**When Less is More**

Wrote a whole bunch of notes but then Word crashed ☹

Key is look at footnote 6!!!

Love to discuss methods here

**Culture and the Self**

Eastern vs Western concepts of self. Eastern = Interdependent, Western = Independent

Consequences for Cognition

* More interpersonal knowledge – ie Figure 2, for western self is perceived as significantly more dissimilar to the other than the other to the self
* Context specific knowledge of self and other – interdependent (estern) using specific social situations as unit of representation other than attributes of separate persons
  + Also calls into question of FAE!!! “It may be that the fundamental attribution error is only characteristic of those with an independent view of the self.”
* Basic Cognitioin in an interpersonal context – argue that keeping track of others all the time actually reduces verbal and ideational fluency.
  + Gave example of difficulty getting Chinese nationals to discuss or even contemplate counterfactuals. (really? Seems Western statement in of itself) This was shown not ture in later studies
  + Resolved by consderinging that eastern respondents care about nature of questioner and their relationship with them. It is the specific situation described in the coutnerfactural that matters

Consequences for Emotion

* Study showed American subjecs feeling emotions for longer and with more bodily symptoms than Japanese subjects. But these were all ego-focused emotions (joy sad anger guilt fear shame)
* Anger as counter production and antisocial feeling. Very rare if ever expressed in interpersonal settings (example of angry Japanese mothers and Eskimo cutlures)
* Pride in ones own performance inhibited among those with interdependnent selves

Consdequences for Motivation

* Separate motivations. Cognitive dissonance less a thing in eastern settings
* Definition of Achinvement different
* Interpersonal – more paternal magaement style versus with western more separation of work and personal
* Self enhancement or self promotion perceived negatively in Japanese culture
* View of self as being above the mean higher in western culture

Q: how changed in 30 years?

**A Problem in Theory**

“Experiments are the last resort”

Idea Of a unifing theory is interesting but perhaps not worded correctly… there is no grand unified theory in other rhelms… it is that that there isn’t even a scientific process?

I guess key argument is predictability . Feels like Ducan Watt 2017 paper Should Social Science be more Solution-Oriented

Interesting that experiments are the last resort, that theory should be good enough as is

Tversky and Kannaman heuristics at aplay here

Fits with above papers by applying concepts of evolution to social constructs

Key is not suing metaphor but rather self consistent theory to communicate. Concern here is that this is macro?

The paper “A Problem in Theory” not only sets up a general argument for this approach, but basically demands it as a necessary step to mitigate the replication crisis in social sciences. I briefly bristled that “without a general and unifying theory of human behavior” social sciences are at a disadvantage to the physical sciences. There is no general and unifying theory in the physical sciences. There are frameworks of theory that are revised built upon, and the social sciences certainly are wanting in that regard, but to claim that the solution is a single ‘unifying theory’ seems inappropriate, or even dangerous if it places blinders on theoretical exploration.

That paper reminded me, in its broadest statements, of the Duncan Watts 2017 paper we read earlier this semester. Both make the claim that social sciences must be based in more testable theory that builds upon itself, rather than rely on ‘guess work’ and ‘intuition’ based on WEIRD observers of WEIRD populations. In broad strokes I agree, through I appreciated that the Watts paper left the door for exploration in theory a bit wider open. This 2019 paper Muthukrishna and Henrich almost reads like an argument that the author’s dual inheritance model is capable of being the unifying theory they argue for. What I do worry about is that the emphasis on prediction can overemphasize correlational relationships over causal explanations. While the authors do take pains to emphasize the need for Big Theory to complement Big Data, they do concede that the need for theory “diminishes…for applied problems that are purely about prediction.” What does it mean then if the gold standard for rigorous theory, prediction, is also the driver for non-causal models?