

Retrospectives

The Ethology of *Homo Economicus*

Joseph Persky

This feature addresses the history of economic words and ideas. The hope is to deepen the workaday dialogue of economists, while perhaps casting light on ongoing questions. If you have suggestions for future topics or authors, please write to Joseph Persky, c/o *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Department of Economics (M/ C 144), The University of Illinois at Chicago, 601 S. Morgan St., Room 2103, Chicago, Illinois 60607-7121.

The Origin of Economic Man

When rummaging through the card catalog, one might easily infer that *homo economicus*¹ will soon appear on the endangered species list. As early as 1939, Peter Drucker warned of *The End of Economic Man*. By 1976, Harvey Leibenstein could see *Beyond Economic Man*. In 1986, David Marsden asked the perennial question: *The End of Economic Man?* And recently Marianne Ferber and Julie Nelson have described the territory *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics*. Despite these warnings, I suspect that the majority of economists remain confident of the survival of their favorite species. In fact, many see economic man as virtually the only civilized species in all of social

¹Before going any further we should note that Donald McCloskey tells us that *homo economicus* is better translated as “economic human” since a male adult would usually be designated by *vir* in Latin, while *homo* had a broader meaning. For a truly sexist economic man, McCloskey (1993, p. 79) suggests *vir economicus*. However, it is not clear that *homo economicus* preceded “economic man” in usage. See note 3 below.

■ *Joseph Persky is Professor of Economics, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.*

science. Given such conflicting assessments of his present status, a review of the origins, early character and natural history of economic man may prove useful.

While John Stuart Mill is generally identified as the creator of economic man, he never actually used this designation in his own writings. But the term did emerge in reaction to Mill's work. In its first appearances in the late nineteenth century, "economic man" carried a pejorative connotation reflecting the widespread hostility of the historical school toward Mill's theoretical abstractions. Economic man also raised the indignation of Victorian moralists shocked at the postulation of such blatant selfishness.²

For example, the earliest explicit naming of economic man that I have identified is in John Kells Ingram's *A History of Political Economy* (1888).³ Ingram, an advocate of a broad sociology in the tradition of Auguste Comte,⁴ took considerable pains to disparage John Stuart Mill's political economy, which "dealt not with real but with imaginary men—'economic men' . . . conceived as simply 'money-making animals'" (p. 218). Two years later, John Neville Keynes (1890) picked up (and singularized) the phrase in his much more extensive methodological treatment.⁵ Keynes's efforts, though considerably less hostile than Ingram's, still painted "an 'economic man,' whose activities are determined solely by the desire for wealth," and ascribed the origins of this tightly drawn abstraction to John Stuart Mill.

Like most caricatures, those drawn by Ingram and Keynes hardly did justice to their model. While Mill's economic man was admittedly simple, he was not trivial. To understand this economic man, we must turn to Mill's early field notes.

John Stuart Mill's Abstraction

John Stuart Mill's (1836) famous essay "On the Definition of Political Economy; and on the Method of Investigation Proper to It" described a hypothetical subject, whose narrow and well-defined motives made him a useful

²For a description of the historical school, see Leslie (1879). As to the confusion with ethical issues, see Goschen (1893). Of course, the question of the social consequences of self-interested behavior considerably antedates economic man and formal political economy. In this respect, see the insightful essay by Milton Myers (1983), *The Soul of Modern Economic Man*.

³The first use of the Latin *homo economicus* I turned up is in Vilfredo Pareto's *Manual* (1906, pp. 12–14), but I haven't done a serious search of continental sources. Schumpeter (1954, p. 156) pointed to B. Frigerio's usage of *economio prudente*, circa 1629, as a "common sense forerunner of the Economic Man." I suspect the formal christening of economic man late in the nineteenth century required as a prerequisite the major change in the name of our discipline from "political economy" to "economics," which occurred about the same time Ingram wrote.

⁴Comte argued for an unified social science that considered the complete range of human motives. Mill early on had been attracted to Comte's vision, but held that political economy be maintained as a separate discipline.

⁵"Economic man" must have been quite the buzzword around Cambridge that year since Marshall also used it the same year in his *Principles*. See Marshall (1890, p. vi, 26–27).

abstraction in economic analysis. At first glance it might seem that this economic man bears a striking resemblance to Ingram's and Keynes' caricatures. According to Mill (1836, p. 321), political economy:

... does not treat of the whole of man's nature as modified by the social state, nor of the whole conduct of man in society. It is concerned with him solely as a being who desires to possess wealth, and who is capable of judging the comparative efficacy of means for obtaining that end.

But on the same page Mill goes on to qualify this proposition strongly:

It [political economy] makes entire abstraction of every other human passion or motive; except those which may be regarded as perpetually antagonizing to the desire of wealth, namely, aversion to labour, and desire of the present enjoyment of costly indulgences. These it takes, to a certain extent, into its calculations, because these do not merely, like other desires, occasionally conflict with the pursuit of wealth, but accompany it always as a drag, or impediment, and are therefore inseparably mixed up in the consideration of it.

Thus economic man has a dash more character than the money-hungry monomaniac described by Ingram (1888). In addition to his underlying drive for accumulation, Mill's subject desires both luxury and leisure. And just a bit later in the essay, Mill (honest Victorian that he was) felt obligated to acknowledge that even at the level of abstract theory, we had better take account of economic man's passion for producing babies as summarized in the "principle of population."

All told, then, Mill's economic man has four distinct interests: accumulation, leisure, luxury and procreation; more than his critics maintained, but less than they might have desired. Mill argued that this number was quite enough, since in his view economic deduction worked best when focussed on well-defined and relatively simple abstractions. In his methodology, Mill did recognize a need to explore for "disturbing causes": forces not included in a theory that might be identified when discrepancies between prediction and empirical observations materialized. But no single theory could reasonably cover the full complexity of human motivation. Such efforts Mill considered both unnecessary and hopelessly indeterminate.

Mill's economic man is surely more complex than Mill's critics alleged. But we make a serious error if we read into this animal the modern identification of economic man with rationality itself. In much contemporary usage, the essence of economic man lies not in what he picks, but in his rational method for making choices.⁶ Whatever the usefulness of such a "rational-man" abstraction,

⁶Kirzner (1960) provides a clear history of the broad shift in economic theory from the classical concern with the production and distribution of wealth to Lionel Robbins's science of choice.

he hardly corresponds to Mill's insistence that the range of economic man's choices be kept quite limited. Only those motives "which may be regarded as perpetually antagonizing to the desire of wealth" are reasonable candidates. And we should note that within this narrow range of motives, Mill countenanced the likelihood that when it came to procreation, even economic man might not be all that rational.

Mill's economic man provides just enough psychological complexity to make him interesting. On the one hand, Mill argued that an expansion of economic man's range of motives risked indeterminacy. On the other, he recognized that without this modest psychological complexity, economic man would have no alternative but to work all day, regardless of incentives. Such a workaholic would behave exactly the same way in any institutional environment. But Mill recognized that a wide range of economic behaviors could be observed across industries, nations and epochs. He reasoned that a large portion of this variation in behavior could be traced to differing economic institutions. Indeed, Mill's central theoretical and empirical project was to use economic man, with his rudimentary but manageable psychology, to prove that institutions did matter.

Mill's Project: Economic Man and Economic Institutions

Mill (1848) began his great work, *Principles of Political Economy*, with a very Smithian discussion of the historical record of the wealth of nations. He observed that among modern societies, wide differences persisted in the level and distribution of wealth. These differences, Mill asserted, could not be traced merely to differences in physical conditions and knowledge. For Mill the key to comparative economics lay in exploring the interactions between human nature and institutions. As soon as we recognize that economic man considers several key tradeoffs in his behavior, we can imagine a society of economic men, each with strong interests in wealth, luxury, leisure and procreation, and attempt to determine the likely effects on them of differing institutions.

Among historians of economic thought, it has often been argued that when Mill came to write the *Principles* he deserted his monotonal and abstract economic man in favor of a broader approach. This interpretation is traceable to Leslie (1879) and repeated in various forms by Marshall, John Neville Keynes and Schumpeter. Along similar lines, several of these authors also accused Mill of deserting the deductive approach he advocated in his methodological writings in favor of an historical or inductive approach. As evidence of this inconsistency between Mill's early essay on economic man and his magnum opus on *Principles*, such critics have often pointed out the host of descriptive

details on alternative land tenure structures in the latter. However, I believe that much of this material relates directly to Mill's basic project of exploring the reactions of economic man to alternative institutional regimes.

For example, when Mill discusses peasant proprietors (1848, Book II, chaps. VI–VII), his concern centers on the influence of small-scale ownership as an incentive to work effort and accumulation and a discouragement to luxury and leisure. Acknowledging that there may be economies of scale associated with large agricultural enterprises, Mill's purpose is to determine whether the incentive effects of small-scale ownership are strong enough to act as an offset and raise overall production. His conclusion, based largely on reviewing empirical (and often anecdotal) writings, is that the incentive effects in question are quite strong indeed.

Mill (1848, Book II, chaps. VIII–X) follows a similar pattern in his treatment of metayers (British and French sharecroppers) and cottiers (Irish tenant farmers). In both cases he argues that the more divided the laborer from ownership, the less industrious the laborer. Mill's strong condemnation of cottier tenancy grows directly from this analysis of economic man in differing institutional settings. In considering the situation of Irish tenants, Mill (1848, p. 324) argues: "What race would not be indolent and insouciant when things are so arranged, that they derive no advantage from forethought or exertion." Or again: "It speaks nothing against the capacities of industry in human beings, that they will not exert themselves without motive. No labourers work harder, in England or America, than the Irish."

Even in Mill's famous chapter on the future of the working classes (1848, Book IV, chap. VII) we find that his central concern remains the response of economic man to institutional structures. A case can be made that this chapter, with its utopian schemes of profit sharing and joint ownership, is but an exercise in political sentimentalism at sharp odds with the rest of the *Principles* and quite distant from Mill's pure theory. But even here, I believe that Mill sticks closely to his basic approach. For him the central question always concerns the interaction of economic man and economic institutions. More specifically, in this chapter, Mill is searching for the best incentive system for manufacturing workers. Consciously echoing his theme with respect to land tenancy, Mill emphasizes the effectiveness of cooperative ownership and profit sharing in raising work effort and hence output. (Mill even suggests such forms might be best for agriculture as well.) Under a wage system, Mill (1848, p. 761) notes, the worker's "sole endeavor is to receive as much, and return as little in the shape of service as possible." Here is a solid economic man indeed. Mill concludes that radical institutional reforms will be needed to motivate such a species.

I certainly do not hold that the *Principles* rigidly limits its purview to economic man. Mill makes more than a few forays aimed at analyzing "disturbing causes." Yet, he repeatedly emphasizes how economic man, freed from

oppressive institutional forms, will produce a great deal more wealth.⁷ For Mill, the most promising institutions were laissez-faire in tone, but included radical reforms such as profit sharing. Far from having to make a choice between abstract a priori theory and the forces of historicism, sociologism and institutionalism, Mill demonstrates that much can be learned from considering a simple, but hardly trivial, view of human nature in interaction with diverse real world institutions. This methodology—using economic man as guinea pig in widely different institutional settings—remains an essential tool of modern economics.

Ethology and Character

While Mill often dealt with economic man as a given, he was also eager to analyze the evolution of economic man's preferences and passions. Throughout the *Principles*, Mill's discussions of incentives slipped almost seamlessly into explorations of the social psychology of tastes and character.

Strictly speaking, Mill viewed efforts to analyze the development of character as the proper task of ethology, a science he placed logically subsequent to elementary psychology. Ethology, according to Mill (1843, p. 869), was that science "which determines the kind of character produced in conformity to those general laws [of psychology], by any set of circumstances, physical and moral." In terms of Mill's grander scheme of sciences and arts, ethology (like political economy) produced *axiomata media*, or middle-level theory—logically precise deductions from admittedly shaky first principles that then could be applied in useful arts. Thus, the art corresponding to ethology was "education," or what today might be called "character building."

Working from the base of general ethology, Mill (1843, p. 905) argued that "economic ethology"⁸ would then construct "a theory of the causes which determine the type of character belonging to a people or to an age." Mill thought economic ethology was still in its infancy: "The causes of national character are scarcely at all understood, and the effect of institutions or social arrangements upon the character of the people is generally that portion of their effects which is least attended to, and least comprehended."

Despite Mill's assertion that little was known of economic ethology, in the *Principles* he repeatedly attempted deductions as to the economic ethology of

⁷While Mill often supported such deductions in the *Principles* with empirical data, I would argue that he used these data for the purpose of verification, not induction. However, the line between the two methods can be narrow, and this surely has been the source of the many claims that Mill adopted an inductive approach in the *Principles*.

⁸Actually Mill called this activity "political ethology," thus paralleling the field of political economy. In modern usage our discipline is called economics. Hence I think the term "economic ethology" is faithful to the spirit of the original, while being more easily understood by modern readers.

economic man. At any given time, economic man could be expected to respond differently to different institutions. This was political economy. Over time, continuous exposure to a particular set of institutions could be expected to influence the very tastes of economic man. This was economic ethology.

Thus Mill (1848, p. 286), in analyzing the character of peasant proprietors, argues that small land ownership in addition to developing mental faculties is “propitious to the moral virtues of prudence, temperance, and self-control.” Or in a very different context, when discussing inheritance, Mill argues that an early life of luxury predisposes the younger children of the nobility to extravagant consumption.

In many of his examples, Mill applies what might be called a Lamarckian view to the development of character: the notion that more or less rational choices made by one generation predispose the tastes of subsequent generations to reinforce similar choices.⁹ The incentives facing the peasant lead to energetic effort, which becomes a way of life and even a passion. A choice of luxurious consumption by the parents becomes a taste in the children. Mill wavers on precisely how persistent an effect such acculturation has on economic man. At some points he implies that national characteristics rooted in long custom can only be changed gradually. On other occasions he suggests a change of institutional regimes will have almost instantaneous results; for example, in his discussion of Irish character quoted above, he virtually rules out an intergenerational perpetuation of lassitude once individuals are removed from oppressive institutional conditions.

Closely related to this question of the cultural persistence of economic man’s tastes is that of his social-historical origins. Virtually no economist in the last half of the nineteenth century claimed that history, or even economic history, could be understood only through the lens of economic man. A common view, championed by Walter Bagehot (1879), held that the motives and tastes typical of economic man were themselves a product of the spread of commerce. Bagehot (p. 106) saw economic man as a product of societies where “the commercial element is the greatest element.” Thus, the logic of economic man implicit in political economy could only be applied to such communities: “In so far as nations are occupied in ‘buying and selling,’ in so far will Political Economy, the exclusive theory of men buying and selling, come out right, and be true.” Bagehot (p. 104) thought political economy an appropriate tool for studying England where it might be “exactly true.” Yet for much of the world and much of history, economic man played little role. In a military-slave power like Rome or “Oriental nations” fixed in custom, Bagehot (p. 106) wrote: “The

⁹Late in the nineteenth century, J. B. de Monet Lamarck was responsible for the view, now in disrepute, that environment can cause structural changes in animals or plants that are then genetically transmitted to future generations.

money-getting element is a most subordinate one in their minds; its effects are very subordinate ones in their lives.”

In places, Mill anticipated this more limited historical and geographic vision of economic man. In his *Logic* (1843), he had suggested: “In political economy . . . empirical laws of human nature are tacitly assumed by English thinkers, which are calculated only for Great Britain and the United States.” Mill did not have to go as far as Asia or back to Roman history to find the antithesis of economic man. He wrote (1843, p. 906) that those “who know the habits of the Continent of Europe are aware how apparently small a motive often outweighs the desire of money-getting, even in the operations which have money-getting for their direct object.”

Such observations remained uncharacteristic of the creator of economic man. More typically, Mill defended the basic psychological construct of economic man as primary for the purposes of political economy and argued that peculiarities of national character at odds with this psychology could be treated as secondary disturbing causes. Moreover, the trend of history was moving in economic man’s favor. As Bagehot emphasized, commercial activities occupied an increasingly central position in most countries. If exposure to commerce changed tastes, then economic man might yet be universal.

Soviet Man, Feminist Economics and Parsimonious Psychology

The science of ethology has a quaint nineteenth-century ring, but the questions raised by Mill are still of importance to economics. The origin and persistence of economic motives have striking implications for public policy today. The usefulness of a whole range of public and private bureaucratic reforms, including antipoverty initiatives, welfare reform, affirmative action and foreign assistance all rest on the extent to which changing economic incentives can have rapid and predictable effects on the behavior of the relevant population. Economists who have ventured into these areas of research are carrying out, perhaps unknowingly, Mill’s ethological program. For the most part, their results support the broad usefulness of Mill’s original conception of economic man.

For example, Robert Shiller, Maxim Boycko and Valdimir Korobov (1992) provide a striking example of ethological research in their recent article, “Hunting for *Homo Sovieticus*: Situational versus Attitudinal Factors in Economic Behavior.” In their questionnaire approach they focus on differences in national economic character and especially differences between the United States and Russia. Mill would easily recognize their concern with the tradeoffs people make between work and leisure and between current and future consumption. In addition, they put considerable emphasis on possible national differences in attitudes toward risk taking, a dimension not emphasized in Mill’s original discussion, but much discussed in his *Principles*. Shiller, Boycko

and Korobov (1992) also explore the tradeoff between fortune and fame, finding significant minority interest in fame across all the countries studied, a finding that might give Mill pause. Their discussion guardedly concludes that situations—constraints and institutions—as opposed to attitudes account for the bulk of the economic lethargy of former Soviet citizens. Much of what they write parallels Mill's own discussion of the Irish.

Shiller, Boycko and Korobov (1992) clearly are doing ethology. Interestingly enough, these modern day ethologists don't seem to require a much wider universe of preferences than Mill made do with. *Homo Sovieticus* appears as a surprisingly close cousin of *homo economicus*.

In a rather different context, much of recent feminist writing can also be viewed from Mill's methodological perspective. Feminists emphasize that traditional economics puts too much weight on men's choices and too little on women's constraints. Feminists have brought attention to the long-neglected role of social and institutional constraints in limiting the economic productivity, achievements and welfare of women. Such efforts, even as they illustrate the influences of patriarchy, draw heavily on Mill's project. Like Mill, at root, they are concerned with the economic implications of oppressive or discriminatory institutional constraints.

None of these feminist arguments should cause problems for consistent nineteenth-century liberals. And surely such liberals must now recognize the hypocrisy of not a few of their comrades. Feminists have done considerable service in pointing out the striking contradictions of liberal economists who repeatedly insisted on excluding women from the domain of *homo economicus*, making a special psychology of economic dependence for them. Michele Pujole (1992) provides fine critiques of the patriarchal views of Edgeworth, Marshall and Pigou. Pujole shows that each of these liberal authors had a double standard for approaching the psychology of men and women, which they used to justify highly illiberal policy recommendations. Even Mill, the author of *The Subjection of Women*, does not escape from Pujole's scrutiny.

Beyond the liberal documentation of enforced constraints, feminist writers have also launched a broad critique of modern economic practice (Strassmann, 1993; Folbre and Hartmann, 1988; Nelson, 1993, and this issue). To an extent, this work has taken Mill's ethological perspective. Like Mill, these writers show serious concern for the process of character building in the development of both women and men. Such concerns are the stuff of ethology. But unlike Mill, some of these modern feminists have generally denied the need for a parsimonious psychology. They have called for a wholesale revision of the psychology of economic persons. Like Comte, they have proposed a virtually universal social science.

The issue here is not the desirability of such a social science, but rather its feasibility. The danger arises not from well-reasoned adjustments to economic man's short list of motives, but from losing sight of Mill's methodological insistence on parsimony. Motives such as status, security, creativity, sociability

and a concern for social reproduction have all been suggested by feminists as relevant to the economic behavior of men and women. I suspect Mill himself would not have rejected out-of-hand such feminist efforts to reconsider the basic drives relevant to economics. As several of the passages above make clear, Mill at times argued the need for a broader economic ethology. Yet Mill would have counselled that any additions to the list of basic drives be winnowed to a minimum. Fundamental to Mill's methodology was his effort to limit economic reasoning to a significant but manageable set of human motives.

Many groups over the years, starting with the historical school and including American institutionalists, have recognized that humans were a good deal more complex than the economic man Mill had suggested. Like some of today's feminists, these groups have offered a wide range of competing motives and behaviors. But their lists were so long and unwieldy that they virtually excluded tightly reasoned generalizations. Their method could perhaps generate history, but not economics.

The message to derive from Mill's *homo economicus* is not that humans are greedy, not that man is rational, but that social science works best when it ruthlessly limits its range. It is useful and serious work to explore alternative bases. But to compete successfully against economic man, a new ethology must be parsimonious; it must clearly specify the relevant psychological makeup of economic agents; and it must demonstrate that such a system yields better and/or new insights. In models where everything affects everything else, social scientists have little ability to draw inferences. Perhaps the "economic" in "economic man" relates as much to his parsimonious psychology as to his fascination with wealth.

■ *I would like to thank Victoria Persky, Carl Shapiro and Timothy Taylor for their useful comments on this piece.*

References

- Bagehot, Walter**, "The Preliminaries of Political Economy," 1879. In *Economic Studies*. Reprint, London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1902.
- Drucker, Peter**, *The End of Economic Man: A Study of the New Totalitarianism*. New York: John Day Co., 1939.
- Ferber, Marianne, and Julie Nelson, eds.**, *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Folbre, Nancy, and Heidi Hartmann**, "The Rhetoric of Self-interest: Ideology of Gender in Economic Theory." In Klamer, Arjo, Donald McCloskey, and Robert Solow, eds., *The Consequences of Economic Rhetoric*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. 184–203.
- Goschen, George**, "Ethics and Economics," *Economic Journal*, September 1893, 3, 377–87.
- Ingram, John Kells**, *A History of Political Economy*. 1888. Reprint, New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1967.
- Keynes, John Neville**, *The Scope and Method of Political Economy*. 1890. Reprint, New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1963.
- Kirzner, Israel**, *The Economic Point of View: An Essay in the History of Economic Thought*. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand, 1960.
- Leibenstein, Harvey**, *Beyond Economic Man: A New Foundation for Microeconomics*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Leslie, T. E. Cliffe**, "The Love of Money," "On the Philosophical Method in Political Economy," and "Political Economy and Sociology." In *Essays in Political Economy*. 1879. Reprint, New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1969, pp. 1–18, 163–90, 191–220, respectively.
- Marsden, David**, *The End of Economic Man?: Custom and Competition in Labour Markets*. Brighton: Wheatshaf Books, 1986.
- Marshall, Alfred**, *Principals of Economics*. 9th (variorum) ed. 1890. Reprint, London: Macmillan, 1961.
- McCloskey, Donald**, "Some Consequences of a Conjective Economics." In Ferber, M., and J. Nelson, eds., *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993, pp. 69–93.
- Mill, John Stuart**, "On the Definition of Political Economy; and on the Method of Investigation Proper to It," *London and Westminster Review*, October 1836. Reprint, Mill, *Essays on Some Unsettled Questions of Political Economy*. 1844. Reprint, *Collected Works*. Vol. 4. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967, pp. 120–64.
- Mill, John Stuart**, *A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive*. 1843. Reprint, *Collected Works*. Vol. 8. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.
- Mill, John Stuart**, *Principles of Political Economy with Some of their Applications to Social Philosophy*. 1848. Reprint, Ashley, W. J., ed., London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1929.
- Myers, Milton**, *The Soul of Modern Economic Man: Ideas of Self-Interest, Thomas Hobbes to Adam Smith*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.
- Nelson, Julie**, "The Case of Choice or the Study of Provisioning? Gender and the Definition of Economics." In Ferber, M., and J. Nelson, eds., *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993, pp. 23–36.
- Pareto, Vilfredo**, *Manual of Political Economy*. 1906. Reprint, Ann Schwier, trans., New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1971, a translation of the 1927 French edition.
- Pujole, Michele**, *Feminism and Anti-Feminism in Early Economic Thought*. Hants, Eng.: Edward Elgar, 1992.
- Reskin, Barbara, and Heidi Hartmann, eds.**, *Women's Work, Men's Work*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1986.
- Schumpeter, Joseph**, *History of Economic Analysis*. Schumpeter, Elizabeth, ed., New York: Oxford University Press, 1954.
- Shiller, Robert, Maxim Boycko, and Vladimir Korobov**, "Hunting for Homo Sovieticus: Situational versus Attitudinal Factors in Economic Behavior," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1992, no. 1, 127–81.
- Strassman, Diana**, "Not a Free Market: The Rhetoric of Disciplinary Authority in Economics." In Ferber, M., and J. Nelson, eds., *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993, pp. 54–68.

This article has been cited by:

1. Florian Fuchs, Volker Lingnau. 2024. The Homo Economicus as a Prototype of a Psychopath? A Conceptual Analysis and Implications for Business Research and Teaching. *Journal of Business Ethics* 29. . [[Crossref](#)]
2. David C. Rose. Political Economy, Moral Reasoning, and Global Warming 79-96. [[Crossref](#)]
3. Maria Soledad Pera, Federica Cena, Monica Landoni, Cataldo Musto, Alain D. Starke. Human Factors in User Modeling for Intelligent Systems 3-42. [[Crossref](#)]
4. Rui Falcão, Maria João Carneiro, António Carrizo Moreira. 2023. Why do business angels invest? Uncovering angels' goals. *Cogent Business & Management* 10:2. . [[Crossref](#)]
5. Guangkuan Deng, Jianyu Zhang, Lijuan He, Ying Xu. 2023. Research on the impact of e-commerce platform's AI resources on seller opportunism: a cultivational governance mechanism. *Nankai Business Review International* 14:4, 720-745. [[Crossref](#)]
6. Syed Sibghatullah Shah, Tariq Shah. 2023. Responsible consumption choices and individual values: an algebraic interactive approach. *Mind & Society* 22:1-2, 1-32. [[Crossref](#)]
7. Phoebe Koundouri, Barbara Hammer, Ulrike Kuhl, Alina Velias. 2023. Behavioral Economics and Neuroeconomics of Environmental Values. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* 15:1, 153-176. [[Crossref](#)]
8. Anna Olga Kuzminska, Agata Gasiorowska, Tomasz Zaleskiewicz. 2023. Market mindset hinders interpersonal trust: The exposure to market relationships makes people trust less through elevated proportional thinking and reduced state empathy. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 76:8, 1830-1851. [[Crossref](#)]
9. Thomas Holtfort, Andreas Horsch. 2023. Social science goes quantum: explaining human decision-making, cognitive biases and Darwinian selection from a quantum perspective. *Journal of Bioeconomics* 25:2, 99-116. [[Crossref](#)]
10. Wojciech Kaftanski. 2023. Defining collective irrationality of COVID-19: shared mentality, mimicry, affective contagion, and psychosocial adaptivity. *Frontiers in Psychology* 14. . [[Crossref](#)]
11. Francisco Gómez-García, Ángela Ruiz-Guillermo. 2023. La influencia de la obra de Vilfredo Pareto en el análisis económico moderno: ¿Un obstáculo al desarrollo de la economía de la felicidad?. *Iberian Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 10:1, 1-10. [[Crossref](#)]
12. Quan-Hoang Vuong, Tam-Tri Le, Viet-Phuong La, Thu-Trang Vuong, Minh-Hoang Nguyen. 2023. Investigation into the Rationale of Migration Intention Due to Air Pollution Integrating the Homo Oeconomicus Traits. *Urban Science* 7:2, 59. [[Crossref](#)]
13. Alberto Acerbi, Pier Luigi Sacco. 2023. Self-Interest, prosociality, and the moral cognition of markets: A comparative analysis of the Theory of Moral Sentiments and the Wealth of Nations. *Rationality and Society* 41, 104346312311704. [[Crossref](#)]
14. Joseph Tanke. 2023. The gentle way in governing: Foucault and the question of neoliberalism. *Philosophy & Social Criticism* 49:3, 257-282. [[Crossref](#)]
15. Robin Schimmelpfennig, Michael Muthukrishna. 2023. Cultural evolutionary behavioural science in public policy. *Behavioural Public Policy* 31, 1-31. [[Crossref](#)]
16. Thomas F. Phillips. Economic Man 594-596. [[Crossref](#)]
17. Andrea Lučić, Dajana Barbić, Marija Uzelać. 2023. Theoretical underpinnings of consumers' financial capability research. *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 47:1, 373-399. [[Crossref](#)]
18. Robertas Damasevicius. 2023. Progress, Evolving Paradigms and Recent Trends in Economic Analysis. *Financial Economics Letters* 2:2. . [[Crossref](#)]

19. Lotte Nystrup Lund. Ideas and Logics of Protesting Citizens, Their Actions and Use of Artefacts. A Case Study of Protest Actions and Activist Performance Advocating Biodiversity Beyond the Formal Frameworks of Urban Development 835-851. [[Crossref](#)]
20. Ebru IŞIK. 2022. Adam-Akım İktisadın Öznesi “Homoeconomicus”u Toplumsal Cinsiyet Gözlüğü ile Okumak. *Politik Ekonomik Kuram* 6:2, 396-421. [[Crossref](#)]
21. Katherine Ruff. 2022. In support of making up users. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 88, 102325. [[Crossref](#)]
22. Michele Bee, Maxime Desmarais-Tremblay. 2022. THE BIRTH OF HOMO ECONOMICUS : THE METHODOLOGICAL DEBATE ON THE ECONOMIC AGENT FROM J. S. MILL TO V. PARETO. *Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 4, 1-26. [[Crossref](#)]
23. Andrew J. Collins, Sheida Etemadidavan. 2022. Humans and the core partition: An agent-based modeling experiment. *PLOS ONE* 17:9, e0273961. [[Crossref](#)]
24. Yi Yang Teoh, Cendri A. Hutcherson. 2022. The Games We Play: Prosocial Choices Under Time Pressure Reflect Context-Sensitive Information Priorities. *Psychological Science* 33:9, 1541-1556. [[Crossref](#)]
25. Martin Svensson, Mattias Jacobsson. 2022. Managing inconsistencies in medical decision-making: An eight-fold typology. *European Management Journal* 9. . [[Crossref](#)]
26. Angela V Flynn. 2022. Solidarity and collectivism in the context of COVID-19. *Nursing Ethics* 29:5, 1198-1208. [[Crossref](#)]
27. Manuel F. Vieites. 2022. Aprender a actuar: idea y relevancia de la educación dramática. *Márgenes Revista de Educación de la Universidad de Málaga* 3:2, 9-30. [[Crossref](#)]
28. D. Shane Miller, Stephen B. Carmody. 2022. Fire on the Mountain: The Ideal Free Distribution and Early Hunter-gatherer Demography in the Tennessee River Drainage, USA. *Environmental Archaeology* 27:4, 357-371. [[Crossref](#)]
29. Ann C. Rumble, Kevin Willcox, Hirotaka Imada, Dejah Yansen. 2022. Beyond Reciprocity: Forgiveness, Generosity, and Punishment in Continuing Dyadic Interactions. *Journal of Theoretical Social Psychology* 2022, 1-19. [[Crossref](#)]
30. Jose P. Arrieta, Yash R. Shrestha. 2022. On the strategic value of equifinal choice. *Journal of Organization Design* 11:2, 37-45. [[Crossref](#)]
31. Ebru IŞIK. 2022. ADAM-AKIM İKTİSADIN ÖZNESİ “HOMOECONOMICUS”U TOPLUMSAL CİNSİYET GÖZLÜĞÜ İLE OKUMAK. *Hakkari Review* . [[Crossref](#)]
32. Victor I. Espinosa, William Hongsong Wang, Jesús Huerta de Soto. 2022. Principles of Nudging and Boosting: Steering or Empowering Decision-Making for Behavioral Development Economics. *Sustainability* 14:4, 2145. [[Crossref](#)]
33. Agata Gasiorowska, Tomasz Zaleskiewicz. 2022. Can We Get Social Assistance Without Losing Agency? Engaging in Market Relationships as an Alternative to Searching for Help from Others. *Psychological Inquiry* 33:1, 38-41. [[Crossref](#)]
34. Ricardo F. Crespo. The Identity of the Economic Agent 77-100. [[Crossref](#)]
35. Laura McHale. The Curious Case of Phineas Gage 29-34. [[Crossref](#)]
36. Sara Pluviano. Information Biases 605-609. [[Crossref](#)]
37. Anne Birgitta Pessi, Anna Martta Seppänen, Jenni Spännäri, Henrietta Grönlund, Frank Martela, Miia Paakkanen. 2022. In search of copassion: Creating a novel concept to promote re-enchantment at work. *BRQ Business Research Quarterly* 25:1, 82-97. [[Crossref](#)]
38. Laura McHale. Der seltsame Fall des Phineas Gage 33-39. [[Crossref](#)]

39. Quan Hoang Vuong, Tam-Tri Le, Viet-Phuong La, Thu-Trang Vuong, Minh-Hoang Nguyen. 2022. Investigation into the Rationale of Migration Intention Due to Air Pollution Integrating the Homo Oeconomicus Traits. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 44. . [[Crossref](#)]
40. Xiang Yuan, Luyao Wang, Xicheng Yin, Hongwei Wang. 2021. How text sentiment moderates the impact of motivational cues on crowdfunding campaigns. *Financial Innovation* 7:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
41. Leszek Sieczko, Anna Justyna Parzonko, Anna Sieczko. 2021. Trust in Collective Entrepreneurship in the Context of the Development of Rural Areas in Poland. *Agriculture* 11:11, 1151. [[Crossref](#)]
42. Galit Ailon. 2021. The Phenomenology of Homo Economicus. *KANT Social Sciences & Humanities* 8:4, 16-31. [[Crossref](#)]
43. Haram Lee. 2021. The Empiricist Origin of Biopolitics: Freedom and Potentiality in John Locke. *Philosophia* 49:4, 1583-1600. [[Crossref](#)]
44. Hardivizon, Muhammad Sholihin. 2021. Hybrid Rationality behind Customers' Choices of the Islamic Banks : An Experience of Bengkulu, Indonesia. *Journal of Islamic Thought and Civilization* 11:1, 175-200. [[Crossref](#)]
45. Didem Özkiziltan. 2021. Goodbye labouring man , long live homo economicus : the new precarity in the world of work. *Globalizations* 18:4, 499-515. [[Crossref](#)]
46. Sebastian Kretschmer, Bettina Langfeldt, Christian Herzig, Thomas Krikser. 2021. The Organic Mindset: Insights from a Mixed Methods Grounded Theory (MM-GT) Study into Organic Food Systems. *Sustainability* 13:9, 4724. [[Crossref](#)]
47. Manolis Manioudis, Dimitra Giardoglou. 2021. Surveying Financial Decisions? From Homo Economicus to Historical Specificity and J.S. Mill's Cultural-Institutional Individualism. *Journal of Business Accounting and Finance Perspectives* 3:1, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
48. Giorgos Meramveliotakis, Manolis Manioudis. 2021. History, Knowledge, and Sustainable Economic Development: The Contribution of John Stuart Mill's Grand Stage Theory. *Sustainability* 13:3, 1468. [[Crossref](#)]
49. Simon Munzert, Peter Selb, Anita Gohdes, Lukas F. Stoetzer, Will Lowe. 2021. Tracking and promoting the usage of a COVID-19 contact tracing app. *Nature Human Behaviour* 5:2, 247-255. [[Crossref](#)]
50. Hardy Hanappi, Edeltraud Hanappi-Egger. 2021. Social Identity and Class Consciousness. *Forum for Social Economics* 50:1, 124-151. [[Crossref](#)]
51. Yoshifumi Ozawa. John Stuart Mill on Self-interest: Focusing on His Political Economy and the Principles 85-105. [[Crossref](#)]
52. Tanusree Dutta, Manas Kumar Mandal. Consumer Happiness and Decision Making: The Way Forward 153-161. [[Crossref](#)]
53. Alessandra Duz, Matteo Corno. 2021. Flexible Pricing Strategies in Electric Free-Floating Bicycle Sharing. *IEEE Access* 9, 152972-152983. [[Crossref](#)]
54. Michael P. Schlaile. A Case for Economemetics? Why Evolutionary Economists Should Re-evaluate the (F)utility of Memetics 33-68. [[Crossref](#)]
55. Ivana Anton Mlinar, Ricardo F. Crespo. Identity Theories in Economics: A Phenomenological Approach 193-211. [[Crossref](#)]
56. John Hartley. 2021. Zombie Semiotics and the Economics of the Apocalypse. *Recherches sémiotiques* 41:1, 269-288. [[Crossref](#)]
57. Yi Yang Teoh, Ziqing Yao, William A. Cunningham, Cendri A. Hutcherson. 2020. Attentional priorities drive effects of time pressure on altruistic choice. *Nature Communications* 11:1. . [[Crossref](#)]

58. Erin N. Bodine, Robert M. Panoff, Eberhard O. Voit, Anton E. Weisstein. 2020. Agent-Based Modeling and Simulation in Mathematics and Biology Education. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* **82**:8. . [[Crossref](#)]
59. Alina Mirela Teacu Parincu, Alexandru Capatina, David Juarez Varon, Pablo Ferreiros Bennet, Ana Mengual Recuerda. 2020. Neuromanagement: the scientific approach to contemporary management. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Business Excellence* **14**:1, 1046-1056. [[Crossref](#)]
60. Esra KILIÇ, Mehmet Mubarek ALAN. 2020. İnsanın Üç Yüzü; Homoeconomicus, Homoislamicus ve True Man: “Takva” Filmi Üzerinden Bir Değerlendirme. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi* **9**:2, 801-827. [[Crossref](#)]
61. Xiang Yuan, Hongwei Wang. 2020. How linguistic cues affect the motivation of capital-giving in crowdfunding: a self-determination theory perspective. *New Review of Hypermedia and Multimedia* **26**:1-2, 1-23. [[Crossref](#)]
62. Vitantonio Gioia. 2020. From “prudent man” to homo oeconomicus: Does historicity matter for the category of individualism?. *International Review of Economics* **67**:1, 47-67. [[Crossref](#)]
63. Friedrich Lohmann. Anthropological Underpinnings of Business Ethics and Work Ethics in Relation to Business Legitimacy 53-68. [[Crossref](#)]
64. Margit Neisig. Human Resource Management and Business Legitimacy: Changing Roles and Legitimacy-as-Process 1079-1100. [[Crossref](#)]
65. Friedrich Lohmann. Anthropological Underpinnings of Business Ethics and Work Ethics in Relation to Business Legitimacy 1-17. [[Crossref](#)]
66. Roger Frantz. Two beginnings 9-24. [[Crossref](#)]
67. . References 207-231. [[Crossref](#)]
68. Sreedevi Somadas Kottayil, Panagiotis Tsoleridis, Kacper Rossa, Richard Connors, Charles Fox. 2020. Investigation of Driver Route Choice Behaviour using Bluetooth Data. *Transportation Research Procedia* **48**, 632-645. [[Crossref](#)]
69. Hatice Isil Alkan. A Challenge to Homo Economicus: Behavioral Economics 181-200. [[Crossref](#)]
70. Christopher Johnstone, Sheryl Lazarus, Predrag Lazetic, Gordana Nikolic. 2019. Resourcing inclusion: Introducing finance perspectives to inclusive education policy rhetoric. *PROSPECTS* **47**:4, 339-359. [[Crossref](#)]
71. Laura Valladão de Mattos. 2019. O desafio historicista à economia política: uma análise do debate metodológico na Inglaterra na década de 1870. *Economia e Sociedade* **28**:3, 641-663. [[Crossref](#)]
72. Thomas A. Loughran. 2019. Behavioral criminology and public policy. *Criminology & Public Policy* **18**:4, 737-758. [[Crossref](#)]
73. Tomasz Kopczewski, Iana Okhrimenko. 2019. Can homo economicus be an altruist? A classroom experimental method. *International Review of Economics Education* **32**, 100167. [[Crossref](#)]
74. Robin Maialeh. 2019. Generalization of results and neoclassical rationality: unresolved controversies of behavioural economics methodology. *Quality & Quantity* **53**:4, 1743-1761. [[Crossref](#)]
75. Nan Enstad. 2019. The “Sonorous Summons” of the New History of Capitalism, Or, What Are We Talking about When We Talk about Economy?. *Modern American History* **2**:1, 83-95. [[Crossref](#)]
76. Alexander Bassen, Katrin Gödker, Florian Lüdeke-Freund, Josua Oll. 2019. Climate Information in Retail Investors’ Decision-Making: Evidence From a Choice Experiment. *Organization & Environment* **32**:1, 62-82. [[Crossref](#)]
77. Michael Muthukrishna, Joseph Henrich. 2019. A problem in theory. *Nature Human Behaviour* **3**:3, 221-229. [[Crossref](#)]

78. Maria Gabriella Baldarelli, Antonietta Cosentino, Mara Del Baldo, Angela Magistro. Toward the Theory of Enterprise: Dialogue Between Business and Economics Women Scholars 59-81. [[Crossref](#)]
79. Estrella Trincado. Adam Smith 87-117. [[Crossref](#)]
80. Svein Olaf Thorbjørnsen. Competition and the Economy: Historical Perspectives 115-152. [[Crossref](#)]
81. Alain Anquetil, Thomas Hoerber. Conclusion 239-257. [[Crossref](#)]
82. Margit Neisig. Human Resource Management and Business Legitimacy: Changing Roles and Legitimacy-as-Process 1-22. [[Crossref](#)]
83. Yi Ding, Yonghua Song, Hongxun Hui, Changzheng Shao. Heterogeneous Air Conditioner Aggregation for Providing Operating Reserve Considering Price Signals 29-47. [[Crossref](#)]
84. Girts Racko. 2019. The Values of Economics. *Journal of Business Ethics* **154**:1, 35-48. [[Crossref](#)]
85. Thomas J. L. van Rompay, Bob M. Fennis. Full-Bodied Taste: On the Embodied Origins of Product Perception and Sensory Evaluation 163-190. [[Crossref](#)]
86. Dajana Barbić, Andrea Lučić, James Ming Chen. 2019. Measuring responsible financial consumption behaviour. *International Journal of Consumer Studies* **43**:1, 102-112. [[Crossref](#)]
87. Xabier Arrizabalo, Patricia Pinto, Lucía Vicent. 2019. Historical Significance of Labor's Increased Precariousness in Germany, the United Kingdom, and Spain. *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* **78**:1, 255-290. [[Crossref](#)]
88. Dante A. Urbina, Alberto Ruiz-Villaverde. 2019. A Critical Review of Homo Economicus from Five Approaches. *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* **78**:1, 63-93. [[Crossref](#)]
89. Werner De Bondt, Marie Pfiffelmann, Patrick Roger. 2018. Richard Thaler: The anomalies of life. *Finance* **Vol. 39**:1, 9-34. [[Crossref](#)]
90. Anton Vaskovskiy. 2018. Genesis of behavioral economics and its applicability in public finance. *Český finanční a účetní časopis* **2018**:3, 57-77. [[Crossref](#)]
91. Marlyse Pouchol. 2018. Homo oeconomicus ou animal laborans . L'agent économique est-il le devenir de l'être humain ?. *Revue de philosophie économique* **Vol. 19**:1, 135-167. [[Crossref](#)]
92. Lynda Ng. 2018. Sino-liberalism: the socialist market and the neoliberal concept of freedom. *Globalizations* **15**:5, 608-621. [[Crossref](#)]
93. Julen Gonzalez-Redin, J. Gareth Polhill, Terence P. Dawson, Rosemary Hill, Iain J. Gordon. 2018. It's not the 'what', but the 'how': Exploring the role of debt in natural resource (un)sustainability. *PLOS ONE* **13**:7, e0201141. [[Crossref](#)]
94. S. Kuzmuk. 2018. The socialization of economy in the context of transformational changes in the economy. *Ekonomična teoriâ* **2018**:2, 41-58. [[Crossref](#)]
95. Ana Maria Peredo, Nick Montgomery, Murdith McLean. 2018. The BoP business paradigm: what it promotes and what it conceals. *Oxford Development Studies* **46**:3, 411-429. [[Crossref](#)]
96. Qili Wang, Wei Xu, Han Zheng. 2018. Combining the wisdom of crowds and technical analysis for financial market prediction using deep random subspace ensembles. *Neurocomputing* **299**, 51-61. [[Crossref](#)]
97. Christophe Schinckus, Cinla Akdere. 2018. Duality of knowledge, singularity of method. *Journal of Asian Business and Economic Studies* **25**:1, 163-184. [[Crossref](#)]
98. Mauro Boianovsky. 2018. 2017 HES PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: ECONOMISTS AND THEIR TRAVELS, OR THE TIME WHEN JFK SENT DOUGLASS NORTH ON A MISSION TO BRAZIL. *Journal of the History of Economic Thought* **40**:2, 149-177. [[Crossref](#)]
99. Samuel A. Chambers. 2018. Undoing Neoliberalism: Homo Oeconomicus , Homo Politicus , and the Zōon Politikon. *Critical Inquiry* **44**:4, 706-732. [[Crossref](#)]

100. Rômulo Carvalho Cristaldo, Juliana Rodrigues de Senna, Lara Sousa Matos. 2018. The founding narratives of the myth of economic development and the Brazilian neo-developmentalism. *Revista de Administração Pública* 52:3, 527-553. [[Crossref](#)]
101. Thomas Reimer, Martin Benkenstein. 2018. Not just for the recommender: How eWOM incentives influence the recommendation audience. *Journal of Business Research* 86, 11-21. [[Crossref](#)]
102. Dunjian Xie, Hongxun Hui, Yi Ding, Zhenzhi Lin. 2018. Operating reserve capacity evaluation of aggregated heterogeneous TCLs with price signals. *Applied Energy* 216, 338-347. [[Crossref](#)]
103. Michael Mew, Gerald Steiner, Bernhard Geissler. 2018. Phosphorus Supply Chain—Scientific, Technical, and Economic Foundations: A Transdisciplinary Orientation. *Sustainability* 10:4, 1087. [[Crossref](#)]
104. Thomas F. Phillips. Economic Man 1-2. [[Crossref](#)]
105. Björn Röber. Rationality as the Basic Criterion for the Evaluation of Judgment and Decision-Making Processes 11-50. [[Crossref](#)]
106. Christopher Schlick, Ralph Bruder, Holger Luczak. Arbeitswissenschaft im Umriss: Disziplinen- und Konzeptstruktur 1-58. [[Crossref](#)]
107. Martine Deparis, Ekaterina Voropanova. Le rapport à l'espace et au temps du consommateur connecté en mobilité 325-343. [[Crossref](#)]
108. F. M. Resende, G. W. Fernandes, D. C. Andrade, H. D. Néder. 2017. Economic valuation of the ecosystem services provided by a protected area in the Brazilian Cerrado: application of the contingent valuation method. *Brazilian Journal of Biology* 77:4, 762-773. [[Crossref](#)]
109. Laura Thomas-Walters, Nichola J Raihani. 2017. Supporting Conservation: The Roles of Flagship Species and Identifiable Victims. *Conservation Letters* 10:5, 581-587. [[Crossref](#)]
110. Kamilè TAUJANSKAITĖ, Eugenijus MILČIUS, Nomedas DOBROVOLSKIENĖ. 2017. USE OF QUANTITATIVE CRITERIA IN THE MANAGEMENT OF PERSONAL CONSUMPTION EXPENDITURE: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES. *Journal of Business Economics and Management* 18:3, 468-486. [[Crossref](#)]
111. Kevin Hargaden. 2017. Calling for a Time-Out: The Theology of Disability Sport and The Broader Understanding of Competition. *Journal of Disability & Religion* 21:2, 201-214. [[Crossref](#)]
112. Michael Leese. 2017. Kapêloi and Economic Rationality in Fourth-Century B.C.E. Athens. *Illinois Classical Studies* 42:1, 41-59. [[Crossref](#)]
113. Pavlo Illiashenko. 2017. Behavioral Finance: History and Foundations. *Visnyk of the National Bank of Ukraine* :239, 28-54. [[Crossref](#)]
114. Dennis Attick. 2017. Homo Economicus at School: Neoliberal Education and Teacher as Economic Being. *Educational Studies* 53:1, 37-48. [[Crossref](#)]
115. Ulfried Reichardt. Wall Street and Representations of Masculinity in Contemporary American Film and Fiction 219-232. [[Crossref](#)]
116. Shane A. Scaggs, Karen S. Fulk, Delaney Glass, John P. Ziker. Framing Charitable Solicitations in a Behavioral Experiment: Cues Derived from Evolutionary Theory of Cooperation and Economic Anthropology 153-178. [[Crossref](#)]
117. Nicholas Biddle. 2017. Insights for Indigenous Policy from the Applied Behavioural Sciences. *Asia & the Pacific Policy Studies* 4:1, 129-140. [[Crossref](#)]
118. Zofia Łapniewska. 2016. A Gender-centered Perspective in the Institutional Analysis of Commons. *Social Entrepreneurship Review* 1, 60-71. [[Crossref](#)]
119. Camila Castanhato, Thiago Brazolin Abdulmassih. 2016. Sociedades Limitadas e Livre-Iniciativa: Concretização dos Ditames da Constituição Federal de 1988. *Revista Internacional Consinter de Direito* 477-500. [[Crossref](#)]

120. Thomas Reimer, Martin Benkenstein. 2016. When good WOM hurts and bad WOM gains: The effect of untrustworthy online reviews. *Journal of Business Research* **69**:12, 5993-6001. [[Crossref](#)]
121. Linda Thunström, Todd L. Cherry, David M. McEvoy, Jason F. Shogren. 2016. Endogenous context in a dictator game. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* **65**, 117-120. [[Crossref](#)]
122. Oh-Hyun Jung, Hyojin Kim. 2016. Are tourists rational or irrational consumers?. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research* **21**:11, 1169-1183. [[Crossref](#)]
123. Simon Waskow, Sebastian Markett, Christian Montag, Bernd Weber, Peter Trautner, Volkmar Kramarz, Martin Reuter. 2016. Pay What You Want! A Pilot Study on Neural Correlates of Voluntary Payments for Music. *Frontiers in Psychology* **7**. . [[Crossref](#)]
124. Alexander M. Kusmanoff, Mathew J. Hardy, Fiona Fidler, Georgina Maffey, Christopher Raymond, M.S. Reed, James A. Fitzsimons, Sarah A. Bekessy. 2016. Framing the private land conservation conversation: Strategic framing of the benefits of conservation participation could increase landholder engagement. *Environmental Science & Policy* **61**, 124-128. [[Crossref](#)]
125. Kristen Guest. 2016. JEKYLL AND HYDE, INC.: LIMITED LIABILITY, COMPANIFICATION, AND GOTHIC SUBJECTIVITY. *Victorian Literature and Culture* **44**:2, 315-329. [[Crossref](#)]
126. Michael Lightfoot. Structure and Agency in the MENA Region: Theoretical Perspectives 83-102. [[Crossref](#)]
127. Martin Reuter, Christian Montag. Genes and Human Decision-Making 67-83. [[Crossref](#)]
128. Michela Betta. Governmentality and the Economy: A Foucauldian Perspective 25-41. [[Crossref](#)]
129. Carolyn Declerck, Christophe Boone. Two Routes to Cooperation 1-33. [[Crossref](#)]
130. Veroniek Collewaert, Sophie Manigart. 2016. Valuation of Angel-Backed Companies: The Role of Investor Human Capital. *Journal of Small Business Management* **54**:1, 356-372. [[Crossref](#)]
131. Kamilė Taujanskaitė. A system for formalized control of personal consumption expenditure **9**, . [[Crossref](#)]
132. Jordan Levine, Kai M.A. Chan, Terre Satterfield. 2015. From rational actor to efficient complexity manager: Exorcising the ghost of Homo economicus with a unified synthesis of cognition research. *Ecological Economics* **114**, 22-32. [[Crossref](#)]
133. YUNGWOOKKIM, ###. 2015. An Analysis of Influencing Factors on Smoking as a Risk Taking Behavior : With a Focus on Sensation Seeking, Social Smoking Conformity and Perceived Benefit/Barriers. *Journal of Public Relations* **19**:2, 22-50. [[Crossref](#)]
134. Jung-Kyoo Choi. 2015. Disappearance of Accountability and Sympathy in Economics, and the Possibility of Their Restoration. *Korean Journal of Cognitive Science* **26**:1, 69-96. [[Crossref](#)]
135. Zhihu Yang, Zhi Li, Te Wu, Long Wang. 2015. Effects of partner choice and role assignation in the spatial ultimatum game. *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **109**:4, 40013. [[Crossref](#)]
136. Roland Maximilian Happach, Meike Tilebein. Simulation as Research Method: Modeling Social Interactions in Management Science 239-259. [[Crossref](#)]
137. Jose Luis Vivero Pol. 2015. Transition Towards a Food Commons Regime: Re-Commoning Food to Crowd-Feed the World. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
138. Acheampong Frank. 2015. Assessment of Food Safety Knowledge and Attitude of Street Food Consumers in the Kumasi Metropolis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
139. Thomas Wiese. 2014. Growth and life satisfaction in the Euro zone. *Acta Oeconomica* **64**:4, 511-524. [[Crossref](#)]
140. Paul Cisek, Alexandre Pastor-Bernier. 2014. On the challenges and mechanisms of embodied decisions. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **369**:1655, 20130479. [[Crossref](#)]

141. Thomas Dohmen. 2014. Behavioral labor economics: Advances and future directions. *Labour Economics* 30, 71-85. [[Crossref](#)]
142. Kristina F. Pattison, Thomas R. Zentall. 2014. Suboptimal choice by dogs: when less is better than more. *Animal Cognition* 17:4, 1019-1022. [[Crossref](#)]
143. Shigehiro Oishi, Yoshiro Tsutsui, Casey Eggleston, Iolanda Costa Galinha. 2014. Are maximizers unhappier than satisficers? A comparison between Japan and the USA. *Journal of Research in Personality* 49, 14-20. [[Crossref](#)]
144. Rima M. Bizri. 2014. A study of Islamic banks in the non-GCC MENA region: evidence from Lebanon. *International Journal of Bank Marketing* 32:2, 130-149. [[Crossref](#)]
145. Jesse Kluver, Rebecca Frazier, Jonathan Haidt. 2014. Behavioral ethics for Homo economicus, Homo heuristicus, and Homo duplex. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 123:2, 150-158. [[Crossref](#)]
146. Sven F. Crone, Christian Koeppel. Predicting exchange rates with sentiment indicators: An empirical evaluation using text mining and multilayer perceptrons 114-121. [[Crossref](#)]
147. Linda Naughton. 2014. Geographical narratives of social capital. *Progress in Human Geography* 38:1, 3-21. [[Crossref](#)]
148. Meir Russ. Homo Sustainabiliticus and the "New Gold" 1-16. [[Crossref](#)]
149. Jörn S. Basel, Rolf Brühl. 2013. Rationality and dual process models of reasoning in managerial cognition and decision making. *European Management Journal* 31:6, 745-754. [[Crossref](#)]
150. Mark Whitehead, Rhys Jones, Jessica Pykett. Neuroliberal Climatic Governmentalities 95-110. [[Crossref](#)]
151. Derek D. Reed, Christopher R. Niileksela, Brent A. Kaplan. 2013. Behavioral Economics. *Behavior Analysis in Practice* 6:1, 34-54. [[Crossref](#)]
152. Mauro Boianovsky. 2013. Humboldt and the economists on natural resources, institutions and underdevelopment (1752 to 1859). *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 20:1, 58-88. [[Crossref](#)]
153. Paul Crosthwaite. 2013. ANIMALITY AND IDEOLOGY IN CONTEMPORARY ECONOMIC DISCOURSE. *Journal of Cultural Economy* 6:1, 94-109. [[Crossref](#)]
154. Hidefumi Imura. Seeing and Understanding Connections Between Nature and Humanity 1-10. [[Crossref](#)]
155. Hannes Rusch, Ulrich Frey. Biological and Experimental Perspectives on Self-Interest: Reciprocal Altruism and Genetic Egoism 313-335. [[Crossref](#)]
156. Tom Clements, Hugo Rainey, Dara An, Vann Rours, Setha Tan, Sokha Thong, W.J. Sutherland, E.J. Milner-Gulland. 2013. An evaluation of the effectiveness of a direct payment for biodiversity conservation: The Bird Nest Protection Program in the Northern Plains of Cambodia. *Biological Conservation* 157, 50-59. [[Crossref](#)]
157. T. W. Fawcett, S. Hamblin, L.-A. Giraldeau. 2013. Exposing the behavioral gambit: the evolution of learning and decision rules. *Behavioral Ecology* 24:1, 2-11. [[Crossref](#)]
158. Joe Bull. 2012. Loads of green washing—can behavioural economics increase willingness-to-pay for efficient washing machines in the UK?. *Energy Policy* 50, 242-252. [[Crossref](#)]
159. Dirk Sijmons, Machiel van Dorst. Strong Feelings 45-68. [[Crossref](#)]
160. . Character Making: Ideal Types, Idealization, and the Art of Caricature 136-171. [[Crossref](#)]
161. Xiaoli Zhao, Feng Wang, Mei Wang. 2012. Large-scale utilization of wind power in China: Obstacles of conflict between market and planning. *Energy Policy* 48, 222-232. [[Crossref](#)]

162. Evelina Tverdohleb. 2012. The institutional change in action: Transitioning to Economic Man. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 45:3-4, 363-373. [[Crossref](#)]
163. Patrick T. Hester, Andrew Collins. Mathematical Applications for Combat Modeling 385-412. [[Crossref](#)]
164. David William Cattell. 2012. An overview of component unit pricing theory. *Construction Management and Economics* 30:1, 81-92. [[Crossref](#)]
165. Lorenzo Garbo. 2012. Early Evolution of the Assumption of Non-satiation. *Review of Political Economy* 24:1, 15-32. [[Crossref](#)]
166. Sverre Bugge Midthjell. 2012. Deliberating or Quarreling? - An Enquiry into Theory and Research Methods for the Relationship between Political Parties and Deliberation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
167. Alexandre Di Miceli da Silveira. 2012. Corporate Scandals of the 21st Century: Limitations of Mainstream Corporate Governance Literature and the Need for a New Behavioral Approach. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
168. Jonathan A. J. Wilson. The Brand Stakeholder Approach 136-160. [[Crossref](#)]
169. Argang Ghadiri, Andreas Habermacher, Theo Peters. Neuroleadership: The Backdrop 1-15. [[Crossref](#)]
170. David W. Cattell, Paul A. Bowen, Ammar P. Kaka. 2011. Proposed Framework for Applying Cumulative Prospect Theory to an Unbalanced Bidding Model. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management* 137:12, 1052-1059. [[Crossref](#)]
171. William G. Feighery. 2011. Consulting ethics. *Annals of Tourism Research* 38:3, 1031-1050. [[Crossref](#)]
172. Neale Martin, Kyle Morich. 2011. Unconscious mental processes in consumer choice: Toward a new model of consumer behavior. *Journal of Brand Management* 18:7, 483-505. [[Crossref](#)]
173. Markus Wartiovaara. 2011. Rationality, REMM, and Individual Value Creation. *Journal of Business Ethics* 98:4, 641-648. [[Crossref](#)]
174. Jörn Sebastian Basel, Rolf Brühl. 2011. Concepts of Rationality in Management Research: From Unbounded Rationality to Ecological Rationality. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 52. . [[Crossref](#)]
175. Shigehiro Oishi, Jesse Graham. 2010. Social Ecology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 5:4, 356-377. [[Crossref](#)]
176. Hideki Ohira. 2010. The Somatic Marker Revisited: Brain and Body in Emotional Decision Making. *Emotion Review* 2:3, 245-249. [[Crossref](#)]
177. Laura Valladão de Mattos. 2010. Marshall e os críticos à economia política clássica. *Revista de Economia Política* 30:2, 271-292. [[Crossref](#)]
178. Matthew Sommerville, Julia P.G. Jones, Michael Rahajaharison, E.J. Milner-Gulland. 2010. The role of fairness and benefit distribution in community-based Payment for Environmental Services interventions: A case study from Menabe, Madagascar. *Ecological Economics* 69:6, 1262-1271. [[Crossref](#)]
179. Federico Gallo, Pierluigi Contucci, Adam Coutts, Ignacio Gallo. Tackling Climate Change Through Energy Efficiency: Mathematical Models to Offer Evidence-Based Recommendations for Public Policy 131-146. [[Crossref](#)]
180. Klaus Mohn. 2010. Autism in Economics? A Second Opinion. *Forum for Social Economics* 39:2, 191-208. [[Crossref](#)]
181. Michel Zouboulakis. 2010. Trustworthiness as a Moral Determinant of Economic Activity: Lessons from the Classics. *Forum for Social Economics* 39:3, 209-221. [[Crossref](#)]
182. Freya A. V. St John, Gareth Edwards-Jones, Julia P. G. Jones. 2010. Conservation and human behaviour: lessons from social psychology. *Wildlife Research* 37:8, 658. [[Crossref](#)]

183. Stig Ingebrigtsen, Ove Jakobsen. 2009. Moral development of the economic actor. *Ecological Economics* 68:11, 2777-2784. [[Crossref](#)]
184. Mehmet Bulut. 2009. Reconsideration of Economic Views of a Classical Empire and a Nation-State During the Mercantilist Ages. *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 68:3, 791-828. [[Crossref](#)]
185. Jim Wishloff. 2009. The Land of Realism and the Shipwreck of Idea-ism: Thomas Aquinas and Milton Friedman on the Social Responsibilities of Business. *Journal of Business Ethics* 85:2, 137-155. [[Crossref](#)]
186. Hans-Werner Bierhoff, Gerd Göckenjan, Mattias Iser, Herbert Schnädelbach, Gerd Spittler, Michael Pauen, Heiner Hastedt, Doris Bischof-Köhler, Rahel Jaeggi, Harald Welzer, Tabea Häberlein, Walter Bruchhausen, Nicole C. Karafyllis, Mi-Yong Lee-Peuker, Joachim Fischer, Gertrud Nunner-Winkler, Norbert Kluge, Karl-Siegbert Rehberg, Ralf Elm, Annette Scheunpflug, Dirk Jörke, Heike Baranzke, Roman Meinhold, Christian Illies, Eike Bohlken, Wolfgang Schmidbauer, Klaus Hock, Hans-Georg Soeffner, Jan Assmann, Volkmar Sigusch, Hilge Landweer, Hans Werner Ingensiep, Norbert Meuter, Ludger Hoffmann, Héctor Wittwer, Jan Philipp Reemtsma, Günter Dux. Begriffe 283-445. [[Crossref](#)]
187. J. Gary Polhill. Agent-based modeling of socio-economic processes related to the environment: Example of land-use change 61-76. [[Crossref](#)]
188. Long Cheng, Canfeng Chen, Jian Ma, Yimin Chen. A Group-Level Incentive Scheme for Data Collection in Wireless Sensor Networks 1-5. [[Crossref](#)]
189. Tracy B. Strong. 2008. Is the political realm more encompassing than the economic realm?. *Public Choice* 137:3-4, 439-450. [[Crossref](#)]
190. Susan Walsh. 2008. "Arithmetic of Bedlam!": Markets and Manhood in Charles Reade's *Hard Cash*. *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 63:1, 1-40. [[Crossref](#)]
191. Henk Elffers, Danielle Reynald, Margit Averdijk, Wim Bernasco, Richard Block. 2008. Modelling Crime Flow between Neighbourhoods in Terms of Distance and of Intervening Opportunities. *Crime Prevention and Community Safety* 10:2, 85-96. [[Crossref](#)]
192. Irene C. L. Ng, Lu-Ming Tseng. 2008. Learning to be Sociable: The Evolution of Homo Economicus. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 67:2, 265-286. [[Crossref](#)]
193. M. N. Kuperman, S. Risau-Gusman. 2008. The effect of the topology on the spatial ultimatum game. *The European Physical Journal B* 62:2, 233-238. [[Crossref](#)]
194. H. Y. Quek, A. Tay. A evolutionary, game theoretic approach to the modeling, simulation and analysis of public goods provisioning under asymmetric information 4735-4742. [[Crossref](#)]
195. Marek Hudík. 2007. J. S. Mill's Methodology of Political Economy. *Acta Oeconomica Pragensia* 15:5, 109-123. [[Crossref](#)]
196. Carlos Bastien, José Luís Cardoso. 2007. From homo economicus to homo corporativus: A neglected critique of neoclassical economics. *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 36:1, 118-127. [[Crossref](#)]
197. Mary S. Morgan. 2006. Economic Man as Model Man: Ideal Types, Idealization and Caricatures. *Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 28:1, 1-27. [[Crossref](#)]
198. David L. Rigby, Jürgen Essletzbichler. 2006. Technological variety, technological change and a geography of production techniques. *Journal of Economic Geography* 6:1, 45-70. [[Crossref](#)]
199. Richard Swedberg. 2005. Tocqueville als Wirtschaftssoziologe. *Berliner Journal für Soziologie* 15:4, 473-494. [[Crossref](#)]
200. António Almodovar, José Luís Cardoso. 2005. Corporatism and the Economic Role of Government. *History of Political Economy* 37:Suppl_1, 333-354. [[Crossref](#)]
201. Michel S. Zouboulakis. 2005. On the social nature of rationality in Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill. *Cahiers d'économie Politique* n° 49:2, 51-63. [[Crossref](#)]

202. Julie A. Nelson. 2005. Rationality and Humanity: A View from Feminist Economics. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **18**. . [[Crossref](#)]
203. Okeoghene Odudu. 2005. The Meaning of Undertaking within 81 EC. *Cambridge Yearbook of European Legal Studies* **7**, 211-241. [[Crossref](#)]
204. François Etner. 2004. La fin du XIXe siècle, vue par les historiens de la pensée économique. *Revue d'économie politique* **Vol. 114**:5, 663-680. [[Crossref](#)]
205. Michel S. Zouboulakis. 2001. From Mill to Weber: the meaning of the concept of economic rationality. *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* **8**:1, 30-41. [[Crossref](#)]
206. Heath Pearson. 2000. Homo Economicus Goes Native, 1859-1945: The Rise and Fall of Primitive Economics. *History of Political Economy* **32**:4, 933-990. [[Crossref](#)]
207. GABRIELLE MEAGHER. 1998. "A WOMAN SELDOM RUNS WILD AFTER AN ABSTRACTION": FEMINIST CONTRIBUTIONS TO ECONOMICS. *Economic Papers: A journal of applied economics and policy* **17**:1, 51-69. [[Crossref](#)]
208. Malte Faber, Reiner Manstetten, Thomas Petersen. 1997. Homo Oeconomicus and Homo Politicus. Political Economy, Constitutional Interest and Ecological Interest. *Kyklos* **50**:4, 457-483. [[Crossref](#)]
209. Timothy P. Roth. 1997. Competence-difficulty gaps, ethics and the new social welfare theory. *The Journal of Socio-Economics* **26**:5, 533-552. [[Crossref](#)]