

Comparison of Hungarian and Vietnamese Cultural Differences in Classic Behavioural Economics Experiments

DOI: 10.30819/cmse.4-1.03

ABSTRACT

Nowadays behavioural economics is widely studied and referenced. Well-known classic experiments (e.g. prospect theory) have provided many results which prove that we are human, but most of these studies did not deal with the background and origin of these problems. In this paper we use classic ex-

"Finally, there is an exciting challenge ahead for scholars engaged in fundamental rather than applied research on how cultural values vary across space and time, and how these should be operationalized and measured."

(Tung and Verbeke, 2010)

periments on one sample each of Hungarian and Vietnamese students. The respondents are not just geographically distant, but their cultures differ greatly. Cultural differences can be described through cultural comparisons (e.g. the Hofstede, GLOBE, and Schwartz studies) which explain the main differences between our two studied samples. But each actor has a different personality, and the way we handle risky situations colours our decisions. Due to this fact, we applied the DOSPERT Scale to each respondent, measuring their personal risk-taking levels. Our main research question focuses on how cultural background and personal risk level matter in economic decisions. Based on the relevant state of the art, we have added to classic experiments the DOSPERT Scale and extended it with cultural dimensions using Hofstede's theory; the impact of gender differences was also observed. Altogether seven hypotheses were defined and tested using an online survey in order to compare cultural differences between Vietnamese and Hungarian samples (n=190). We found significant differences between the two samples; we can therefore conclude that the final decision is in many cases associated significantly with participants' cultural background.

KEY WORDS

Behavioural economics, experiment, cultural differences, Vietnam, Hungary

Paper received: 29 November 2019 • Paper revised: 20 May 2020 • Paper accepted: 4 June 2020

Anita Kolnhofer-Derecskei holds a PhD in Economic Sciences. She is a Senior Lecturer and Assistant Professor at the Obuda University, Keleti Faculty of Business and Management. She has participated, and continues to do so, in Centre for Knowledge and Research in Budapest, and is the author of over 80 scientific publications. Her main research area concerns the field of behavioural economics. She has also studied organizational creativity, risk and heuristics, and biases. In 2016 and 2017 she won the National Award of Excellence for her research activities. Cur-

rently, she lives in Melbourne, Australia, where she is an Academic Tutor at the University of Melbourne, Faculty of Business and Economics.

Email: derecskei.anita@gmail.com

Viktor Nagy (PhD) is economist and associate professor. He is the director of the Institute of Enterprise Management, and vice-dean for education of Keleti Faculty of Business and Management at Óbuda University, Budapest, Hungary. His research field is decision theory and he deals with both normative and descriptive branches. He obtained his PhD degree at the University of West Hungary for researching in the field of modelling, preparation and IT support of decision making.

Email: nagy.viktor@kgk.uni-obuda.hu

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Márton Gere (former student at Obuda University), who wrote and defended his Master's thesis partly about a similar topic (the consultant professor was Anita Kolnhofer-Derecskei). We are also grateful to our colleagues at Da Nang University, and to Márton for helping us to collect data. The authors state that there are no conflicts of interest.

References

- Bateman, I. J., Munro, A., Poe, G. L. (2008), Decoy effects in choice experiments and contingent valuation: Asymmetric dominance, *Land Economics*, 84(1): 115-127.
- Blais, A., R., Weber, E. U. (2006), A Domain-Specific Risk Taking (DOSPERT) scale for adult populations, *Judgment and Decision Making*, 1: 33-47.
- Chen, M., K., Lakshminarayanan, V., Santos, L. (2006), How Basic Are Behavioral Biases? Evidence from Capuchin Monkey Trading Behavior, *Journal of Political Economy*, 114(3): 517-537.
- Chuah, S., H., Hoffmann, R., Jones, M., Williams, G. (2005), An Economic Anatomy of Culture: Attitudes and Behaviour in Inter- and Intra-National Ultimatum Game Experiments, *CeDEX Discussion Paper*, 11.
- Durana, P., Kral, P., Stehel, V., Lazaroiu, G., Sroka, W. (2019), Quality Culture of Manufacturing Enterprises: A Possible Way to Adaptation to Industry 4.0, *Social Sciences*, 8(4): 1-25.
- Ericson, K. M. M., Fuster, A. (2014), The endowment effect, *Annual Review of Economics*, 6(1): 555-579.
- Ferreira, M. (2018), Risk Seeker or Risk Averse? Cross-Country Differences in Risk Attitudes Towards Financial Investment, In: *The Behavioral Economics Guide 2018*, A. Samson (Ed.), available at: <http://www.behavioraleconomics.com>. 87-95 (accesses 10 May 2020)
- Figner, B., Weber, E., U. (2011), Who Takes Risks When and Why? Determinants of risk-taking Current Directions, *Psychological Science*, 20(4): 211-216.
- Fischer, R., Poortinga, Y., H. (2012), Are cultural values the same as the values of individuals? An examination of similarities in personal, social and cultural value structures, *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 12(2): 157-170.
- Helliwell, J., Layard, R., & Sachs, J. (2019), *World Happiness Report 2019*, New York: Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
- Henrich, J. (2000), Does Culture Matter in Economic Behavior? Ultimatum Game Bargaining among the Machiguenga of the Peruvian Amazon, *American Economic Review*, 90(4): 973-979.
- Hofstede, G. (1996), Riding the Waves Of Commerce: A Test Of Trompenaars' "Model" Of National Culture Differences, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, (20)2: 189-198.
- Hofstede, G. (2011), Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context, *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), available at: <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014> (accessed 10 May 2020).
- Horak, S. (2013), Cross-Cultural Experimental Economics and Indigenous Management Research – Issues and Contributions, *Duisburg working papers on East Asian studies*, 92.

- Horak, S. (2016), Decision-making behavior, gender differences, and cultural context variables, *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 16(3): 281–299.
- Hsee, C., K., Weber, E., U. (1999), Cross-national differences in risk preference and lay predictions, *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, Special Issue: Selected Proceedings of the 16th Research Conference on Subjective Probability, Utility and Decision Making, pp. 165-179.
- Huber, J., Payne, J. W., Puto, C. (1982), Adding Asymmetrically Dominated Alternatives: Violations of Regularity and the Similarity Hypothesis, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9(1): 90-98.
- Inglehart, R., C., Haerpfer, A., Moreno, C., Welzel, K., Kizilova, J., Diez-Medrano, M., Lagos, P., Norris, E., Ponarin & B., Puranen et al. (Eds.) (2014), *World Values Survey: All Rounds - Country-Pooled Datafile Version*, available at: <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSDocumentationWVL.jsp>. (accessed 10 May 2020), Madrid: JD Systems Institute.
- Inglehart, R., Welzel, C. (2010), *The WVS cultural map of the world - World Values Survey*, available at: pages.uab.cat (accessed 10 May 2020).
- Jones, M. (2007), Hofstede – Culturally questionable? *Oxford Business & Economics Conference*, Oxford, UK, 24-26 June.
- Kahneman, D. (2011), *Thinking, fast and slow*, London: Allen Lane.
- Kahneman, D., Knetsch, J. L., Thaler, R. H. (1990), Experimental tests of the endowment effect and the Coase theorem, *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(6): 1325-1348.
- Kahneman, D., Knetsch, J. L., Thaler, R. H. (1991), Anomalies: The endowment effect, loss aversion, and status quo bias, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 5(1): 193-206.
- Kahneman, D., Tversky, A. (1979), Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk, *Econometrica*, (47): 263-291.
- Kahneman, D., Tversky, A. (1984), Choices, Values, and Frames, *American Psychologist*, 39(4): 341-350.
- Lane, T. (2016), Discrimination in the laboratory: A meta-analysis of economics experiments, *European Economic Review*, 90: 375–402.
- Loewenstein, G., Weber, E. U., Hsee, C. K., Welch, N. (2001), Risk as feelings, *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(2): 267-286.
- Maleki, A., de Jong, M. (2014), A Proposal for Clustering the Dimensions of National Culture, *Cross-Cultural Research*, 48(2): 107–143.
- Mata, R., Josef, A., K., Hertwig, R. (2016), Propensity for risk taking Across the Life Span and Around the Globe, *Psychological Science*, 1–13.
- McSweeney, B. (2002), Hofstede's model of national cultural differences and their consequences: A triumph of faith – a failure of analysis, *Human Relations*, 55(1): 89–118.
- Minkov, M. (2018), A revision of Hofstede's model of national culture: old evidence and new data from 56 countries, *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management*, 25(2): 231-256.
- Oosterbeek, H., Sloof, R., Van De Kuilen, G. (2004), Cultural Differences in Ultimatum Game Experiments: Evidence from a Meta-Analysis, *Experimental Economics*, 7: 171–188.
- Placek, M., Pucek, M., Ochran, F., Krapek, M., Matyas, O., H., (2019), Risk Management for Cultural Organizations. The Example of Agricultural Museums in the Czech Republic, *Cultural Management: Science and Education*, 3(2): 111-122.
- Reiche, B. S., Carr, C., Pudelko, M. (2010), The role of culture at different levels of analysis, *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 10(2): 131–136.
- Reicher, R. (2018), Hungarian Millennials' Attitudes on Being Online, *Forum Scientiae Oeconomia*, 6(1): 5-18.
- Reis, N. R., Ferreira, M. P., Santos, J. C. (2013), A Bibliometric Study Of The Cultural Models In International Business Research, *Base – Revista de Administração e Contabilidade da Unisinos*, 10(4): 340-354.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2007), Cultural and Individual Value Correlates of Capitalism: A Comparative Analysis.
- Simonson, I. (1989), Choice based on reasons: The case of attraction and compromise effects, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16(2): 158-174.
- Sunstein, C., R. (2005), Precautions against What - The Availability Heuristic and Cross-Cultural Risk Perception Meador Lecture Series 2004-2005: Risk and the Law, *Alabama Law Review*, 57- 75
- Thaler, H. R., Tversky, A., Kahneman, D., Schwartz, A. (1997), The Effect Of Myopia and Loss Aversion

- sion On Risk Taking: An Experimental Test, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 647-661.
- Thaler, R. (1981), Some Empirical Evidence of Dynamic Inconsistency, *Economics Letter*, 8: 201-207.
- Thaler, R. (1999), Mental Accounting Matters, *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 12: 183-206.
- Thaler, R. T. (2017), Integrating Economics with Psychology. The Committee for the Prize in Economic Sciences in Memory of Alfred Nobel.
- Tremblay, P. R. (2002), Interviewing and Counseling Across Cultures: Heuristics and Biases, *Clinical Law Review*, 9(1): 373-416.
- Trompenaars, F., Hampden-Turner, Ch. (1998), *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Diversity in Global Business*, 2nd Edition, McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Tung, R. L., Verbeke, A. (2010), Beyond Hofstede and GLOBE: Improving the quality of cross-cultural research, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41: 1259-1274.
- Wang, M., Oliver, M., Hens, R. (2017), The impact of culture on loss aversion, *Behavioral Decision Making*, 30(2): 270-281.
- Williamson, D. (2002), Forward from a critique of Hofstede's model of national culture, *Human Relations*, 55(11): 1373-1395.
- Women's Liveability Index (2019), available at: <https://www.nestpick.com/womens-liveability-index-2019/> (accessed 10 May 2020).
- Wroblewski, Ł. (2017), *Culture Management: Strategy and marketing aspects*, Logos Verlag, Berlin.