amount sent in the TG and the real growth rate of GDP (as in Knack and Keefer), Figure 2 also plots the relationship between the behavioral trust data and the fraction of the population in poverty, the Gini coefficient as a measure of inequality, and the rate of unemployment.³² In each case the correlations are significant at the 5% level or better. Countries with higher growth rates are associated with more trust ($\rho=0.51$, $p=0.02$), countries with less poverty are associated with more trust ($\rho=-0.66$, $p<0.01$), countries in which the division of economic gains is more unequal are associated with less trust ($\rho=-0.48$, $p=0.04$), and higher unemployment is associated with less trust ($\rho=-0.64$, $p<0.01$). While all these relationships are provocative, the particularly strong correlation between poverty and trust indicates that a lot of worthwhile research might be done in this area.

We also think that a similar project focusing on time and risk preferences would be particularly valuable to development (and environmental) economists because of the extensive use of cost-benefit analysis to create policy. Finally, we consider projects of more modest scope to be important. The important criteria for the assessment of these smaller projects at the community level will be whether or not there is some hypothesis explaining interesting community level differences. We are currently engaged in one of these projects (NSF CAREER grant 0092953) in which the communities we study are all linked by the fact that the community members face the incentive problems of social dilemmas on a daily basis. Some of our participants extract resources from common pools in Colombia, other extract fish from Toyama Bay in Japan, and still others are faced with the collective action problems associated with survival in urban slums (e.g., clean water and the disposal of solid and biological waste).

There are equally relevant topics in Table 1 that have little attention so far. For instance, fiscal constraints in many non-industrialized countries combined with growing populations of pensioners may be fertile ground for behavioral research on self-restraint, observed discounting and endowment effects. Combined with research in the industrialized world, such research could provide the

³²There are fewer observations in the unemployment graph because this information is not reported for Tanzania or Uganda.

intuition for policy experiments such as the case for a voluntary pension saving mechanism in the U.S. (Thaler and Benartzi, 2004). More generally, the tools perfected in the lab by experimental economists could enrich the growing work on random interventions that are increasingly being used by academic and development groups in critical areas like gender bias, local governance, education or agricultural technology transfer (Duflo and Kremer, 2003; Chattopadhyay and Duflo, 2004; Banarjee et al., 2003).

Another area with central application to the problem of development relates to the role of external versus internal regulation in the provision of local public goods or the collective maintenance of common pool resources. There seems to be a universal pattern of a partial cooperation in most baseline CPR experiments, but rather little is known about the effect that subsidies or pecuniary fees may have in cooperation rate, particularly when the regulator has limited capacity of monitoring compliance. Yet this is one of the major issues that has emerged in the literature concerning local governance, decentralization of state control and the role of citizen participation. The possibility of crowding in and crowding out of the intrinsic motivations to cooperate that humans seem to exhibit in experiments and elsewhere, has received little attention outside of university laboratories.

In sum, given modern development economics is ripe with behavioral questions which may matter a lot to the growth in living standards, we feel it is particularly important to model the actor correctly. To get the actor right, development economist should consider spending more time in the field conducting experiments.

5 Figures and Tables




Figure 1 – An Overview of Trust Game Behavior by Country and Subject Population.




Figure 2 – Do Experimental Measures of Trust Correlate with Economic Indicators?

Table 1 – Modern Development Themes and Experimental Applications	
Development themes	Topics to which economic experiments may be or have been applied
Preferences & Norms	• Social preferences (altruism, trust, reciprocity, fairness, cooperation) • Risk and Time preferences • Intra-household allocation and bargaining • Gender, ethnic, racial discrimination
Social Dilemmas	• Public Goods Provision and Voluntary Contributions Mechanisms • Common-Pool Resources • Prisoners' Dilemma, Trust and Third Party Punishment Games • Self-governing institutions • Non-subgame perfect solutions (e.g. communication, punishment)
Well-Being	• Behavioral effects of Poverty & Inequality • Norms and Poverty • Behavioral effects on Environmental or Health outcomes
Asymmetric Information in incomplete contracts	• Land, Labor & Credit markets • Gift-exchange in labor and land contracts • Share-cropping and other land arrangements
Biases, Heuristics & Decision Making	• Loss Aversion and endowment effects • Hyperbolic and other non-linear discounting • Risk & Stakes • Expectations
Institutions, Behaviors & Feedback	• Institutional determinants of Behavior (e.g., crowding in and out, intrinsic and extrinsic motivations) • Behavioral determinants of Institutions (e.g., property rights – formal versus informal, individual versus collective) • External regulations, self-governance and imperfect monitoring

Table 2 – Cooperation in Developing Countries				
Game	Study	Location	Students	Mean Cooperation
PD	Cooper et al. (1996)	United States	Yes	22% cooperate
PD	Hemesath & Pomponio (1998)	United States	Yes	25% cooperate
		China	Yes	54% cooperate
PD	Tyson et al. (1988)	South Africa	Yes	45% cooperate w/black confederate
			Yes	37% cooperate w/white confederate
VCM	Carpenter & Matthews (2002)	United States	Yes	42% of endowment, 64% ^a
VCM	Barr (2001)	Zimbabwe	No	48% of endowment, 52% ^a
VCM	Barr & Kinsey (2002)	Zimbabwe	No	53% of endowment - women
		Zimbabwe	No	48% of endowment - men
VCM	Carpenter et al. (2004b)	Vietnam	No	72% of endowment, 76% ^a
		Thailand	No	61% of endowment, 73% ^a
VCM	Ensminger (2000)	Kenya	No	58% of endowment
VCM	Gaechter et al. (2004)	Russia	Yes	44% of endowment
		Russia	No	52% of endowment
VCM	Henrich & Smith (2004)	Peru	No	23% of endowment
		Chile-Mapuche	No	33% of endowment
		Chile-Huinca	No	58% of endowment
VCM	Karlan (2004)	Peru	No	81% of endowment ^b
CPR	Cardenas & Carpenter (2004)	United States	Yes	79% of Nash Extraction
		Colombia	Yes	74% of Nash Extraction
CPR	Cardenas et al. (2000)	Colombia	No	72% of Nash Extraction
CPR	Cardenas et al. (2002)	Colombia	No	68% of Nash Extraction, 49% ^c
CPR	Cardenas (2002)	Colombia	No	74% of Nash Extraction, 62% ^c

Notes: ^a Without social sanctions, with social sanctions. ^b This results is from a threshold public goods game. ^c Without communication, with communication.

Table 3 – Trust in Developing Countries					
Study	Location	Students	Fraction Sent	Fraction Returned	Return Ratio
Berg et al. (1995)	United States	Yes	0.52	0.30	0.90
Burks et al. (2003)	United States	Yes	0.65	0.40	1.31
Ashraf et al. (2003)	United States	Yes	0.41	0.23	0.58
	Russia	Yes	0.49	0.29	0.80
	South Africa	Yes	0.43	0.27	0.73
Barr (1999a; 2003b)	Zimbabwe	No	0.43	0.43	1.28
Buchan et al. (2003)	United States	Yes	0.65	0.45 ^a	1.35
	China	Yes	0.73	0.50 ^a	1.51
	Japan	Yes	0.68	0.50 ^a	1.51
	South Korea	Yes	0.64	0.49 ^a	1.47
Burns (2003)	South Africa	Yes	0.33	0.23	0.70
Cardenas (2003a)	Colombia	Yes	0.50	0.41	1.22
Carter & Castillo (2002)	South Africa	No	0.53	0.38	1.14
Castillo & Carter (2003)	Honduras	No	0.49	0.42	1.26
Holm & Danielson (2005)	Tanzania	Yes	0.53	0.37	1.17
	Sweden	Yes	0.51	0.35	1.05
Danielson & Holm (2003)	Tanzania	No	0.56	0.46	1.40
Ensminger (2000)	Kenya	No	0.44	0.18	0.54
Fehr & List (2004)	Costa Rica	Yes	0.40	0.32	0.96
	Costa Rica	No	0.59	0.44	1.32
Greig and Bohnet (2005)	Kenya	No	0.30	0.41	0.82
Johansson-Stenman et al. (2004)	Bangladesh	No	0.46	0.46	1.38
Karlan (2004)	Peru	No	0.46	0.43	1.12
Koford (2001)	Bulgaria	Yes	0.63	0.46	1.34
Lazzarini et al. (2004)	Brazil	Yes	0.56	0.34	0.80
Mosley and Verschoor (2003)	Uganda	No	0.49	0.33	0.99
Schechter (2004)	Paraguay	No	0.47	0.44	1.31
Wilson & Bahry (2002)	Russia	No	0.51	0.38	1.15

Notes: ^a This figure differs from Buchan et al (2003) because they include the second-mover's endowment in the amount of money available to send back.

Table 4 – Fairness in Developing Countries					
Study	Location	Students	UG	UG	DG
			Mean Proposal	Rejection Rate	Mean Allocation
Carpenter et al. (2005) ^a	United States	Yes	0.41	0.05	0.25
		No	0.45	0.07	0.45
Ashraf et al. (2003) ^a	United States	Yes	-	-	0.24
	Russia	Yes	-	-	0.26
	South Africa	Yes	-	-	0.25
Burns (2003)	South Africa	Yes	-	-	0.26
Cameron (1999) ^a	Indonesia	Yes	0.42	0.10	-
Cardenas & Carpenter (2004)	United States	Yes	-	-	0.27
	Colombia	Yes	-	-	0.19
Carter & Castillo (2002) ^a	South Africa	No	-	-	0.42
Castillo & Carter (2003)	Honduras	No	-	-	0.42
Holm & Danielson (2005) ^a	Tanzania	Yes	-	-	0.24
	Sweden	Yes	-	-	0.28
Ensminger (2000) ^a	Kenya	No	^b	^b	0.31
Gowdy et al. (2003) ^a	Nigeria	No	0.43	0.01	0.42
Henrich et al. (2001) ^a	Peru	No	0.26	0.05	-
	Tanzania – H	No	0.40, 0.27	0.19, 0.28	-
	Bolivia	No	0.37	0.00	-
	Ecuador – Q	No	0.27	0.15	-
	Mongolia	No	0.35, 0.36	0.05, ^c	-
	Chile	No	0.34	0.07	-
	PNG	No	0.43, 0.38	0.27, 0.40	-
	Tanzania – S	No	0.41, 0.42	0.25, 0.05	-
	Zimbabwe	No	0.41, 0.45	0.10, 0.07	-
	Ecuador – A	No	0.42	0.00	-
	Kenya	No	0.44	0.04	-
	Paraguay	No	0.51	0.00	-
	Indonesia	No	0.58	0.00	-

Notes: PNG is Papua New Guinea. ^aHigh stakes. ^bReported under Henrich et al (2001). ^cSecond rejection rate not reported in the original. Two entries in a cell indicate two different samples in the same population.

Table 5 – Risk and Time Preferences in Developing Countries

Decision Task	Study	Location	Students	Mean Behavior
Risk: Accept/Reject Lotteries	Holt & Laury (2002) ^b	USA	Yes	$0.68 < \text{CRRA}^a < 0.97$
Risk : Choose Lottery	Binswanger (1980) ^b	India	No	$\text{CRRA}^a = 0.71^\circ$
Risk : Choose Lottery	Barr (2003a) ^b	Zimbabwe	No	$0.32 < \text{CRRA}^a < 0.81$
Risk: Certainty Equivalent	Barr & Packard (2000)	Chile	No	$\text{CE}^d = 0.57$
Risk: Certainty Equivalent	Henrich & McElreath (2002)	Chile & Tanzania	No	$\text{CE}^d(\text{Mapuche})=0.7$ $\text{CE}^d(\text{Huinca})=0.4$ $\text{CE}^d(\text{Sangu})=0.68$
Risk: Accept/Reject Lotteries	Jimenez (2003)	Spain	Yes	$0.40 < \text{CRRA}^a < 1.25$
Risk: Choose Lottery	Nielsen (2001)	Madagascar	No	$\text{CRRA}^a = 0.32$
Risk: Bet on a die roll	Schechter (2005)	Paraguay	No	$\text{CRRA}^a = 2.57$
Time: Accept/Reject Delays	Coller & Williams (1999)	USA	Yes	$17\% < \text{MIDR}^f < 20\%$
Time: Accept/Reject Delays	Harrison et al. (2003)	Denmark	No	$\text{IDR}^e = 28\%^\circ$
Time: Questionnaire	Barr & Packard (2000)	Chile	No	$\text{IDR}^e = 43\%$
Time: Accept/Reject Delays	Kirby et al. (2002)	Bolivia	No	$\text{MHIDR}^g = 12\%$
Time: Choose Delay	Nielsen (2001)	Madagascar	No	$\text{IDR}^e = 117\%$
Time: Accept/Reject Delays	Pender (1996)	India	No	$\text{MIDR} > 50\%$

Notes: ^aCRRA is the measure of constant relative risk aversion. ^bHigh stakes. ^cControlling for demographics. ^dCE is the mean certainty equivalent constructed from individual fixed effects in regressions with eight observations per participant that varied the odds of the high and low outcomes. This measure is expressed as a fraction of the high payout. ^eIDR is the estimated individual discount rate. ^fColler & Williams report the median individual discount rate (MIDR) because their analysis is sensitive to cutoffs and the distribution of responses is right-skewed. ^gKirby et al. (2002) report median hyperbolic individual discount rates based on the function $PV=A/(1+kD)$ where A is the reward, k is the hyperbolic discount rate, and D is the delay in days.

6 References

- Ashraf, N., Bohnet, I., Piankov, N., 2003. Decomposing trust. Kennedy School of Government Working Paper.
- Banarjee, A., Cole, S., Duflo, E., Linden, L., 2003. Remedying education: Evidence from two randomized experiments in India. Department of Economics, MIT working paper.
- Bardhan, P., Udry, C., 1999. Development microeconomics. Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York.
- Barr, A., 1999a. The effects of social disruption on bargaining and investment behavior: An experimental study from Zimbabwe. mimeo.
- Barr, A., 1999b. Familiarity and trust: An experimental investigation. Center for the Study of African Economies Working Paper. WPS99-23.
- Barr, A., 2001. Social dilemmas and shame-based sanctions: Experimental results from rural Zimbabwe. Center for the Study of African Economies Working Paper. WPS2001.11.
- Barr, A., 2003a. Risk pooling, commitment, and information: An experimental test of two fundamental assumptions. Oxford University Centre for the Study of African Economies Working Paper CSAE WPS/2003-05.
- Barr, A., 2003b. Trust and expected trustworthiness: Experimental evidence from Zimbabwe. *The Economic Journal*. 113, 614-630.
- Barr, A., Kinsey, B., 2002. Do men really have no shame? Center for the Study of African Economies Working Paper. WPS2002.05.
- Barr, A., Packard, T., 2000. Revealed and concealed preferences in the Chilean pension system: An experimental investigation. University of Oxford Department of Economics Discussion Paper Series.
- Benabou, R., Tirole, J., 2003. Self-knowledge and self-regulation: An economic approach. In: Brocas, I., Carrillo, J. (Eds.), *The psychology of economic decisions*. 1, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp.
- Berg, J., Dickaut, J., McCabe, K., 1995. Trust, reciprocity and social history. *Games and Economic Behavior*. 10, 122-142.
- Binswanger, H., 1980. Attitudes toward risk: Experimental measurement in rural India. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 62, 395-407.
- Bolle, F., 1998. Rewarding trust: An experimental study. *Theory and Decision*. 45, 83-98.
- Botelho, A., Harrison, G., Hirsch, M., Rutstrom, E., 2005. Bargaining behavior, demographics and nationality: What can the experimental evidence show? In: Carpenter, J., Harrison, G., List, J. (Eds.), *Field experiments in economics*, JAI Press, Greenwich, Conn. and London, pp. 337-372.
- Branas-Garza, P., 2003. Poverty in dictator games: Awakening solidarity. *centrA Working Paper E2003/50*.
- Buchan, N., Croson, R., Johnson, E., 2003. Let's get personal: An international examination of the influence of communication. Culture, and social distance on other regarding preferences. mimeo.
- Burks, S.V., Carpenter, J.P., Verhoogen, E., 2003. Playing both roles in the trust game. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*. 51, 195-216.

- Burns, J., 2004. Rebuilding trust in post-apartheid south Africa. Department of Economics, University of Cape Town Working Paper.
- Camerer, C., Fehr, E., 2004. Measuring social norms and preferences using experimental games: A guide for social scientists. In: Henrich, J., Boyd, R., Bowles, S., Gintis, H., Fehr, E., Camerer, C. (Eds.), *Foundations of human sociality: Experimental and ethnographic evidence from 15 small-scale societies*. forthcoming, Oxford University Press pp. 55-95.
- Cameron, L., 1999. Raising the stakes in the ultimatum game: Experimental evidence from Indonesia. *Economic Inquiry*. 37, 47-59.
- Cardenas, J.C., 2003a. En vos cofio: An experimental exploration on the micro-foundations of trust, reciprocity, and social distance in Colombia. Faculty of Economics, Universidad de Los Andes, Working Paper.
- Cardenas, J.C., 2003b. Real wealth and experimental cooperation: Evidence from field experiments. *Journal of Development Economics*. 70, 263-289.
- Cardenas, J.C., Carpenter, J., 2004. An inter-cultural examination of cooperation in the commons. Department of Economics, Middlebury College Working Paper.
- Cardenas, J.C., Carpenter, J., 2005. Three themes on field experiments and economic development. In: Carpenter, J., List, J., Harrison, G. (Eds.), *Field experiments in economics*, JAI Press, Greenwich, pp. 71-124.
- Cardenas, J.C., Stranlund, J., Willis, C., 2000. Local environmental control and institutional crowding-out. *World Development*. 28, 1719-1733.
- Cardenas, J.-C., Stranlund, J., Willis, C., 2002. Economic inequality and burden-sharing in the provision of local environmental quality. *Ecological Economics*. 1-17.
- Carpenter, J., 2002. Measuring social capital: Adding field experimental methods to the analytical toolbox. In: Isham, J., Kelly, T., Ramaswamy, S. (Eds.), *Social capital and economic development: Well-being in developing countries*, Edward Elgar, Northampton, pp. 119-137.
- Carpenter, J., 2004a. Punishing free-riders: How group size affects mutual monitoring and the provision of public goods. *Games and Economic Behavior*. forthcoming.
- Carpenter, J., 2004b. When in Rome: Conformity and the provision of public goods. *Journal of Socio-Economics*. 33, 395-408.
- Carpenter, J., 2005. Endogenous social preferences. *Review of Radical Political Economy*. 37, 63-84.
- Carpenter, J., Burks, S., Verhoogen, E., 2005. Comparing students to workers: The effects of social framing on behavior in distribution games. In: Carpenter, J., Harrison, G., List, J. (Eds.), *Field experiments in economics*, JAI/Elsevier, Greenwich, Conn. and London, pp. 261-290.
- Carpenter, J., Danieri, A., Takahashi, L., 2004a. Cooperation, trust, and social capital in southeast Asian urban slums. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*. 55, 533-551.
- Carpenter, J., Danieri, A., Takahashi, L., 2004b. Social capital and trust in southeast Asian cities. *Urban Studies*. 41, 853-874.

- Carpenter, J., Matthews, P., 2002. Social reciprocity. Middlebury College Department of Economics Working Paper 2002-29.
- Carpenter, J., Matthews, P., 2005. Norm enforcement: Anger, indignation, or reciprocity. Department of Economics, Middlebury College, Working Paper 0503.
- Carter, M., Castillo, M., 2002. The economic impacts of altruism, trust and reciprocity: An experimental approach to social capital. AAE Staff Papers, University of Wisconsin-Madison. mimeo.
- Carter, M., Castillo, M., 2003. An experimental approach to social capital in south Africa. University of Wisconsin Department of Agricultural Economics Working Paper.
- Castillo, M., Carter, M., 2003. Identifying social effects in economic field experiments. Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, University of Wisconsin, Working Paper.
- Chattopadhyay, R., Duflo, E., 2004. "women and policy makers: Evidence from a randomized policy experiment in India. *Econometrica*. 72, 1409-1443.
- Chenery, H., Srinivasan, T.N., 1988. Handbook of development economics. North Holland, Amsterdam.
- Coller, M., Williams, M.B., 1999. Eliciting individual discount rates. *Experimental Economics*. 2, 107-127.
- Cooper, R., DeJong, D., Forsythe, R., Ross, T., 1996. Cooperation without reputation: Experimental evidence from prisoner's dilemma games. *Games and Economic Behavior*. 12, 187-218.
- Cox, J.C., 2004. How to identify trust and reciprocity. *Games and Economic Behavior*. 46, 260-281.
- Danielson, A., Holm, H., 2003. Do you trust your brethren? Eliciting trust attitudes and trust behavior in a Tanzanian congregation. mimeo.
- de Quervain, D., Fischbacher, U., Treyer, V., Schellhammer, M., Schnyder, A., Fehr, E., 2004. The neural basis for altruistic punishment. *Science*. 305, 1254-1258.
- Duflo, E., 2003. Poor but rational. Department of Economics, MIT, working paper.
- Duflo, E., Kremer, M., 2003. Use of randomization in the evaluation of development effectiveness. Paper prepared for the World Bank Operations Evaluation Department Conference on Evaluation and Development Effectiveness in Washington D.C. 15-16 July, 2003.
- Durlauf, S.N., 2002. On the empirics of social capital. *The Economic Journal*. 112, 459-479.
- Eckel, C., Grossman, P., 1996. Altruism in anonymous dictator games. *Games and Economic Behavior*. 16, 181-191.
- Ensminger, J., 2000. Experimental economics in the bush: Why institutions matter. In: Menard, C. Ed., *Institutions, contracts, and organizations: Perspectives from new institutional economics*, Edward Elgar, London, pp. 158-171.
- Fehr, E., Fischbacher, U., Rosenblatt, B.v., Schupp, J., Wagner, G., 2003. A nation-wide laboratory examining trust and trustworthiness by integrating be-

havioral experiments into representative surveys. University of Zurich, Institute for Empirical Research in Economics Working Paper #141.

Fehr, E., Gächter, S., 2000. Cooperation and punishment in public goods experiments. *American Economic Review*. 90, 980-994.

Fehr, E., List, J., 2004. The hidden costs and returns of incentives: Trust and trustworthiness among CEOs. *Journal of the European Economic Association*. 2, 743-771.

Fisher, I., 1930. *The theory of interest*. Macmillan, New York.

Frederick, S., Loewenstein, G., O'Donoghue, T., 2002. Time discounting and time preference: A critical review. *Journal of Economic Literature*. 40, 351-401.

Fukuyama, F., 1995. *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. The Free Press, New York.

Gächter, S., Herrmann, B., Thoeni, C., 2004. Trust, voluntary cooperation, and socio-economic background: Survey and experimental evidence. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*. 55, 505-531.

Glaeser, E., Laibson, D., Scheinkman, J., Soutter, C., 2000. Measuring trust. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 65, 811-846.

Gowdy, J., Iorgulescu, R., Onyeiwu, S., 2003. Fairness and retaliation in a rural Nigerian village. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*. 52, 469-479.

Greig, F., Bohnet, I., 2004. Is there reciprocity in a reciprocal-exchange economy? Evidence from a slum in Nairobi, Kenya. Kennedy School of Government Working Paper.

Harris, C., Laibson, D., 2002. Hyperbolic discounting and consumption. In: Dewatripont, M., Hansen, L. P., Turnovsky, S. (Eds.), *Advances in economics and econometrics: Theory and applications, eighth world congress*. 1 pp. 258-298.

Harrison, G.W., Lau, M.I., Williams, M.B., 2002. Estimating individual discount rates in Denmark: A field experiment. *American Economic Review*. 92, 1606-1617.

Hemesath, M., Pomponio, X., 1998. Cooperation and culture: Students from china and the united states in a prisoner's dilemma. *Cross-Cultural Research: The Journal of Comparative Social Science*. 32, 171-184.

Henrich, J., Boyd, R., Bowles, S., Camerer, C., Fehr, E., Gintis, H., McElreath, R., 2001. In search of homo economics: Behavioral experiments in 15 small-scale societies. *American Economic Review*. 91, 73-78.

Henrich, J., McElreath, R., 2002. Are peasants risk-averse decision makers? *Current Anthropology*. 43, 172-181.

Henrich, J., Smith, N., 2004. Comparative experimental evidence from Machiguenga, Mapuche, Huinca & American populations shows substantial variation among social groups in bargaining and public goods behavior. In: Henrich, J., Boyd, R., Bowles, S., Gintis, H., Fehr, E., Camerer, C. (Eds.), *Foundations of human sociality: Economic experiments and ethnographic evidence from fifteen small-scale societies*. mimeo, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 125-167.

- Hoff, K., Pandey, P., 2003. Why are social inequalities so durable? An experimental test of the effects of Indian caste on performance. World Bank Working Paper.
- Hoff, K., Stiglitz, J., 2001. Modern economic theory and development. In: Meier, G., Stiglitz, J. (Eds.), *Frontiers of development economics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 389-459.
- Holm, H., Danielson, A., 2005. Trust in the tropics? Experimental evidence from Tanzania. *The Economic Journal*. 115, 505-532.
- Holt, C., Laury, S., 2002. Risk aversion and incentive effects. *American Economic Review*. 92, 1644-1655.
- Jimenez, F., 2003. Does familiar environment affect individual risk attitudes? Olive-oil producer vs. No-producer households. *centra Documento de trabajo Serie Economia E2003/28*. University de Jaen.
- Johansson-Stenman, O., Mahmud, M., Martinsson, P., 2004. Trust, trust games and stated trust: Evidence from rural Bangladesh. Department of Economics, Goeteborg University, Working Paper.
- Kachelmeier, S., Shehata, M., 1992. Culture and competition: A laboratory market comparison between china and the west. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*. 19, 145-168.
- Kahneman, D., Tversky, A., (Eds.) (2000) *Choices, values, and frames*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Karlan, D., 2004. Using experimental economics to measure social capital and predict financial decisions. *American Economic Review*. Forthcoming.
- Kirby, K., Godoy, R., Reyes-Garcia, V., Byron, E., Apaza, L., Leonard, W., Perez, E., Vadez, V., Wilkie, D., 2002. Correlates of delay-discount rates: Evidence from Tsimane Amerindians of the Bolivian rain forest. *Journal of Economic Psychology*. 23, 291-316.
- Knack, S., Keefer, P., 1997. Does social capital have an economic payoff? A cross-country investigation. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 112, 1251-1288.
- Koford, K., 2001. Trust and reciprocity in Bulgaria: A replication of Berg, Dickhaut and McCabe (1995).
- Komorita, S., Lapworth, C., 1982. Cooperative choice among individuals versus groups in an n-person dilemma situation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 42, 487-496.
- Kramer, R., Brewer, M., 1984. Effects of group identity on resource use in a simulated commons dilemma. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 46, 1044-1057.
- Lawrance, E., 1991. Poverty and the rate of time preference: Evidence from panel data. *Journal of Political Economy*. 99, 54-77.
- Lazzarini, S., Madalozzo, R., Artes, R., de Oliveira Siqueira, J., 2004. Measuring trust: An experiment in brazil. *Ibmec Working Paper - WPE - 2004 - 1*.
- Ledyard, J., 1995. Public goods: A survey of experimental research. In: Kagel, J., Roth, A. (Eds.), *The handbook of experimental economics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp. 111-194.

- Ligon, E., 1998. Risk-sharing and information in village economies. *Review of Economic Studies*. 65, 847-864.
- Manski, C., 1993. Identification of endogenous social effects: The reflection problem. *Review of Economic Studies*. 60, 531-542.
- Masclet, D., Noussair, C., Tucker, S., Villeval, M.-C., 2003. Monetary and nonmonetary punishment in the voluntary contributions mechanism. *American Economic Review*. 93, 366-380.
- Moseley, W., 2001. African evidence on the relation of poverty, time preference and the environment. *Ecological Economics*. 38, 317-326.
- Mosley, P., Verschoor, A., 2003. The development of trust and social capital in rural Uganda: An experimental approach. University of Sheffield Working Paper.
- Mullainathan, S., Thaler, R., 2001. Behavioral economics, *International encyclopedia of social and behavioral sciences*, Pergamon Press pp. 1094-1100.
- Narayan, D., Pritchett, L., 1999. Cents and sociability: Household income and social capital in rural Tanzania. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*. 47, 871-897.
- Neilsen, U., 2001. Poverty and attitudes towards time and risk - experimental evidence from Madagascar. Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University of Denmark Department of Economics and Natural Resources Working Paper.
- Ogaki, M., Atkeson, A., 1977. Rate of time preference, intertemporal elasticity of substitution, and level of wealth. *Review of Economics and Statistics*. 79, 564-572.
- Ortmann, A., 2005. Field experiments in economics: Some methodological caveats. In: Carpenter, J., Harrison, G., List, J. (Eds.), *Field experiments in economics*, JAI Press, Greenwich, Conn. and London, pp. 51-70.
- Page, T., Putterman, L., 2000. Cheap talk and punishment in voluntary contribution experiments. Brown University Department of Economics Working Paper.
- Pender, J.L., 1996. Discount rates and credit markets: Theory and evidence from rural India. *Journal of Development Economics*. 50, 257-296.
- Ray, D., 1998. *Development economics*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Roth, A., Prasnikar, V., Okuno-Fujiwara, M., Zamir, S., 1991. Bargaining and market behavior in Jerusalem, Ljubljana, Pittsburgh and Tokyo: An experimental study. *American Economic Review*. 81, 1068-1095.
- Rotter, J.B., 1966. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs; General and Applied*. 80, 1-28.
- Schechter, L., 2004. Traditional trust measurement and the risk confound: An experiment in rural Paraguay. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*. forthcoming.
- Schechter, L., 2005. Risk aversion and expected-utility theory: A calibration exercise. University of Wisconsin Department of Agricultural Economics Working Paper.

- Schubert, R., et al., 1999. Financial decision-making: Are women really more risk-averse? *American Economic Review*. 89, 381-385.
- Smith, V., 1994. Economics in the laboratory. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 8, 113-131.
- Smith, V., 2003. Constructivist and ecological rationality in economics. *American Economic Review*. 93, 465-508.
- Stiglitz, J., 1989. Rational peasants, efficient institutions, and a theory of rural organization: Methodological remarks for development economics. In: Bardhan, P. Ed., *The economic theory of agrarian insitutions*, Claredon Press, Oxford, pp.
- Thaler, R., Benartzi, S., 2004. Save more tomorrow: Using behavioral economics to increase employee savings. *Journal of Political Economy*. 112, 164-187.
- Todaro, M., Smith, S., 2002. *Economic development*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Townsend, R.M., 1994. Risk and insurance in village India. *Econometrica*. 62, 539-591.
- Tyson, G.A., Schlachter, A., Cooper, S., 1988. Game playing strategy as an indicator of racial prejudice among south African students. *Journal of Social Psychology*. 128, 473-485.
- Wilson, R., Bahry, D., 2002. Intergenerational trust in transitional societies. Department of Political Science, Rice University, Working Paper.