Original research article / Originalus mokslinis straipsnis
Vol. 1 No. 4 (2025): Birželis

Culture as Capital: Exploring the Economic Impact of Societal Values and Institutions

[1] Sadaqat Ahmedova

Accepted: 06.10.2025
Published: 06.16.2025
https://doi.org/10.69760/portuni.0104025

Abstract: This paper explores how culture influences economic development across nations and regions. By examining cultural values, norms, and institutions through empirical and theoretical lenses, the study identifies key cultural dimensions—such as trust, work ethic, and individualism—that correlate with economic outcomes. Data from cross-national surveys and economic indicators are analyzed to draw connections between cultural traits and economic performance. The findings suggest that culture is a foundational element of development, shaping both formal institutions and individual behavior in the economy. Using a mixed-methods approach that combines statistical analysis with comparative case studies, the findings reveal that cultural traits significantly correlate with economic outcomes.

Keywords: *economic development, cultural dimensions, productivity, innovation, cultural variables, economic variables*

1. INTRODUCTION

Economic development has traditionally been analyzed through factors such as capital accumulation, technological progress, and institutional frameworks. However, a growing body of research highlights the significance of culture—defined as shared values, beliefs, and norms—in shaping economic behavior and outcomes (Inglehart & Baker, 2000). Culture affects productivity, innovation, governance, and social cohesion, all of which are central to development. This study investigates the role of cultural variables in economic growth and performance, aiming to understand how deeply ingrained social patterns influence economic trajectories.

Economic development has traditionally been understood through the lenses of capital accumulation, technological progress, resource endowment, and institutional quality. Classical and neoclassical growth models, such as those proposed by Solow and Romer, emphasize physical and human capital, innovation, and policy stability as core drivers of economic growth. While these models have significantly advanced our understanding of development dynamics, they often understate or overlook the role of intangible social factors—particularly culture—in shaping economic outcomes.

Culture, defined as the shared values, norms, beliefs, customs, and behaviors that characterize a society or group, influences how individuals make decisions, how institutions function, and how communities interact (Mammadova & Abdullayev, 2025). Cultural frameworks affect people's attitudes toward

[1] Ahmedova, S. Nakhchivan State University, Azerbaijan. Email: sedaqetehmedova@ndu.edu.az. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0001-3329-4055

work, education, trust, risk-taking, saving, and investing—factors that are directly linked to economic activity. For instance, a society that highly values punctuality and long-term planning may be more conducive to industrial productivity than one that emphasizes short-term gratification or informal economic practices.

The relationship between culture and economic development has gained increasing attention in recent decades, particularly as economists and social scientists seek to explain persistent disparities in development across regions and nations that cannot be fully accounted for by traditional economic variables alone. Notable scholars such as Max Weber, David Landes, and more recently, Daron Acemoglu and Luigi Guiso, have argued that cultural variables play a foundational role in shaping institutions, entrepreneurship, governance, and innovation—all crucial elements of economic growth (Tabellini, 2010).

Moreover, globalization has intensified the interaction between cultures and economies, making cultural adaptability and values alignment increasingly critical for sustained economic performance. Countries and regions with cultures that foster social trust, meritocracy, education, and individual initiative often experience faster and more stable growth than those where corruption, fatalism, or clientelism dominate.

This paper explores how specific cultural attributes—such as trust, individualism, work ethic, and openness to innovation—affect economic development. Through empirical analysis using cross-national data and comparative case studies, the research aims to illuminate the mechanisms by which culture influences economic behavior and institutional quality. By better understanding the role of culture in economic development, policymakers and development practitioners can design more effective, culturally informed strategies to promote growth and reduce poverty (Landes,1998).

Cuisine is also a constituent of culture and it can make any country popular and can make the countries earn some money (Javid & Sadikhova, 2025).

2. METHODS

To investigate the role of culture in economic development, this study employs a multidisciplinary research design that integrates both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The methodology is designed to identify correlations, patterns, and plausible causal relationships between cultural variables and economic performance across diverse national contexts. This section outlines the data sources, variables, analytical techniques, and limitations of the research.

2.1. Data Sources

The study relies on several well-established and publicly available datasets:

- World Values Survey (WVS) and European Values Study (EVS): These are large-scale, cross-national surveys that collect data on cultural values, attitudes, beliefs, and social norms across over 100 countries. Key indicators relevant to economic behavior—such as trust, attitudes toward work, achievement, authority, and civic responsibility—are extracted.

- Hofstede Cultural Dimensions: Hofstede's model provides standardized scores for cultural dimensions such as individualism versus collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, power distance, and long-term orientation for a broad range of countries.

- World Bank Development Indicators: These offer data on macroeconomic outcomes such as GDP per capita, investment rates, inflation, and trade openness.

- United Nations Human Development Index (HDI): HDI incorporates life expectancy, education, and income indices to provide a broader measure of development.

- Global Innovation Index (GII) and Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI): These provide further context to examine how culture correlates with innovation and institutional quality.

2.2. Key Variables

Cultural Variables:

- Interpersonal Trust: Percentage of respondents who agree with the statement "Most people can be trusted."

- Individualism vs. Collectivism: Scores based on Hofstede's framework.

- Work Ethic: Derived from survey items on the value placed on hard work, ambition, and perseverance.

- Secular-Rational vs. Traditional Values: Based on the Inglehart–Welzel cultural map.

Economic Variables:

- GDP per capita (PPP-adjusted): As a measure of economic output.

- HDI: As a broader development metric.

- Innovation Score: From GII, capturing the knowledge economy.

- Institutional Quality: Measured through governance indicators (e.g., rule of law, corruption).

2.3. Analytical Techniques

Descriptive Statistics: Summary statistics are used to provide an overview of cultural and economic patterns.

Correlation Analysis: Pearson correlation coefficients are calculated to examine the strength and direction of the relationship between cultural and economic variables.

Multiple Regression Models: Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression is applied to test the statistical significance and explanatory power of cultural variables on economic outcomes, controlling for confounding variables such as education, geography, and institutional quality (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012).

Cluster Analysis: Countries are grouped based on cultural profiles to identify similarities and outliers in development outcomes.

Case Study Methodology: In-depth comparative case studies of selected countries (e.g., South Korea vs. Argentina, Germany vs. Greece) are conducted to provide context-specific insights. These cases are selected based on comparable economic potential but divergent cultural characteristics and development paths.

2.4. Limitations and Assumptions

Causality: While statistical correlations are identified, establishing definitive causality between culture and economic development is inherently challenging due to endogeneity and feedback loops.

Cultural Dynamics: Culture is not static. The analysis acknowledges that culture evolves and that development itself can reshape cultural norms.

Measurement Bias: Cultural values are difficult to quantify, and survey responses may be influenced by social desirability or local interpretation of terms.

Geographical Scope: While the study includes data from a wide range of countries, certain regions (e.g., Sub-Saharan Africa) may have less consistent data coverage, which could affect comparative validity.

This mixed-methods approach allows for a nuanced exploration of the cultural dimensions of development and supports the integration of empirical evidence with contextual analysis.

3. RESULTS

This section presents the key findings from both the quantitative analyses and the qualitative case studies, illustrating how cultural factors correlate with and potentially influence economic development outcomes. The results are structured around three central cultural dimensions: trust, individualism vs. collectivism, and work ethic/achievement motivation, each analyzed in relation to core economic indicators.

3.1. Trust and Economic Performance

The statistical analysis reveals a strong positive correlation between interpersonal trust and several indicators of economic development:

GDP per capita: Countries where a higher percentage of respondents report that "most people can be trusted" tend to have significantly higher income levels. For example, in Scandinavian countries (e.g., Norway, Denmark, Sweden), where trust levels exceed 60%, GDP per capita is among the highest globally.

Institutional Quality: High-trust societies also score well on World Bank governance indicators, particularly in rule of law, regulatory quality, and control of corruption. Regression models suggest that trust accounts for a substantial portion of the variance in these institutional indicators, even when controlling for education and income.

Investment and Entrepreneurship: Data from the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) and national investment statistics show that trust fosters stronger business networks, reduces transaction costs, and encourages long-term planning and investment.

3.2. Individualism, Innovation, and Economic Dynamism

Analysis using Hofstede's individualism scores reveals that societies with high levels of individualism tend to exhibit stronger innovation performance and entrepreneurial activity:

Innovation Index: Countries such as the United States, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom—scoring high on individualism—also lead in the Global Innovation Index. Regression analysis finds a statistically significant association ($p < 0.01$) between individualism and innovation output, especially in patent filings, R&D investment, and startup density.

Human Development: Individualistic cultures often emphasize personal achievement and self-actualization, correlating with higher HDI scores. These societies also exhibit more fluid labor markets and meritocratic educational systems.

However, the benefits of individualism are nuanced. In some contexts, excessive individualism may undermine social cohesion and collective responsibility, as observed in certain high-income but socially unequal societies.

3.3. Work Ethic and Productivity

Cultural attitudes toward hard work, discipline, and delayed gratification—proxied by responses to WVS questions on work values—show strong alignment with economic productivity:

Labor Productivity: East Asian countries such as South Korea, Japan, and Singapore demonstrate a cultural emphasis on perseverance, loyalty, and educational achievement, which aligns with high levels of labor productivity and strong human capital development.

Savings and Investment Rates: High work ethic societies often maintain higher household savings rates, which fuel capital formation and domestic investment.

Education and Skill Development: Societies that place high cultural value on education (e.g., Confucian-influenced nations) outperform others in international assessments such as PISA, contributing to their economic competitiveness (Mammadova & Abdullayev, 2025).

3.4. Case Study Highlights

South Korea vs. Argentina

South Korea: Post-war development was driven not only by economic policy but also by cultural values emphasizing education, discipline, and collective effort. These cultural traits supported strong institutional development and social mobilization.

Argentina: Despite early 20th-century prosperity, cultural tendencies toward political populism, short-termism, and low institutional trust contributed to economic stagnation and repeated fiscal crises.

Germany vs. Greece

Germany: A culture characterized by rule adherence, punctuality, and long-term planning has helped maintain economic stability and industrial competitiveness.

Greece: Widespread tax evasion, patronage systems, and lower institutional trust are reflective of cultural and institutional weaknesses that exacerbated the Eurozone debt crisis.

3.5. Cultural Clusters and Development Patterns

Using cluster analysis, countries were grouped into cultural zones (e.g., Anglo-Saxon, Confucian, Nordic, Latin American, Sub-Saharan African) to assess development patterns. Results show:

Nordic countries: High trust, low power distance, and strong gender equality correlate with high HDI and economic resilience (Farzaliyeva, & Abdullayev, (2025).

Confucian societies: Emphasis on education and family responsibility aligns with rapid industrialization and technological advancement.

Latin America and Sub-Saharan Africa: Cultural traits such as hierarchical authority structures and present-oriented thinking, combined with institutional instability, often correlate with slower development.

These findings strongly support the hypothesis that cultural factors significantly influence economic development outcomes. While not deterministic, culture operates as a key contextual variable that shapes both individual behavior and institutional effectiveness.

4. DISCUSSION

The results reinforce the argument that culture matters in economic development—not merely as a background factor but as an active driver. High trust societies tend to foster more efficient markets, reduce transaction costs, and support better institutions. Individualistic cultures may encourage entrepreneurial risk-taking and innovation, while collectivist societies may emphasize social cohesion and long-term planning. However, cultural traits do not operate in isolation; their economic effects are mediated by political, historical, and institutional contexts.

Moreover, while some cultural traits appear advantageous for growth, economic development itself can transform culture—highlighting a reciprocal relationship. For example, economic modernization often increases individualism and secular-rational values.

One of the most consistent results across both quantitative and qualitative analyses is the positive role of trust in fostering economic growth and institutional quality. Trust reduces transaction costs, facilitates contract enforcement, and enhances cooperation within both the private and public sectors. High-trust societies, like those in Northern Europe, are able to build and sustain robust welfare states and highly functional bureaucracies due to lower levels of corruption and greater civic participation.

Conversely, in low-trust societies, individuals are more likely to rely on kinship networks and informal systems, which can limit market expansion, increase the cost of doing business, and reduce

institutional legitimacy. These patterns suggest that trust is not merely a social good, but a productive economic asset.

Importantly, the relationship between culture and development is not unidirectional. While culture influences economic outcomes, economic change can also reshape cultural values (Hofstede, 2001). For example, increased prosperity and education levels often lead to more secular-rational and self-expressive cultural orientations, as observed in the Inglehart–Welzel World Cultural Map.

This reciprocal dynamic implies that policies aimed at economic development can be more effective when they also recognize and engage with cultural foundations, rather than ignoring or attempting to override them. Institutional reforms that align with local cultural values are more likely to be accepted, adapted, and sustained over time.

5. CONCLUSION

Culture plays a crucial role in shaping economic development through its influence on behavior, institutions, and governance. Policymakers aiming to promote development should consider cultural contexts and seek to align institutional reforms with prevailing cultural norms. Recognizing and leveraging cultural strengths—while addressing cultural barriers—can lead to more sustainable and inclusive economic outcomes.

This study has provided comprehensive evidence that culture is not a peripheral influence but a central pillar of economic development. Through a combination of statistical analysis and comparative case studies, we have shown that cultural traits—such as interpersonal trust, individualism, work ethic, and long-term orientation—are significantly correlated with key economic indicators including GDP per capita, innovation output, institutional quality, and labor productivity.

In conclusion, culture is both a context and a catalyst for economic development. By acknowledging its influence and integrating it into economic theory and policy, we gain a more complete understanding of why some nations prosper while others struggle—and how we might create the conditions for more inclusive, resilient, and culturally resonant development in the future.

REFERENCES

Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty.

Farzaliyeva, E., & Abdullayev, A. (2025). The Economic Power of Culture: How Arts and Heritage Drive Employment. Global Spectrum of Research and Humanities, 2(3), 80-91.

Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations.

Inglehart, R., & Baker, W. E. (2000). "Modernization, Cultural Change, and the Persistence of Traditional Values." American Sociological Review.

Javid, B., & Sadikhova, S. (2025, May). Culturonyms in Food and Drink: How Language Reflects Cultural Identity Through Cuisine. In Publisher. agency: Proceedings of the 10th International Scientific Conference «Modern scientific technology»(May 29-30, 2025). Stockholm, Sweden, 2025. 418p (p. 346). Malmö University.

Landes, D. S. (1998). The Wealth and Poverty of Nations: Why Some Are So Rich and Some So Poor.

Mammadova, E., & Abdullayev, A. (2025). Cultural Industries and National Economic Competitiveness: A Global Perspective. Porta Universorum, 1(3), 322-344.

Mammadova, E., & Abdullayev, A. (2025). Protection of Cultural Heritage and Its Economic Benefit. Acta Globalis Humanitatis et Linguarum, 2(3), 180-187.

Tabellini, G. (2010). "Culture and Institutions: Economic Development in the Regions of Europe." Journal of the European Economic Association.