Lost in Transition? How Civil War Violence Can Impair the

Foundations for Market Development - The Case of Tajikistan

By Alessandra Cassar^{*}, Pauline Grosjean^{*} and Sam Whitt[†]

May 19, 2011

Abstract

We carried out experiments and survey in Tajikistan on 426 randomly selected subjects 13 years after the end of the 1992-1997 civil war to investigate the effects of conflictrelated violence on social and economic preferences. Our results indicate that exposure to warfare violence is strongly associated with the disruption of those kinds of social norms that are at the very foundation of market development. Conflict exposure destroys local trust and fairness, decreases the willingness to engage in impersonal exchange and reinforces kinship-based norms of morality. At the same time, we find evidence that trust, generosity and egalitarianism are at the highest among the mostly affected individuals when matched with a distant partner, in accordance with a growing body of literature showing surprisingly positive outcomes for social behavior in the aftermath of very traumatic events. The robustness of the results to the use of pre-war controls, village fixed effects and alternative samples suggests that selection into victimization is unlikely to be the factor driving the results.

Key Words: Civil war, trust game, dictator game, market institution, experimental methods

JEL Classification: C93, D03, P30, O53

^{*} Department of Economics, University of San Francisco, 2130 Fulton St., San Francisco, CA 94117. Emails: <u>acassar@usfca.edu</u>, <u>pagrosjean@usfca.edu</u>.

[†] Fulbright Scholar, University of Pristina, Kosovo. <u>Whitt.sam@gmail.com</u>.

We would like to thank Alexandra Ghosh, Lexi Russel and Azicha Tirandozov for outstanding assistance in carrying out the experimental work and data collection. We are grateful for their comments to Eli Berman, Stefano DellaVigna, Dan Friedman, Craig McIntosh, Ted Miguel, Bruce Wydick and participants at PacDev 2011 and Bay Area Experimentalists workshop 2011. We would like to especially recognize the University of San Francisco and the U.S. State Department Title VIII Program – University of Delaware for their very generous financial support.

1. Introduction

This project investigates the effects that civil war related violence might exert on behavioral preferences for trust, reciprocity, fairness, egalitarianism and on the support for market institutions and democracy. The vast majority of economic research on war focuses on macroeconomic outcomes and finds conflicting results. A significant body of literature puts civil war as a forefront underdevelopment trap (Collier et al., 2003; Collier and Hoeffler 2004) and highlights the economic, social and political disintegration that has followed many conflicts, particularly in the developing world. At the same time, a long tradition in economic and political history has characterized international wars and inter-group competition as preconditions for state formation, nation building (mostly based on the example of Western Europe as in Tilly and Ardant, 1975; Tilly, 1985) and market development (Greif 2006). More recently, a small number of papers have been focusing on the microeconomic and behavioral outcomes and points to surprising results: International and even intra-national conflicts (civil wars) have been found carriers of positive prosocial elements among the victims (Bauer et al., 2011; Bellows and Miguel, 2009; Blattman, 2009; Voors et al., 2011). Our work contributes to this literature by showing that such prosocial elements are indeed heighten among the individuals from victimized households, but such result should not be taken as a positive element for market development and growth. On the contrary our data show the emergence of a very different picture when the survey results are combined with the experimental evidence. The increase in collective action that we (and the cited other works) find is actually associated with erosion of local trust, stronger kinship-based norms of conflict resolution mechanisms as opposed to reliance on formal rule of law. This result emerges when comparing victims to non-victims in a post-war setting, so it cannot be directly interpreted as a civil war effect. But if one allows that certain civil wars bring about violence (in different degrees) on a vast number of civilians, and that the effect of such violence on the individuals are of the kind we observe in Tajikistan, then one can conclude that ferocious civil wars can unleash behavioral elements which are potential hinderers of market development and growth.

More in particular, we report here the results of a series of experiments designed to investigate whether the 1992-1997 Tajikistan civil war has left any effect on social and

economic preferences more than 10 years after the Peace Agreement. We focus on preferences and social norms that are thought to sustain the development of impersonal exchange and state building, namely trust and norms of fairness. We utilize a simplified version of the trust game and the dictator game under two treatment conditions: Same Village, in which the anonymous second player is someone who lives in the same village as the first player, and Distant Village, in which the second player might come from anywhere in Tajikistan, therefore naturally a more abstract concept. We carried out our study in 17 randomly selected villages of the four regions of Tajikistan (Dushanbe, Khatlon, Gharm and Pamir) and, within village, our subjects came from household randomly selected via the random route technique, resulting in a sample of 426 individuals.

What makes the Tajik civil conflict both complex and interesting is the inability to apply basic cues such as ethnicity or language to make shorthand predictions about who was on what side. It was often difficult to confirm who was committing violence against whom in the midst of the confusion of the inter-mixed regions in the conflict zone. In many cases, factions of the same regional groups were even fighting among themselves (Kilavuz, 2009). Our findings unequivocally point to negative and persistent effects of such violence on the norms that support impersonal exchange, in particular on trust within a village. Victimization during the civil war is associated with a roughly 40% decrease in trust (the amount sent by the first mover in the trust game) when respondents are matched to another individual from the same village. We corroborate our experimental evidence with survey data on actual behavior and stated preferences. Consistently with the decrease in local trust in the experimental games, former victims are both less likely and less willing to participate in local markets, in particular when they do not have a personal connection with the trader they are dealing with.

What we find particularly interesting is that our data confirm previous findings that victimization is associated with more active participation in groups (e.g. Bellows and Miguel, 2009; Blattman, 2009) and, in particular, in religious groups. Our results nevertheless suggest that such collective action cannot be taken as a form of inclusive social capital. Indeed, for those who have experienced violent conflict directly, participation in local groups is associated with further erosion of local trust. Our results

3

also indicate that experiences of victimization are associated with a resurgence of kinship-based norms of morality and behavior and a weakening of the rule of formal law.

In contrast with the negative implications of our results for local social cohesion and local market development, we find evidence consistent with an increasing body of evidence on the so-called "post-traumatic growth" and communitarian behavior in post-disaster environments (Tedeschi and Calhoun, 2004; Solnit, 2009). While being affected by violence consistently reduces pro-social preferences towards fellow villagers, victims display more trust (by about 20%), generosity (by nearly 35%) and egalitarianism towards an abstract distant other, someone who may not have hurt them directly like someone from the same village.

Because of the regional nature of the conflict, all specifications include regional fixed effects. Yet, victims of violence may be different from non-victims in observable and unobservable ways and so any comparison of victims and non-victims will conflate the impacts of war with preexisting differences that led some people to be victimized. This is especially problematic if the characteristics associated with victimization are also those associated with the outcomes that we want to observe. As a Soviet creation, Tajikistan had no experience with a market economy and democratic self-governance as a civil society prior to the onset of violence. This helps alleviate the (statistical) problem that such characteristics may predict selection into war victimization. Still, some concerns remain for the identification of causal effects of victimization and we employ several strategies to deal with the potential selection bias. First, we use a selection on observable strategy by investigating the determinants of victimization and controlling for such characteristics in the analysis. Second, we check that all results are robust to the inclusion of village fixed effects. Village fixed effects enable us to isolate the variation in violence experienced across neighbors within the same village. Third, in order to address the concern that selection into victimization was based upon unobservable characteristics, we follow Altonji, Elder and Taber (2005) and gauge how much the importance of unobservable variables would need to be, relative to observable factors, in order to explain away all the effects of war violence on post-war outcomes. Our last strategy to deal with potential selection bias is to focus our analysis on different sub-samples. We restrict our attention to individuals who were too young to be systematically targeted –

those who were 12 or younger at the beginning of the conflict. We also consider the subsample of people who have never moved in order to rule out that our results are due to selective migration. Taking all the evidence together, our analysis indicates that selection into victimization is unlikely to have been the factor driving our results.

The next section reviews the relevant literature. Section 3 discusses our main hypotheses. Section 4 presents the experimental protocol and the data. Section 5 describes the empirical strategy and the results. Section 6 concludes. More information on the Tajik civil war and additional results can be found in the supplementary appendix.

2. Relevant Literature

This paper contributes to two main strands of the literature. First, it contributes to the literature on the origins of prosocial preferences and on the formation of political attitudes. Understanding the origins of prosocial preferences and the factors affecting them is becoming increasingly important in several fields of economics. For development, in particular, societal trust and preferences for fairness have been positively associated with growth and the level of market development (e.g. Knack and Keefer, 1997; Knack and Zack, 1999; Henrich et al., 2010). Second, we contribute to the literature on the social and institutional legacy of conflict. While the long term impact of international wars and civil wars has been studied in terms of economic activity, industrial recovery, physical and human capital, the impact of conflicts through their impact on preferences has only recently started to be experimentally studied (e.g. Bauer, Cassar, Chytilova and Henrich, 2011; Voors et al., 2011) and it is the object of this paper.

The origin of individual preferences is a fascinating research question. For a long time contemporary economists have assumed individual preferences to be exogenously determined and fixed (Stigler and Becker, 1977) or, at the very least, a topic to be studied by other social scientists. As a stark departure, in the past couple of decades experimental and behavioral economists have started to identify a number of predictable determinants of preferences and sources of preference change (Loewenstein and Angner, 2003). The question is important for many fields of economics and for development in particular for which one of the hypotheses advanced to explain poverty is that certain people have a set

of preferences that are not conducive to those activities that bring prosperity. For example, individuals that do not trust anonymous others might forgo important profitable opportunities, same for those who do not play fair with money. So far, the empirical evidence in support of the hypothesis that such preferences would be born with the individual is quite weak while, at the same time, important correlations have been found between trust and reciprocity and important economic indicators like the growth rate, fraction of population in poverty, rate of unemployment and Gini coefficient (for a survey see Cardenas and Carpenter, 2008). Quite interestingly, a significant set of experimental results show that there are fundamental behavioral differences in fairness and cooperation between people who are WEIRD (Western, educated, industrialized, rich and living in democracies) and people who are not (Henrich, Heine, and Norenzayan, 2010). In particular, greater level of fairness and punishment have been found to positively covariate with market integration and community size, providing significant evidence that preferences would not be uniquely exogenously determined, but might have been evolved over the course of human history jointly with norms and institutions (Friedman, 2008).

Given this evidence of different behavioral preferences across groups, what we want to address in our research is the issue of whether current conditions and past experiences can affect preferences in a persistent and systematic way. Some related evidence in this regard is presented by Cassar et al. (2011) who find that Thai subjects affected by the 2004 tsunami are, four and a half year after the event, significantly more trusting (as well as more risk averse, and, modestly, more trustworthy and impatient). In this paper we focus on prosocial preferences such as trust and fairness, because they have been found vital to solve cooperation and coordination problems in modern societies and therefore crucial for economic and social development. Individual preferences towards others (such as trust, reciprocity, altruism, egalitarianism, parochialism, fairness, etc...) are key component of many economic decisions and are often associated to social capital and considered necessary for growth and development. While a lot more work still needs to be done to learn which outcomes do different social preferences correlate with, recent studies have already show how other-regarding preferences are decisive for the human ability to cooperate in large groups (Bowles, 2004; Boyd and Richerson, 2005), to participate in public life and politics (Bowles and Gintis, 2006) and how they amplify reputational incentives in strategic interactions (Rockenbach and Milinski, 2006). Generosity, egalitarianism and a sense of fairness, instead of spitefulness, may help sustain trade, cooperation and development especially in countries when institutional contracts enforcement is weak by letting individual engage in profitable trades that are beneficial to self and others and by preventing the violation of contracts. Even in countries with well functioning institutions, a sense of fairness and trust may support trade, given the necessarily incomplete nature of contracts. Inside societies in which generosity and fairness are anticipated, more individuals may be willing to participate in impersonal trade, while the opposite definitely may work as a trade deterrent (Fehr et al., 2008).

If circumstances and experiences can affect prosocial preferences, can they be shaped in a predictable manner by wars and civil conflicts? Due to data availability, empirical evidence so far has mainly focused on economic activity and industrial recovery and has found no long-term effect of international wars in countries such as Germany, Japan or Vietnam (Davis and Weinstein, 2002; Miguel and Roland, 2011). More recent evidence however has found bleaker results concerning the long-term effects of war on human capital, education and health (Blattman and Miguel, 2010).

An important channel through which conflicts can affect development and growth is the effects the may exert on impersonal societal trust. A prerequisite for the successful development of market economies is to depart from closed group interactions and to enlarge exchanges to anonymous others (Fafchamps, 2006; Algan and Cahuc, 2010). In this regard, generalized trust appears as a keystone for successful market development and it is often included in the various definitions of "social capital" as one of its main elements. Understanding the effect of social capital on economic decision-making has been the subject of a broad literature too. This literature has pointed to the positive effects of social capital on economic growth (Knack and Keefer 1997), reducing corruption (LaPorta et. al. 1997), community governance (Bowles and Gintis 2002), preventing crime (Case and Katz 1991), curtailing moral hazard in the workplace (Ichino and Maggi 2000), and financial development (Guiso, Sapienza and Zingales 2004). Yet it

is often the case that social capital variables are endogenous to outcome variables, presenting a challenge to causal inferences.¹

The interplay of trust with violence is particularly interesting since it has been shown that violence and a history of violence, even going as far back as the slave trade in Africa, impact contemporaneous trust negatively and strongly (Nunn and Wantchekon, *forth*). Their hypothesis is that the negative legacy of slave trade on general trust is mainly due to the destruction of social ties through inter-ethnic slave raiding. This hypothesis suggests that civil wars, among the different types of conflicts, should have the most detrimental effect on general trust.

In conclusion, the interest in the economic legacies of violence and civil war is growing and the surveyed literature points to an important question whose answer is still very much elusive. The long-term impact of violence and civil war on the economy through their impact on prosocial preferences has only recently started to gather attention and it is the object of this study.

3. Research Hypothesis

We consider our research question in the context of a devastating civil war in the former Soviet republic of Tajikistan. When the Soviet Union collapsed, Tajikistan collapsed with it. In 1992, regional rivalries, many of which were explicitly developed and exploited during the Soviet era, gave way to a brutal power struggle for control of the central government. A negotiated settlement brought a tenuous peace to Tajikistan in 1997. We will test whether over a decade later (or nearly two decades from the start of the conflict) some of the effects of violence are enduring or not (see Appendix A for detailed background information on Tajikistan and the civil conflict). One possibility, the null hypothesis, is that pro-social and pro-market economic preferences are not systematically different between individuals that were heavily affected and those who were less so (since everyone is presumably affected, by varying degrees, by a civil conflict that lasts

¹ Some rigorous studies on the economic effects of social capital have used instrumental variables to address problems of correlated unobservable (e.g. Knack and Keefer, 1997) or exploited differences in regional social capital within a country to identify its effects (Putnam, 1993; Ichino and Maggi, 2000).

years). An alternative hypothesis is whether, at the individual level, the more direct and personal the experience of violence, the more dramatic the effects in lowering trust and sense of fairness. As stressed by Fafchamps (2006) and Algan and Cahuc (2010), for market institutions to thrive individuals should move beyond personalized trust towards indiscriminate trust, from clan based norms of morality towards a more impersonal sense of fairness.

From a theoretical perspective, an important foundation for our work comes from the culture/gene evolutionary approaches to understanding human cooperation. A fascinating hypothesis since Darwin is that frequent lethal inter-groups conflicts are at the very origin of human altruism and prosocial behavior (Darwin, 1873). Such violent conflicts would select as winners groups abounding of altruistic and prosocial types, providing a solution to the evolutionary puzzle of the sustainability of altruism and prosociality in large groups of genetically unrelated strangers (Bowles, 2006; 2008; 2009; Choi and Bowles, 2007; Boyd, Gintis, Bowles and Richerson, 2003). In facts, wars and evolutionary pressures would open a gap between insiders and outsiders, and this gap (known as parochialism) would favor cooperative institutions among insiders. To test whether intergroup conflicts increase prosocial behavior within the members of one's own group, Bauer, Cassar, Chytilová and Henrich (2011) conducted experiments with over 600 children in Georgia six months after the August 2008 armed conflict with Russia. The subjects were children age 4-11 years from locations that were hit by the conflict to various degrees. The results show that experiencing an inter-group conflict does lead to a stronger application of norms of parochial altruism and egalitarianism.

It is not clear, a priori, whether a preferential treatment towards members of one's own group is beneficial for trade and development since, on one hand, markets require impartiality, but, on the other, they require trust and fairness. In sum, if a market has to be developed within the boundaries of one's group, then it is reasonable to expect parochialism to increase local trust and fairness and therefore to be positive for market development and growth. But while it is a reasonable hypothesis for inter-group conflicts, it is not immediately evident what the predictions would be in case of a civil war. We hypothesize that the final effect would depend on the type of civil war. If the civil conflict would involve village against village or the people in the country against a dictator, the results for the inter-group conflicts might still hold. But if, on the contrary, the civil war would be one that turns neighbors against neighbors we would expect the opposite: less trust and fairness between individuals living in the same village.

We think that the case of Tajikistan should follow in this second category. What makes the Tajik conflict both complex and extremely problematic was the inability to apply basic cues such as ethnicity or language to make shorthand predictions about who was on what side. The various warring factions were not readily identifiable. Among combatants, the Russians and Uzbeks are the only ones who really faced the problem of being readily identifiable by physical appearance and language. Eastern Pamiris (Gorno-Badakhshan) were better capable of blending in and transitioning between Tajik and their Pamiri dialect. There are many examples of the "not readily identifiable" aspect of the conflict. It was widely reported that government soldiers in Dushanbe and elsewhere would stop people at random demanding identity papers, where those with Pamiri names or born in the Gharm region were arrested and later executed (Jawad and Tadjbaksh, 1995; Hiro, 1995). The opposition applied similar tactics in the capital and when dealing with southern Kulyabis in the Kurgan Teppe region. There were also instances of regionally mixed villages, ethnic/regional inter-marriages, and intra-regional violence that further complicated identification (Kilavuz, 2009). It was often difficult to confirm who was committing violence against whom amidst the confusion of the inter-mixed regions of the conflict zone, where in many cases factions of the same regional groups were fighting amongst themselves (Kilavuz, 2009).

In conclusion, we argue that the inability to distinguish friend from foe in conflict may have profound effects on social norms, especially at the local level, by creating long-term concerns about trusting people close by. Normally, local communities are considered to be safe havens for trust, even in times of violence as long as enemies are readily identifiable and front lines can be drawn. In the Tajik civil war, this was not the case. The local environment was extremely dangerous and unpredictable. In contrast to the usual logic of trust (declining as the network of people expands to include more distant strangers) here trust is conditioned by the probability of others taking advantage of you or doing you harm. In this case, people in the village are in the most likely position to take advantage or harm others. The conflict provides a framework for "common knowledge" about the uncertainty of others close by. Because local environments provide many of the foundations for political and economic communities, we argue that the depletion of prosocial norms in those conflict-ridden communities will have profound effects on the ability to develop reliable and credible institutions, decreasing the support for market and democratic reforms.

4. Experimental Design and Survey Instrument

4.1. Experimental Protocol

To elicit individual preferences we had subjects participate in three games: the dictator game, the ultimatum game and the trust game. We always run them in this order (given the natural increase of complexity) without disclosing to the first player the decision taken by the second player until the very end (and only for the game randomly selected for payment) to prevent dependency between games. For economy of space, in this paper we do not discuss the results for the ultimatum game since the data are qualitatively similar to the dictator game results but without any significance². For comparison purposes, our instructions were based on the ones used for the *The Roots of Human Sociality*.³ The original protocol was modified to include our in-group out-group treatments, to preserve anonymity and to adapt it to the Tajikistan environment. In each session the second movers in the games were randomly assigned to be someone either from the same village as the subject or from somewhere else in Tajikistan (see the treatment description below).

The dictator game is a 2-player game in which Person 1 has to decide how to allocate a certain sum of money between self and an anonymous other. In our adaptation, subjects had to choose how to allocate 40 Somoni in increments of 10 Somoni (1USD = 4.43 Somoni so approximately \$9 in increments of \$2.25). Subjects were not given real

² Interested readers can find the ultimatum game analysis in the supplementary materials.

³ An Ethno-Experimental Exploration of the Foundations of Economic Norms in 16 Small-Scale Scoties. Principal investigators: Jean Ensminger, Joseph Heinrich. Instructions and other information available at: http://www.hss.caltech.edu/~jensming/roots-of-sociality

money, but instead made their allocation decisions by checking a box on a form.⁴ To ensure anonymity, each subject was given a big cardboard box to do their writing in. Person 1 was then asked to decide how to divide these 40 Somoni (0, 10, 20, 30 40) between him or herself and an anonymous Person 2. In the first part of this game we had every subject participate as Person 1. When subjects played as Person 2 they had nothing to do, still we didn't reveal any Person 1 choices to them until the very end and only if this was the game selected for payment (see the treatment description below).

The trust game was based on the classic Berg, Dickaut and McCabe (1995) protocol. A first mover has to decide how much of an initial amount I to send to a second mover. The amount sent (X, with $0 \le X \le I$) is then multiplied by 3 before reaching the second mover. The second mover receives 3X and has to decide how much of that sum (Y, with $0 \le Y \le 3X$) he/she wants to return to the first mover. X can then be interpreted as an indication of trust while Y as a measure of trustworthiness. In our adaptation, we gave each first mover 20 Somoni (again, only on a form) and there were only 5 options for dividing the money (0, 5, 10, 15, 20)—this was to simplify the game and to have the same focal points as other studies. In the first part of the game, we had all of our subjects play as first mover, in the second part all played as second mover, using the strategy methods and without revealing what the first mover had actually sent to them.

To avoid issues of correlations across games, we paid subjects only according to one of these game/roles. We announced at the very beginning that at the very end we would ask one of the subjects to throw a 6-faced die and the number this would determine the game/role according to which they would be paid. It is important for our protocol that no information was revealed to Player 2 in the various games until the very end and only if the game/role was selected for payment. To not undermine dominance and introduce other motivations (like simply having fun while participating), we never called these activities games or refer to it as play, we used more neutral terms like task, decision making, make a choice etc...

⁴ The advantage of using forms is that it was easier for subjects to conceal their decisions in a group setting compared to using real money.

In addition to their earnings, all participates received a "show-up" fee of approximately 33 in local currency. Total earnings ranged from 0 to 60 Somoni (0-13.50 USD) with an average of 24 Somoni with a standard deviation of 10.9 (approximately 5.40, SD = 2.46) excluding the show-up fee. Field work started on June 1 and sessions run from July 1 to July 24, 2010. In total, 426 subjects completed the study. Additional sample characteristics are listed in the analysis below.

4.2. Treatments

In order to test our hypothesis we implemented 2 treatments: "Same Village" (SV) and "Distant Village" (DV). In the SV treatments we explained to the subjects that for each game the second mover was selected among people from the same village, while under DV we explained that the second mover was selected from people from a distant village. We described "Same" and "Distant" villages by showing the subjects a map of their country and pointing to where their village was ("Yeah, that's right, that's your village"). If the session was a SV treatment, we explain that if we were to pay according to player 1 decisions, we would send the money anonymously to another person that lived in the same village and who would participate in a future session. If we were to pay according to player 2 decisions, player 1 offers came from an anonymous other who participated in a previous session in the same village.

For the DV treatment, we draw on the map a large circle around their village and we explained that the distant village could be anywhere in or around that circle ("Yeah, that's right, that's your village, and those are all different villages very distant from here"), otherwise we explained the payoffs for first players and second players in a similar manner to the SV sessions. For the DV sessions we used the offers from the first movers from previous locations in which we did DV (using pilot data for the very first one).

4.3. Subject recruitment and sampling frame

The subjects were selected using a multi-stage sampling method. 426 individuals were surveyed and administered the games in 17 villages in 4 regions: Dushanbe, Khatlon,

Gharm and Pamir. In Dushanbe, Pamir and Gharm selection of villages (the first sampling stage) was made at random based on census data with probability of selection proportional to population size. Villages in Gharm were chosen at random within the sub region of the Rasht Valley, where fighting was most intense during the civil war. Within each village, respondents were selected randomly. On arriving at the sampling point, each enumerator was randomly assigned a starting point within the town or village. For the selection of households, each enumerator followed the standard "random route" technique, starting with 5th numbered apartment building or house selecting every 5th entrance. Individual respondents (1 per household) were chosen using a random selection key (a 12-face die) where every adult member of the household had an equal probability of being selected. For each sampling point, all recruitment of subjects and data collection was conducted on the same day using a team of enumerators and administrators to conduct the survey and to run the experiments. In Dushanbe, Gharm, and Khatlon, the team consisted of the same group of five ethnic Tajik enumerators and one ethnic Uzbek enumerator. In Pamir, we used a different team of four ethnic Pamiri enumerators and a Pamiri administrator. The local teams were trained by two graduate students and by one of the authors of this paper who was always on site to supervise data collection.

To address issues of framing either the experiment or the survey, we conducted some sessions in which experiment came before the survey and others in which the order was reversed. For the survey, most of the subjects were interviewed in their home one-on-one by local enumerators. In cases where the home environment was not sufficiently private or accommodating, subjects were interviewed outdoors or at another location. Once subjects completed the survey, they were taken by their enumerator to a common location in the town or village to participate in the experiments. Most experiments were conducted in school rooms, where each person had their own desk and chair to work on. In villages without schools, experiments were conducted in the largest common space, typically a mosque or a meeting hall. The sessions were conducted in groups of 10-20 subjects depending on the size of the room available. Subjects were not allowed to talk with one another during the sessions and this rule was generally well abided. There were no significant disturbances or interruptions that occurred during the experimental sessions.

administrator read instructions from a standard script. All survey and experimental instructions, forms, and materials were translated into Tajik, Russian, and Pamiri and back-translated into English for accuracy.

4.4. Survey

War victimization is captured through survey questions. The survey asks about injury, loss of life of any household member, loss of property and forced displacement as a result of a conflict. Respondents were also asked whether witnessed or took any direct participation in fighting not only during the conflict but also since the 1997 Peace Agreement.

The survey probes about economic, social and political attitudes. Several attitudes are of noteworthy interest. First, our aim is to provide, through survey questions, a validation of our experimental measures of preferences. We are particularly interested in the implications of the trust game behavior with regards to impersonal exchange. The survey therefore investigates stated preferences towards participating in impersonal exchange and towards market liberalization. In order to measure respondents' actual participation in markets, we follow Heinrich et al. (2010) and ask respondents to report the share of their weekly consumption of food purchased through markets as opposed to selfproduced, bartered or exchanged as gifts. Second, we aim at capturing norms of generalized morality and respect for the rule of law as opposed to kinship-based morality. The contribution of generalized norms of morality in solving problems of cooperation and conflict and the contribution of the latter to the development of impersonal exchange and markets has been noted in the literature before, namely by Greif (2006). The survey inquires about procedures of conflict resolution, particularly related to conflicts emerging during market exchange. Last, the survey includes several measures of participation in groups, collective action and political participation. The purpose of these questions is to test whether previous findings of the positive effects of conflict on group membership and local collective action are replicated in the Tajik context.

In order to increase the external validity of our results, the wording of many questions not only on political and social attitudes but also on war exposure replicates the Life in Transition Survey, the second round of which was implemented in late Summer 2010.

6. Empirical Strategy and Results

6.1. Empirical Strategy

We investigate how war experience affects individual preferences, values and beliefs. The analysis compares individuals who suffered from different degrees of violence during the conflict. The general form of the estimation equation is as follows:

$$Y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 W_{ij} + \beta_2 X_{ij} + \beta_3 C_j + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

$$\tag{1}$$

where our outcome variable *Yij* includes different measures of elicited social preferences, market orientation and economic and political preferences of respondent *i* in region or village *j*; *Wij* is a measure of the intensity of individual exposure to civil war violence, *Xij* is a set of individual and household controls, and *Cj* is a set of region or village fixed effects. We use two measures of individual exposure to civil war violence. The first (*injured or killed*) is a dummy variable taking value 1 if either the respondent was injured or one of his or her household member was injured or killed during the civil war. The second (*injured and killed*) is a dummy variable taking value 1 if the respondent reports both injury and loss of life during the civil war. This second measure thus indicates higher degree of severity of exposure to conflict. In all regressions using experimental data we additionally include controls for the different experimental treatments. Standard errors are clustered at the village level in all specifications.

Because of the regional nature of the conflict, all specifications include regional fixed effects. This removes difference between regions, and therefore biases us against finding any effect of victimization. With regional fixed effects, identification of causal effects of conflict requires victimization within a region to be –close to- random. Such an assumption might be too strong. Victims of violence may be different from non-victims in observable and unobservable ways and so any comparison of victims and non-victims will conflate the impacts of war with preexisting differences that led some people to be

victimized. This is especially problematic if the characteristics associated with victimization are also those associated with the outcomes that we want to observe. If, for example, more pro-social or more market oriented individuals, or villages with higher proportion of such individuals, were systematically targeted, this would result in an estimation bias of any effect of the civil war on social preferences and market orientation.

The specific situation of Tajikistan somewhat helps us deal with this issue. As a Soviet creation, Tajikistan had no experience with a market economy and democratic self-governance as a civil society prior to the onset of violence. This helps alleviate the – statistical- problem that such characteristics may predict selection into war victimization. Still, some concerns remain for the identification of causal effects of victimization and we employ several strategies to deal with the potential selection bias.

First, we employ a selection on observables strategy and check that our results are robust to the inclusion of a large number of individual and household controls. Of particular concern are variables that may be related both to post-war outcomes and to victimization. We focus on pre-1992 characteristics, since such characteristics cannot have been affected by victimization. We also empirically investigate what characteristics are associated with victimization and include them as controls in the rest of our analysis.

Second, we check that all results are robust to the inclusion of village fixed effects. Different villages may have been targeted as a function of many characteristics that are not observable to the econometrician, for example the support that local clan leaders gave to different fighting factions. The use of village fixed effects implies that identification now only requires that violence is -close to- random within villages, conditional on household and individual characteristics.

Third, in order to address the concern that selection into victimization was based upon unobservable characteristics, we follow Altonji, Elder and Taber (2005) and gauge how much the importance of unobservable variables would need to be, relative to observable factors, in order to explain away all the effects of war violence on post-war outcomes. Obtained statistics (see Section 6.3.3.) make it unlikely that the omitted variable bias could account for the full effect of civil war on social norms, market orientation or economic and political preferences. Our last strategy to deal with potential selection bias is to focus our analysis on different subsamples. We first restrict our attention to individuals who were too young to be systematically targeted – those who were 12 or younger at the beginning of the conflict, or at most 31 years old today. This is about a third of our sample. There is another rationale behind focusing on this subsample. The psychology literature stresses that traumatic events have a stronger impact on younger individuals, particularly in their late childhood or early teenage years. The effects of victimization are thus expected to be of a larger magnitude on this subsample of the population, who were at most 18 at the end of the conflict. A remaining issue is that the results could be driven by selective migration of individuals who experienced violence. Our results would be biased if, for example, war victims systematically migrated to areas where formal institutions are weak and markets are poorly developed. In order to deal with this issue, we re-run the analysis on the subsample of people who have never moved and still live in the same village where they were born.

6.2. Determinants of Victimization

As can be seen in Table 1, the incidence of war victimization in our sample is very high. On average, 21% of respondents declare that they have been personally injured or that a member of their household has been injured or killed as a result of the conflict. 13% of respondents report both injury and loss of life as a result of the conflict. There is a lot of regional variation (see Figure 1 and Table A2 in Supplementary Appendix). Victimization is particularly high in Gharm, one of the regions most affected by civil war violence. We purposefully surveyed respondents in the Rasht Valley, where fighting was particularly intense. 40% of respondents in this region report loss of life in their household.

Table 2 displays the results of regressions where our victimization indicators are regressed on a number of individual characteristics, controlling for regional and village fixed effects. The results do not support fears that selection into victimization is a major concern. The region where the respondent lived in 1992 is the strongest and most robust predictor of violence. Ethnicity is also found to be a strong predictor of victimization.

Members of *—*easily identifiable- minority groups, Uzbeks and Kyrgyz, are less likely to have been victims of violence. As expected, victimization is positively associated with age, although the relationship is statistically weak. Education is also positively and significantly associated with victimization. In order to explore in more details the relationship between education and victimization, we restrict the sample to the subset of individuals who were or 25 and older in 1992 (Columns 2, 4, 6 and 8), as their education levels were then predetermined and could not have been affected by the conflict. Results on this subsample confirm that higher levels of education are positively associated with victimization. Individuals who completed compulsory or secondary education are more likely to have suffered from civil war violence than those who have no education. The effect of higher education is positive but not significant. This result could be explained by "guns or butter" models of conflict as a choice between production and appropriation, which suggest that the probability of victimization is linked to the resources of potential victims (Haavelmo 1954, Grossman and King 1995). If more educated people had more resources to be expropriated or, more generally, were the object of envy, they might have been targeted during the conflict. In contradiction with this explanation however, the relationship between income and victimization is no robust and if anything, is negative. Another explanation for the relationship between education and victimization has to do with theories of political participation. Higher levels of education generate expectations, which, if unmet, can induce participation in demonstrations. These ideas have been popularized as the J-Curve theory (Davies 1974, Miller et al. 1977). In the context of the Tajik civil war, more educated people were probably more likely to join (or be suspected of joining) the protests that ignited clashes and retaliation by government forces. This positive relationship between education and victimization might lead to an upward endogeneity bias in our results. If more pro-market individuals were systematically targeted, this will bias upward the relationship between victimization and pro-market behavior and preferences. However, our main results point to a negative relationship between market orientation and victimization. Absent such correlation between education and victimization, one may thus expect the main relationship discussed in this paper to be even stronger. Other covariates that may have been expected to be correlated with victimization, such as having a family member that was member of the communist party,

or having been displaced by the communist regime are positive but not significant predictors of violence. In all regressions, education and communist party membership of household members are controlled for. We also control for all characteristics that are unlikely to have changed as a result of the war, such as age, ethnicity, gender and the region where the respondent lived at the onset of conflict.

6.3. Experimental Results: Trust and Dictator Games

6.3.1. Trust Game

The main hypothesis we want to test in this paper is that civil war related violence hampers trust and, in particular, opens a gap between individual trust towards different groups. It is already apparent from the descriptive statistics displayed in Figure 2 that, although war victimization does not lower in a significant manner the overall amount sent in the trust game, it has a strong differential effect across the two treatments. Victimization sharply reduces the amount sent to someone in the same village, while the effect is mostly insignificant (positive if anything) towards someone living in a different village. Regression results controlling for regional differences and individual characteristics confirm this. Panel (a) of Table 3 displays the results for those who report injury or loss of life as a result of the conflict, panel (b) for those who report both injury and loss of life. Specifications control alternatively for region and village dummies. Columns 1 and 2 investigate the main effect of victimization on trust game donations. Columns 3 to 5 include an interaction term between victimization and the same village treatment in order to test for differential effects of victimization on trust within and across villages. Columns 6 to 8 report results of regressions performed on the different treatment subsamples. Columns 10 and 11 report results of regressions performed only on the subsample of those how were 12 or younger at the onset of the conflict, a group for which we are less likely to suspect self-selection into victimization.

The picture emerging from the regressions is clear: war victimization destroys local trust. The coefficient on the interaction between the same village treatment and whether the respondent reports injury and/or loss of life is always negative and significant at the 5% to 10% level. This is confirmed in Columns 8 and 9 of Table 3b: war victims give

substantially less when they play in the same village treatment, and the effect is significant at the 5% level. These effects are robust to the inclusion of village fixed effects. The effect of victimization on local trust is not only statistically but also economically significant. Injury or loss of life during the civil war is associated with between 2.8 and 3.3 Somoni average decrease in donations in the trust game to people of the same village. The average donation being 9.74, this represents a decrease within the same village by around 30%. The effect is even stronger for those who suffered to an even greater degree during the war. People who report both injury and loss of life give about 46% less to people from the same village. The effects are robust when village fixed effects are included and actually become larger. The effect of victimization on local trust far outweighs the influence of any other individual characteristics such as age, gender, ethnicity, education or communist party membership, none of which has a robust effect, either on its own or interacted with the same village treatment. Additional results available upon request (not included for space economy) show that the effect is robust to controlling for additional individual characteristics such as income, working status, marital status, and family size and composition. The effect is also robust to ordinal logit or probit specifications.

By contrast, war victims tend to give more when they play with an anonymous partner from a different village (Columns 6 and 7 and main effect in Columns 4 and 5). Victimization is associated with a roughly 20% increase in trust to an anonymous partner from a distant village.

This increase in basic trust associated with victimization that we find once we control for the treatment and include the interaction term in Columns 4 and 5 is especially meaningful for us. We will see this outcome returning in the young sub-sample analysis and in the various specifications of the dictator game results. This tells us that being more or less directly affected by war-related violence reduces the trust we have in our fellow villagers, but, ultimately, towards a distant other that has not hurt us directly, we are willing to give a chance. This is related to that large body of psychological literature on post traumatic growth we surveyed above (Tedeschi and Calhoun, 2004; Solnit, 2009). This positive effect of trauma might help explain the findings of Bellows and Miguel (2009) and Blattman (2009) and has also been found in other post-war societies such as Georgia (Bauer, Cassar, Chytilova and Henrich, 2011) and Sierra Leone (Bauer, Cassar and Chytilova, 2011).

The effect of war victimization on sending in the trust game remains robust and actually acquires more significant both statistically and economically when we focus our attention to the subsamples of non movers (Supplementary Appendix table A3) and those younger than 12 at the onset of conflict (Columns 10 and 11 of Tables 3a and 3b). In both subsamples, either proxy of victimization is associated with a statistically significant decrease in sending in the same village treatment and a statistically significant increase in the different village treatment, albeit by a smaller amount. The sample of youth is the most interesting sample in order to test additional predictions from the psychological literature concerning the malleability of preferences at different ages. Indeed, in this sample, either proxy of war victimization is associated with a roughly 50% decrease in amount sent by the first mover to a partner from the same village and an average 40% increase in amount sent towards anonymous partners from a different village. This corroborates the idea that traumatic events leave a larger imprint on preferences if experienced during late childhood or teenage years.

6.3.2. Fairness and Generosity

In addition to trust, we are interested in whether civil war related violence exerts a lasting impact on norms of fairness. We have two measures of fairness: generosity, which is measured by contributions in the dictator game and egalitarianism, which is measured by offering an equal split. We proceed in the same way as before by first exploring the main effect of conflict victimization and then interacting the victimization variable with the same village treatment to test for differential effects of victimization towards different groups. All regressions control for the full set of controls discussed in 6.1.

Table 5 reports regression results where the dependent variable consists of contributions sent by the first mover in the dictator game. Having been a victim of conflict is associated with an overall increase in generosity. The effect is substantial. Injury or loss of a household member during the conflict is associated with a 25% (within village, Column 3) to 30% (within region, Column 2) increase in dictator game giving. However,

mirroring the results of the trust game, this is mainly due to an increase in generosity towards a distant other. Again, the effect is much larger for those who experienced such traumatic events in their childhood or early teens. Columns 9 and 10 report the results for the sub-sample of those 18 or younger at the end of the war. Injury or loss of life is associated with a 55% increase in generosity towards an anonymous partner from a different village but a 80% average decrease in giving to someone from the same village (column 10, Table 5a)! The effect is even more dramatic for those who suffered even more during the civil war. Those who report both injury and loss of life give 66% more to an anonymous partner but 90% less to someone from the same village (column 10, Table 5b)! Such effects nevertheless fall short of significance when village fixed effects are included.

A similar picture is obtained for preferences for egalitarianism. Regression results are reported in Table 7 and 8. Preferences for an egalitarian split increase by about 20% towards respondents from a different village but decrease by a superior amount (around 30% on average) towards someone from the same village. The results are robust to the inclusion of village fixed effects and to using alternative subsamples of non-movers (see Table A4 in Supplementary Appendix) as well as different specifications (logit and probit). In the subsample of those who were 18 or younger at the end of the conflict, again, the results are of the same sign and larger in magnitude, although they fall short of significance when victimization is proxied by injured.

6.3.3. Additional Robustness to Selection on Unobservables

Following Altonji, Elder, and Taber (2005) and Nunn and Wantchekon (*forth.*), ratios are computed that reflect how much greater the influence of unobservable factors would need to be, relative to observable factors, to explain away the full positive relationship between war victimization and individual behaviors in game. This test is based on the ratio of coefficients of regressions including full or restricted sets of control variables. The first coefficient $\hat{\beta}^{R}$ is obtained when only the victimization variables are controlled for. The second, $\hat{\beta}^{F}$ is obtained when the full set of observable characteristics are controlled for.

The ratio is calculated as: $\hat{\beta}^{F}/(\hat{\beta}^{R} - \hat{\beta}^{F})$. The intuition behind this formula is that the smaller is the difference between the two coefficients, the less the estimate is affected by selection on observables so that the larger the selection on unobservables needs to be, relative to observables, in order to explain away the entire effect of $\hat{\beta}^{F}$. Table 9 reports the ratio of coefficients of regressions including full or restricted sets of coefficients. Obtained ratios make it unlikely that unobserved heterogeneity could explain away the relationship between victimization and trust game behavior in the same village treatment. The ratios obtained for the dictator game and egalitarian split results yield similar conclusions.

6.3.4. Discussion

Our results suggest that the Tajik civil war has destroyed local trust and norms of fairness towards those in the same village, while it has modestly increased them towards others living far away. We argue that such effect may constitute an important impediment to market and economic development. It has been stressed in the literature that in many developing countries, the weakness of contract enforcement institutions constitutes an obstacle to market and economic development (North,). It has been shown that in this context, social preferences characterized by norms of fairness and trust can play a key role in substituting for formal institutions and solving for the cooperation and coordination problems implied by interpersonal exchange (Fafchamps 2004, Fehr, Hoff and Kshetramade 2008). The evidence above, which points to the destruction of such norms of fairness and trust implies that solving such problems will be more difficult and will impede market development- at least at the local level. A frequent objection to experimental evidence however is that behavior in games may poorly reflect actual behavior. We therefore turn in the next subsection to more direct survey evidence on respondents' stated preferences and actual behavior. Such evidence largely corroborates the conclusions drawn from our experimental evidence.

6.4. Survey Results: Market Integration, Economic and Political Preferences

We first investigate directly respondents' stated and revealed preferences on participation in impersonal exchange. Second, we investigate the strength of formal institutions vs. kinship-based informal institutions, particularly in what relates to conflict adjudication. An important literature and in particular Greif (2000) has stressed the importance of conflict adjudication mechanisms in enforcing economic exchange. Historically, the evolution of such institutions from a kinship and interpersonal basis to an open and impersonal basis has been associated with the "birth of impersonal exchange" (Greif 2006). Third, we investigate the determinants of a form of social capital: collective action. The importance of social capital for growth and market development has been the object of an ever-growing literature (for a recent review, see Guiso, Sapienza and Zingales 2010). Group membership and civic participation have been widely used in the literature as measures of social capital. Recent studies of the effect of civil war have found that individual experiences of civil war violence, either as victims or perpetrators, were associated with more active local political participation and group membership (Bellows and Miguel 2008, Blattman 2009). However, this acceptation of social capital also has negative connotation, if it leads to the exclusion of outsiders (Portes, 1998). To what extent participation in local groups reflects inclusive and impersonal social capital of the kind that has been associated with market development and growth or a fold back on clannishness is investigated in what follows.

6.4.1. Market integration and participation

Table 10 presents regression results where we use several dependent variables in order to measure willingness to participate in impersonal exchange and preferences for free markets through survey questions. Consistently with the observed decrease in the offers in the trust game, victims of civil war violence have a significantly lower willingness to engage in anonymous exchange. We measure such willingness by the following survey question: "When you go to the market, how important is it to buy from a seller that you know personally?", with a 4 points scale answer from "not important at all" to "essential". The effect of conflict is positive and significant at the 1% level and is robust

to the inclusion of village fixed effects, signaling a decreased willingness to participate in exchange with an anonymous trader.

We also measure people's actual participation in markets by asking questions about the proportion of different food items purchased through market exchange, versus self produced or procured through donations. Civil war victims are less integrated into markets according to this measure, although the effect falls short of significance when village fixed effects are included (see Table A5 in Supplementary Appendix).

War victimization is also associated with a significant decrease in preferences for a free market and for market liberalization, which we measure through two survey questions described in Table 1. Preferences for a democratic system are also significantly lower among civil war victims. Support for free markets and democracy is roughly 20% lower among victims of civil war compared to other individuals from the same village.

6.4.2. Kinship vs. rule of law

Table 11 present regressions results where the dependent variables consist of answers to different questions aimed at capturing the strength of clannishness and kinship ties. We included a question that measures to what extent, when facing a conflict situation, respondents turn to legal and formal institutions – the police or village leader - or to their kin in order to solve the conflict. We are particularly interested in conflicts that may be associated with market transactions, and we probe about recourses in three potential conflict situations: (i) the respondent "lent money to someone who does not repay", (ii) he/she "sold a good to someone who refuses to pay, or (iii) "someone knowingly sold him/her a defective good". We build an index that reflects the number of times the respondent would turn to his/her relatives, as opposed to the police or village leader, in order to solve such a conflict. We then regress this index on war experiences. Results are displayed in Columns 1 and 2 of Table 11. Our first measure of victimization, injured or *killed*, is positively and significantly associated with a reinforcement of kinship ties. Accordingly, civil war victims are also less likely to support the statement that "If someone has information that may help justice be done, generally he or she should report it to the police" (Columns 3 and 4).

The third variable that we use to measure the strength of kinship ties is opinions about the freedom to marry. As stressed by Greif (2006), restricted and consanguineous marriages have historically provided one means of creating and maintaining kinship groups. We ask in the survey whether the respondent supports freedom to marry or rather thinks best for parents to choose a spouse for their children. We regress a dummy variable taking value 1 if respondents support the freedom to marry on war experiences. Results are displayed in Columns 13 and 14 of Table 11. War experience is markedly associated with a decrease in the support for free marriage, even hen we control for whether the respondent herself married freely.

6.4.3. Participation in groups

Several survey questions aim at capturing participation in groups and association. First, we asked respondents whether they participated in any community meetings during the week preceding our team's visit. Second, we build an index variable that sums the number of groups and associations the respondents belongs to. We ask about a variety of groups, such as mosque and religious organization, NGOs, neighborhood groups, labor unions, fraternal groups and youth associations. This index takes values from 0 to 5. Group participation is low on average in our sample, which is consistent with the literature documenting evidence of low levels of civil society development in post Soviet Republics, particularly in Central Asia (REFERENCES). The mean of the group participation index is 0.79. 40% of respondents do not participate in any group. However, civil war experience is significantly and positively associated with group participation. Regression results are displayed in Columns 3 to 8 of Table 12. War victims are also more likely to have attended community meetings (Columns 1 and 2 of Table 12). This mirrors the result found by an emerging literature that finds a link between civil war and local collective action, namely by Bellows and Miguel (2008) in the case of Sierra Leone. The interpretation that prevailed in the literature so far was a positive one: that civil war may be 'good' for civil society development. Our results highlight something different. Such participation among war victims is actually associated with a decrease in trust as measured by the trust game. Results are displayed in Table 13. The first variable of interest is an interaction between the same village treatment and a dummy that reflects whether people participate in groups or association. The positive and statistically significant coefficient on this variable reflects the usual result of the literature that group participation is correlated with higher levels of trust. The second variable of interest is an interaction between the same village treatment, a dummy that indicates group participation and one of our victimization proxy (*injured and killed*). The coefficient of this interaction term is negative and statistically significant, indicating that those who participate in groups but are victims of the civil war send less to their fellow villagers in the trust game. The effect holds whether we control for region or village fixed effects. Such evidence is consistent with our previous results that civil war victimization is associated with a reinforcement of clannishness and kinship ties. Participation in groups in this case may not be taken as an indication of inclusive social capital but rather as a sign of victims folding back towards exclusive groups.

We also investigate which particular group and association war victims are more likely to join. It is mainly religious groups and, to a lesser extent, labor unions that receive a boost in membership among war victims. The effect is not significant for any other group. In Tajikistan, participation in religious groups may be perceived as a form of opposition to the government. As a matter of fact, both war veterans and, more worryingly, those who participated in fighting since the Peace Agreement are also significantly more likely to be members of a Mosque and religious groups (see Table A6 for full results).

7. Concluding Remarks Specific to the Case of Tajikistan

This paper reports the results of a study combining experimental evidence with survey data to investigate the effects of civil war violence. We collected data on prosocial and economic preferences for 426 randomly selected subjects coming from different regions of Tajikistan. Our results indicate that over 10 years after the end of the civil war those individuals that have been affected the most behave significantly different when interacting with others from the same village. With respect to trust, those that have been more affected in terms of being injured or having a relative killed trust significantly less those in the same village than distant people elsewhere in Tajikistan. With respect to

fairness and egalitarianism, we observe a similar result within village: those that have been affected are willing to give much less to others from the same village, but much more to abstract distant others.

In conclusion, our study indicates that violence has undermined social trust at the village level, which has eroded support for market liberalization and democratic reform based on individual rights. Many scholars have pointed out a general trust deficit in post-Soviet societies, but we argue that the experience of violence has further complicated the ability of Tajikistan to build on an already poor foundation for trust (See Appendix for more detailed discussion). This manuscript thus raises questions about the enduring effects of Tajikistan's civil war on prospects for economic and political institution building. We argue that civil conflict increases the likelihood that Tajikistan will remain "lost in transition", failing to make significant progress either on democratization or market economic development, which in turn increases the likelihood of recurrent conflict. Institution building is one way in which Tajikistan could possible escape the "conflict trap" – the cycles of poverty and violence well documented in Africa. However, our research indicates that the Tajik civil war has created long-term challenges to institution building. Our concerns are based on what we observe to be the erosion of basic social norms vital to functional political institutions, market economies, and civil societies, especially within local communities.

Much of the institutional literature on trust and social capital more broadly claims that social norms are essential for well functioning institutions. Cooperative pro-social norms like trust, fairness, and reciprocity provide a mechanism for smoothing transactions in complex societies. Institutions provide the enforcement mechanisms to ensure cooperative norms are well-abided. Though norms can persist in the absence of institutions, social cooperation is considered to be significantly less stable. Hence, while there is disagreement about the causal relationship between institutions and social norms, most scholars agree that norms and institutions are at least reflective qualitatively of one another. Strong credible institutions go hand in hand with enduring cooperative norms within society.

War, civil conflict, and violence are potentially devastating because they undermine both the institutional framework of the state as well as the social fabric for cooperation. Violence dramatically increases the risks and uncertainties of social exchange and breaks down the institutions that normally protect people against entrepreneurism. Normally this leads people to turn inward, trusting and relying only on those networks of people who they consider "safe". Typically, this includes family, kinship, and then friendship networks at the local level. As the circle broadens, the likelihood of trust and cooperation declines from family, friends, neighbors, and people in the community. Beyond the local community, people have to rely on social heuristics such as region, religion, ethnicnationalist, or clan-based identities to determine who is friend or foe. Failure to make these types of distinctions can have deadly consequences in an environment of war and violence.

Appendix A. Background on the Tajik civil war and post conflict

The Tajik civil war (1992-1997) has received far less attention than most other conflicts of the 1990s, to the extent that some have described it as a "forgotten civil war" (Jawad and Tadjbaksh, 1995). The historical record of the conflict has been described by scholars as "scattered", "contested and obscured", "heavily biased in favour of one faction or the other" (Chatterjee 2002; Heathershaw 2009; Akiner 2001 respectively). A variety of interpretations of the conflict can be found in the literature based on regionalism, ideology, elite instrumentalism, and conflicts over resources . From a regional perspective, the war is often described as a struggle between a pro-government alliance of northern and southern factions against eastern opposition groups, out of which the southern faction emerged as dominant. Ideologically, the conflict is often characterized as former communists against a highly fractionalized group of challengers comprised of Islamic revivalists, ethnic nationalists, and pro-democratic reformers . Most of the conflict took place in central and southern low-lying areas where these population groups were inter-mixed. Mountainous geographic divisions prevented the fighting from extending into the far north and eastern regions.

Heathershaw (2009, p. 25) writes that Tajik civil war may be best understood as a "complex crisis of decolonization" resulting from the collapse of the Soviet Union and unfolding in several stages. The period from the beginning of following glasnost and perestroika in the late 1980s through 1991 saw the rise of opposition groups and protests against the old guard regime. Following Tajikistan's independence in 1992, protests between government and opposition groups became more violent and an internal powerstruggle escalated within the pro-government alliance, in which the dominant northern leadership was overthrown by southern factions. From 1992 onward, the southerndominated government forces battled eastern opposition groups until a peace agreement was reached in 1997. Fighting was especially fierce in the southern province and around the capital. With military intervention from Russia and Uzbekistan, government forces ultimately regained control by pushing eastern opposition out of the south, the central regions, and the capital back to their homelands in the east or abroad. In 1997 the United Nations brokered a peace agreement between government and opposition forces. Russian troops would remain in Tajikistan after the war, especially along the Tajik-Afghan border, as part of a peacekeeping operation together with other countries from the Commonwealth of Independent States. In the period between 1992 and 1997 estimates of war casualties vary between 50,000 and 100,000 dead and over 1 million people displaced internally and abroad.

Many aid organizations have catalogued the devastating consequences of the civil war on Tajikistan's economic and political development. Economically, Tajikistan is still making up for losses incurred during the war. The World Bank estimates that Tajikistan's GDP fell by over 60% during the war and despite modest recovery over the past decade, remains below pre-war levels . According to the latest National Development Report by the UNDP, Tajikistan is not projected to regain its 1990 HDI levels until 2015 . The strongest component of Tajikistan's current HDI ranking is adult literacy (99.6%), while per capita GDP remains the weakest, indicating a highly educated but impoverished society. Although poverty rates have fallen from highs of over 80% in the past decade, the UNDP estimates that over half the population still lives under the poverty line and real unemployment remains at 35-40%. Although the able-bodied population has grown by over 1.6 million since the end of the war, the UNDP estimates that total economy

productivity within the workforce population has decreased by 18%. The absence of employment opportunity has led anywhere from 400,000 to 1.5 million Tajiks to migrate abroad for work. In 2008 remittances from abroad accounted for \$2.6 billion or 52% of Tajikistan's GDP.

Politically, Tajikistan has also failed to make progress on democratization since the war based on a range of indicators. Using Polity IV data, the Center for Systemic Peace classifies Tajikistan as reflecting "an inherent quality of instability or ineffectiveness" and "especially vulnerable to the onset of new political instability events, such as outbreaks of armed conflict, unexpected changes in leadership, or adverse regime changes" (Marshall and Cole 2009, p. 9). Freedom House consistently ranks Tajikistan as "not free" in provision of political and civil rights . Transparency International also ranks Tajikistan high on its corruption perception index . The 2009 Failed State Index considers Tajikistan "in danger" of state failure . Tajikistan is similarly ranked according to the State Fragility index as "serious" by the Center for Systemic Peace. Finally, Tajikistan has not experienced a single transition in presidential power or parliamentary control since 1992 and neither appears likely in the foreseeable future. Although the government of Emomalii Rahmon has generally succeeded in keeping the peace, political and economic institutions have shown weaknesses in dealing with domestic and external threats to Tajikistan's long term stability (Akiner 2001, Johnson 2006, Heathershaw 2009). A destabilizing political or economic shock could usher in the collapse of Emomalii Rahmon's regime and a return to civil conflict or possibly international conflict with its neighbors.

REFERENCES

- Algan, Y. and Cahuc. P. 2010. "Inherited Trust and Growth," *American Economic Review* 100(5): 2060–92.
- Altonji, J., Elder T., and Taber, C. 2005. "Selection on Observed and Unobserved Variables: Assessing the Effectiveness of Catholic Schools," *Journal of Political Economy* 113(1), pages 151-184.
- Akiner, S. 2001. *Tajikistan: Disintegration or Reconciliation?* London: Royal Institute of International Affairs.

- Michal, B., Cassar, A., Chytilová, J. and Henrich, J. 2011. Warfare during Ontogeny Increases Egalitarian and Parochial Motivations. Working paper.
- Bellows J., Miguel E. 2009. "War and Collective Action in Sierra Leone." *Journal of Public Economics* 93(11-12), 1144-1157.
- Blattman, C. 2009. "From Violence to Voting: War and Political Participation in Uganda." *The American Political Science Review* 103, 231.
- Bowles, S. 2006. "Group competition, reproductive leveling, and the evolution of human altruism." *Science* 314, 1569.
- Bowles, S. 2008. "Conflict: Altruism's Midwife." Nature 456, 326-327.
- Bowles, S. 2009. "Did warfare among ancestral hunter-gatherers affect the evolution of human social behaviors?" *Science* 324, 1293.
- Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. 2006. "Social Preferences, Homo Economicus and Zoon Politikon." In *The Oxford Handbook of Work of Contextual Political Analysis*, Eds. Robert E. Good in and Charles Tilly. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Boyd, R. and Richerson, P. J. 2005. "Solving the Puzzle of Human Cooperation," In: *Evolution and Culture*, S. Levinson ed. MIT Press, Cambridge MA, pp 105–132.
- Cardenas, J.C., and Carpenter, J. (2008). "Behavioural Development Economics: Lessons from Field Labs in the Developing World," *Journal of Development Studies* 44(3): 337-364.
- Case, A. and Katz L. 1991. "The Company You Keep: The Effects of Family and Neighborhood on Disadvantaged Youths." National Bureau of Economic Research Cambridge, Mass., USA.
- Cassar, A., Healy, A. and von Kessler, C. 2011. "Trust, Risk, and Time Preferences After a Natural Disaster: Experimental Evidence from Thailand," Working Paper.
- Choi, J. and Bowles, S. 2007. The Coevolution of Parochial Altruism and War. Science 318, 636-640.
- Chatterjee, S. 2002. Society and Politics in Tajikistan: In the Aftermath of the Civil War. London: Greenwich Millenium Press.
- Collier, P., Elliott, V., Hegre, H., Hoeffler, A., Reynal-Querol, M., Sambanis, N. 2003. "Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil War and Development Policy", Volume 1, A WorldBank policy research report.
- Collier, P. and Hoeffler, A. 2004. "Greed and Grievance in Civil War," *Oxford Economic Papers* 56 (4): 563-595.
- Darwin, C. The Descent of Man. (Appleton: New York, 1873).
- Davies, J. 1974. "The J-Curve and Power Struggle Theories of Collective Violence," *American Sociological Review*, 39(4).
- Davis, D. R., and Weinstein, D. E. 2002. "Bones, bombs, and break points: the geography of economic activity," *American Economic Review* 92:1269-1289.

- Engvall, J. 2006. "The State Under Seige: The Drug Trade and Organized Crime in Tajikistan". *Europe-Asia Studies* 58(6): 827-854.
- Fafchamps, M. 2006. "Development and Social Capital," *Journal of Development Studies*.
- Fehr, E., Hoff, K. and Kshetramade, M. 2008. "Spite and Development," *American Economic Review: Papers & Proceedings*, Vol. 98(2): pp. 494-499.
- Frey, L. and Frey, M. 2004. The French Revolution.
- Friedman, D. 2008. Morals and Markets An Evolutionary Account of the Modern World. Palgrave.
- Greif, A. 2000. "The Fundamental Problem of Exchange: A Research Agenda in Historical Institutional Analysis." *European Review of Economic History* 4: 251-284.
- Greif, A. 2006. "Family Structure, Institutions, and Growth: The Origins and Implications of Western Corporations." *American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings*, 96(2): 308-312.
- Gretsky, S. 1995. "Civil War in Tajikistan: Causes, Developments, and Prospects for Peace" In *Central Asia: Conflict, Resolution, and Change*. Eds. Roald Z. Sagdeev and Susan Eisenhower. Maryland: CPSS Press, pp. 217-247.
- Grossman, H. and Kim. M. 1995. "Swords or Plowshares? A Theory of Security of Claims to Property," *Journal of Political Economy* 103(6).
- Guiso, L., Sapienza, P. and Zingales, L. 2004. "Cultural Biases in Economic Exchange," NBER Working Papers 11005, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- Guiso, L., Sapienza, P. and Zingales, L. 2010. "Civic Capital as the Missing Link," NBER Working Papers 15845, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- Haavelmo, T. 1954. A Study in the Theory of Economic Evolution.
- Heathershaw, J. 2009. Post-Conflict Tajikistan: The Politics of Peacebuilding and the Emergence of Legitimate Order. London: Routledge.
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. 2010. "Most people are not WEIRD." *Nature*, 466, 29.
- Henrich, J., Ensimger, J., McElreath, R., Barr, A., Barrett, C., Bolyanatz, A., Cardenas, J. C., Gurven, M., Gwako, E., Henrich, N., Lesorogol, C., Marlowe, F., Tracer, D., Ziker, J. 2010. "Markets, Religion, Community Size, and the Evolution of Fairness and Punishment." *Science*, 327, 1480-1484.
- Hiro, Dilip (1995). *Between Marx and Muhammad: The Changing Face of Central Asia.* London: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Ichino, A. and Maggi, G. 2000. "Work Environment And Individual Background: Explaining Regional Shirking Differentials In A Large Italian Firm," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 115(3): 1057-1090.
- Jawad, N. and Tadjbakhsh, S. 1995. *Tajikistan: A Forgotten Civil War*. London: Minority Rights Group. January.

Johnson, R. 2007. Oil, Islam, and Conflict. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Jonson, L. 2006. Tajikistan in the New Central Asia: Geopolitics, Great Power Rivalry, and Radical Islam. London: I.B. Taurus.
- Kilavuz, İ. T. 2009. "The Role of Networks in Tajikistan's Civil War: Network Activation and Violence Specialists". *Nationalities Papers* 37(5): 693-725.
- Knack, S. and Keefer, P. 1997. "Does Social Capital Have an Economic Payoff? A Cross-Country Investigation," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112(4): 1251-1288.
- Knack. S. and Zack, P. 2001. "Trust and Growth", *Economic Journal*, 111: 295–321.
- La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A and Vishny, R. 1997. "Legal Determinants of External Finance," *Journal of Finance* 52, 1131-1150.
- Loewenstein, G. and Angner, E. 2003. "Predicting and Indulging Changing Preferences," in G. Loewenstein, D. Read, and R. Baumeister. (Eds.). *Time and Decision: Economic and Psychological Perspectives on Intertemporal Choice* (pp. 351-391). New York: Russell Sage Foundation Press.
- Marshall, M. and Cole, B. 2009. "Global Report 2009: Conflict, Governance, and State Fragility". Center for Systemic Peace.
- Miguel, E. and Roland, G. 2011. Miguel, Edward, Roland Gerard. "Long Run Impact of Bombing in Vietnam," *Journal of Development Economics*. Forthcoming.
- Miller, A., Bolce, L., and Halligan, M. 1977. "The J-curve theory and black urban riots an empirical test of progressive relative deprivation theory," *American Political Science Review*, 71(3).
- Niyazi, A. 1999. "Islam and Tajikistan's Human and Ecological Crisis." In *Civil Society in Central Asia*. Eds. M. Holt Ruffin and Daniel C. Waugh. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Nunn N, Wantchekon L. *forth.* "The Slave Trade and The Origins of Mistrust in Africa." *American Economic Review*, Forthcoming.
- Rockenbach, B. and Milinski, M. 2006. "The Efficient Interaction of Indirect Reciprocity and Costly Punishment." *Nature* 444, 718-723.
- Solnit, R. 2009. A Paradise Built in Hell: The Extraordinary Communities that Arise in Disaster. Viking Books.
- Stigler. G., and Becker. G. 1977. "De Gustibus Non Est Disputandum," *American Economic Review* 67(2): 76-90.
- Tedeschi, R. G. and Calhoun, L. G. 2004. "Post-traumatic Growth: Conceptual Foundations and Empirical Evidence." *Psychological Inquiry* 15(1): 1–18.
- Tilly, C. & Ardant, G. 1975. *The formation of national states in Western Europe*. Princeton University Press.
- Tilly, C. 1985. "War Making and State Making as Organized Crime" in *Bringing the State Back*, edited by Peter Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- UNDP (2010). Employment in the Context of Human Development. National Human Development Report 2008-2009: Dushanbe: United Nations Press.
- Voors, M., Nillesen, E., Verwimp, P., Bulte, E., Lensink, R., and Van Soest, D. 2011."Does Conflict affect Preferences? Results from Field Experiments in Burundi." *American Economic Review*, Forthcoming.

Variables	Description	Obs	Mean	S.d.	Min	Max
Victimization						
Injured or Killed	Respondent or household member injured during war	426	0.21	0.41	0	1
Injured & Killed	Household member killed during war	426	0.13	0.34	0	1
Experimental data:						
Offer Trust Game	Amount sent trust game (0, 5, 10, 15, 20)	426	9.74	6.97	0	20
				0.7	Ŭ	
Offer Dictator Game	Amount sent dictator game (0, 10, 20, 30, 40)	426	10.26	9.69	0	40
Egalitarian split	1 if offer=20 in dictator game	426	0.23	0.42	0	1
Same village	same village treatment	426	0.46	0.5	0	1
Survey data:						
Importance knowing trader	Scale: not important at all (0) to very	424	1.82	1.03	1	4
personally	important/essential (4)					
Freedom in economy	1 if agree or strongly agree to: "We are more likely to	407	0.55	0.5	0	1
y	have a healthy economy if the government allows more				-	
	freedom for individuals to do as they wish"					
Favor market economy	1 if "market economy is preferable to any other form	421	0.55	0.5	0	1
	of economic system"		0.000	0.0	0	-
Favor democracy	1 if "democracy is preferable to any other form of	419	0.6	0.49	0	1
Tavor democracy	nolitical system"	117	0.0	0.12	0	1
Attended community	1 if attended community meetings last month	412	0.37	0.48	0	1
meeting	The attended community meetings last month	112	0.57	0.10	0	1
Part groups and assoc	Sum of dummies=1 if respondent member of:	410	0.79	0.92	0	5
i art. groups and assoc.	masque/religious group NGO paighborhood group	410	0.79	0.72	0	5
	fraternal group and youth association					
Mambar magana	1 if member measure /religious group	211	0.33	0.47	0	1
Turn to relatives if chested	1 if turn to relatives first in either situation, not repaid	344 426	0.55	0.47	0	1
in manhote	for loop and a good and was not reid was sold a	420	0.14	0.59	0	4
mmarkets	defeative acad					
Should up out info to police	1 if agrees on strangly agrees to: "If someone has	404	0.47	0.5	0	1
Should report into to police	information that was half institution had a second link	404	0.47	0.5	0	1
	information that may help justice be done, generally he					
	or she should report it to the police"	200	0.01	0.20	0	1
Support freedom to marry	1 if favors personal freedom to marry rather than	399	0.81	0.39	0	1
<u>Calatan</u> la	parents choosing spouse for their children					
		410	20.94	12 47	17	
Age	1 if male	419	0.04 0.20	13.47	1 /	1
Gender Area CD	1 if male	422	0.29	0.40	0	1
Any CP	1 if either respondent, her mother, father of other HH	420	0.09	0.29	0	1
	member member of Communist party	400	0.40	0.47	0	1
Comp. education	Highest education level: compulsory education	422	0.68	0.47	0	1
Second education	Highest education level: secondary education	422	0.12	0.32	0	1
Higher education	Highest education level: higher education	422	0.14	0.35	0	1
Pamiri		426	0.04	0.2	0	1
Uzbek		426	0.05	0.21	0	1
Kyrgyz		426	0.02	0.14	0	1
Kegion lived in 1992:				o :-	-	
Dushanbe		426	0.22	0.42	0	1
Gharm		426	0.2	0.4	0	1
Khatlon		426	0.38	0.49	0	1
Varzob		426	0.01	0.12	0	1

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Dep variable		Injured	or Killed			Injured	& Killed	
Sample:	Whole	Sample	Older th	nan 25 at	Whole	Sample	Older th	nan 25 at
1	Mean dep	o. var.: 0.21	conflic	t onset	Mean of	dep. var.:	conflic	t onset
			Mean dep	. var.: 0.20	0.	13	Mean dep	. var.: 0.12
	0.000	0.004	0.000	0.00 7	0.004	0	0.00 7	0.00 -
Age	0.002	0.001	0.008	0.007	0.001	0	0.007	0.005
0 1	[0.228]	[0.392]	[0.107]	[0.158]	[0.392]	[0.728]	[0.161]	[0.271]
Gender	0.005	0	-0.06/	-0.062	0.06/	0.06/	-0.012	-0.021
D ''	[0.923]	[0.997]	[0.288]	[0.421]	[0.286]	[0.320]	[0.821]	[0.706]
Pamiri	-0.11	-0.101	-0.099	-0.14	-0.003	0.012	0.011	0.018
TT 1 1	[0.006]	[0.109]	[0.427]	[0.309]	[0.904]	[0.749]	[0.895]	[0.819]
Uzbek	-0.145	-0.123	-0.096	-0.026	-0.097	-0.113	-0.091	-0.06
17	[0.024]	[0.000]	[0.268]	[0.507]	[0.049]	[0.003]	[0.088]	[0.107]
Kyrgyz	-0.109	-0.131	-0.144	-0.086	0.005	-0.012	0.035	0.02
	[0.002]	[0.000]	[0.252]	[0.319]	[0.832]	[0.538]	[0.537]	[0.488]
Dushanbe	0.851	0.867	0.843	0.772	-0.012	0.028	-0.03	-0.003
01	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.815]	[0.6/1]	[0.621]	[0.970]
Gharn	1.232	I.25	1.218	1.257	0.204	0.324	0.204	0.499
171 .1	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.050]	[0.000]	[0.135]	[0.000]
Khatlon	0.033	0.852	0.062	0.478	0.0//	-0.041	0.09	- U.256
X 7 1	[0.608]		[0.614]	[0.016]	[0.139]	[0.6/5]	[0.204]	[0.016]
Varzob	0.69	0.6 7	0.651	0.513	-0.111	-0.058	-0.124	-0.004
4 1 CD	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.005]	[0.012]	[0.319]	[0.160]	[0.964]
Any member CP	0.001	-0.006	0.251	0.251	-0.033	-0.032	-0.05	-0.027
D' 1 1	[0.983]	[0.933]	[0.095]	[0.122]	[0.3/6]	[0.368]	[0.125]	[0.391]
Displaced	0.134	0.164	0.15/	0.146	0.089	0.098	0.01	-0.027
Comm. Reg.	[0.350]	[0.302]	[0.135]	[0.166]	[0.460]	[0.4/5]	[0.895]	[0./2/]
Urban	-0.04	0.033		-0.181	0.041	0.058	0.055	
C 1	[0.321]	[0.5/3]	0.005	[0.001]	[0.328]	[0.256]	[0.274]	[0.036]
Comp edu	0.10	U.24	U.298	0.30		0.124	U.21	U.230
0 1 1	[0.139]	[0.050]	[0.033]	[0.046]	[0.459]	[0.203]	[0.047]	[0.020]
Second edu	0.244	U.291	0.419	0.465	0.0/4	0.094	U.299	U.323
I L'alson adre	[0.026]	[0.017]	[0.029]	[0.035]	[0.305]	[0.262]	[0.061]	[0.051]
Higner edu	0.094	0.1/9 [0.202]	U.249	U.306	0.021	0.081	0.1	0.125
Midianomo	[0.475]	[0.202]	0.090	[0.092]	0.029	[0.538]	[0.333]	[0.254]
Mid income	-0.032	-0.043	-0.029	-0.041	-0.028	-0.037	-0.046	-0.105
D: -1.	[0.526]	[0.373]	[0.640]	[0.484]	[0.540]	[0.407]	[0.554]	[0.081]
Kich	-0.042	-0.030	-0.102	-0.061	-0.033	-0.04	-0.051	-0.05
DD	[0.344]	[0.460]	[0.146]	[0.279]	[0.271]	[0.425]	[0.321]	[0.355]
ГС	region	psu	region	psu	region	psu	region	psu
Observations	377	377	141	141	377	377	141	141
R-squared	0.17	0.24	0.25	0.39	0.15	0.25	0.21	0.39

Table 2: Determinants of Victimization OL S repression

Notes: Robust standard errors clustered at the village level. All regressions with a constant. P-values in brackets. For a description of the variables, see Table 1. Columns 4 and 8: sample restricted to respondents 25 or older in 1992 (43 and older today). Excluded ethnicity is Tajik, excluded 1992 region is Gorno-Badakhshan, excluded education is: compulsory education not completed, excluded income is poor (13%) er third of the income distribution).

Table 3: Trust Regression ResultsOLS regression

Dependent variable: Amount sent by first mover in the trust game

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
						Sub-s	ample	Sub-s	ample	Sub-s	sample
						Distant	t Village	Same	Village	12 or You	nger in Waı
Injured or Killed	0.677	0.677	0.936	1.871	2.045	1.935	1.524	-1.276	-1.314	3.482	4.124
	[0.344]	[0.388]	[0.378]	[0.046]	[0.036]	[0.043]	[0.101]	[0.323]	[0.359]	[0.084]	[0.086]
Same Village	1.281	1.364	2.022	1.866	2.171					2.880	3.193
	[0.272]	[0.392]	[0.008]	[0.157]	[0.217]					[0.171]	[0.233]
Same Vill. * Inj. or Kill.			-2.494	-2.782	-3.289					-4.790	-4.920
			[0.139]	[0.085]	[0.057]					[0.046]	[0.053]
Age	0.012	0.016		0.013	0.016	0.016	0.020	0.021	0.016	0.057	0.101
	[0.675]	[0.606]		[0.674]	[0.597]	[0.670]	[0.556]	[0.742]	[0.800]	[0.713]	[0.584]
Gender	-0.395	-0.677		-0.296	-0.609	-2.619	-2.851	1.619	1.244	0.093	-0.129
	[0.445]	[0.258]		[0.553]	[0.313]	[0.003]	[0.003]	[0.123]	[0.317]	[0.942]	[0.929]
Former comunist in HH	1.111	1.618		1.206	1.731	0.753	2.097	1.280	1.207	0.629	0.192
	[0.189]	[0.135]		[0.126]	[0.088]	[0.373]	[0.112]	[0.443]	[0.520]	[0.791]	[0.953]
Comp. edu	-1.775	-1.227		-1.840	-1.211	-0.801	0.851	-1.752	-1.773	-4.337	-2.689
	[0.236]	[0.330]		[0.215]	[0.346]	[0.643]	[0.663]	[0.312]	[0.102]	[0.009]	[0.076]
Second edu	-2.595	-1.730		-2.743	-1.806	-1.526	-0.191	-2.536	-1.967	-3.376	-1.543
	[0.182]	[0.318]		[0.148]	[0.287]	[0.587]	[0.949]	[0.105]	[0.060]	[0.168]	[0.443]
Higher edu	-0.118	0.852		-0.134	0.947	2.067	3.281	-0.867	-0.008	-2.704	-1.513
	[0.935]	[0.491]		[0.925]	[0.459]	[0.284]	[0.143]	[0.633]	[0.995]	[0.072]	[0.225]
Pamiri	-0.991	-0.065		-0.922	0.042	-0.382	0.304	-0.522	0.424	2.852	4.165
	[0.387]	[0.965]		[0.388]	[0.977]	[0.816]	[0.882]	[0.764]	[0.648]	[0.346]	[0.453]
Uzbek	0.324	-0.939		0.484	-0.883	3.895	2.144	-6.455	-3.877	2.232	-0.673
	[0.850]	[0.688]		[0.791]	[0.722]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.050]	[0.125]	[0.579]	[0.947]
Kyrgyz	-0.136	-2.042		-0.246	-2.184	-2.025	-4.542	0.858	-0.358	3.641	3.069
	[0.854]	[0.000]		[0.736]	[0.000]	[0.003]	[0.000]	[0.354]	[0.450]	[0.000]	[0.000]
Region lived in 1992	yes	yes		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
FE	region	psu		region	psu	region	psu	region	psu	region	psu
Constant	12.244	-3.060	8.801	12.001	-2.572	11.423	-0.819	13.395	6.671	12.564	8.305
	[0.000]	[0.186]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.248]	[0.000]	[0.766]	[0.000]	[0.030]	[0.002]	[0.170]
Observations	416	416	426	416	416	224	224	192	192	131	131
R-squared	0.062	0.116	0.017	0.068	0.124	0.119	0.187	0.079	0.225	0.152	0.269
Mean dep. var.			9.742			9.0	035	10.	556	10.	.076

Table 4: Trust Regression Results

OLS regression Dependent variable: Amount sent by first mover in the trust game

•	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
						Sub-s	ample	Sub-s	ample	Sub-s	sample
						Distant	t Village	Same	Village	18 or You	nger in Wa
Injured & Killed	-0.334	-0.008	0.616	1.426	1.878	1.696	1.517	-3.384	-3.473	3.695	4.589
	[0.726]	[0.993]	[0.632]	[0.205]	[0.070]	[0.153]	[0.167]	[0.031]	[0.048]	[0.096]	[0.080]
Same Village	1.244	1.333	1.994	1.793	2.146					2.520	2.712
	[0.297]	[0.409]	[0.006]	[0.165]	[0.229]					[0.229]	[0.322]
Same Vill. * Inj. & Kill.			-4.053	-4.240	-4.797					-5.242	-5.285
			[0.046]	[0.037]	[0.037]					[0.048]	[0.094]
Age	0.014	0.017		0.010	0.013	0.013	0.017	0.018	0.011	0.067	0.103
	[0.624]	[0.578]		[0.726]	[0.674]	[0.729]	[0.617]	[0.764]	[0.856]	[0.664]	[0.570]
Gender	-0.383	-0.687		-0.274	-0.626	-2.730	-2.958	1.840	1.349	0.011	-0.372
	[0.454]	[0.238]		[0.586]	[0.297]	[0.002]	[0.002]	[0.088]	[0.296]	[0.993]	[0.806]
Former comunist in HH	1.093	1.600		1.128	1.633	0.672	2.078	1.155	1.120	0.191	-0.218
	[0.189]	[0.136]		[0.162]	[0.121]	[0.458]	[0.136]	[0.481]	[0.551]	[0.934]	[0.944]
Comp. edu	-1.648	-1.065		-1.788	-1.099	-0.500	1.060	-1.852	-1.668	-4.276	-2.577
	[0.286]	[0.423]		[0.241]	[0.424]	[0.777]	[0.587]	[0.283]	[0.161]	[0.014]	[0.095]
Second edu	-2.381	-1.516		-2.570	-1.597	-1.048	0.169	-2.570	-1.878	-2.343	-0.255
	[0.228]	[0.390]		[0.180]	[0.359]	[0.710]	[0.955]	[0.126]	[0.136]	[0.370]	[0.901]
Higher edu	-0.039	0.987		-0.217	0.910	2.230	3.376	-1.168	-0.108	-2.737	-1.644
	[0.979]	[0.445]		[0.882]	[0.506]	[0.255]	[0.135]	[0.525]	[0.942]	[0.073]	[0.185]
Pamiri	-1.058	-0.130		-1.000	-0.028	-0.599	0.114	-0.228	0.706	2.779	4.112
	[0.366]	[0.931]		[0.377]	[0.985]	[0.722]	[0.956]	[0.892]	[0.418]	[0.354]	[0.455]
Uzbek	0.173	-1.020		0.335	-0.876	3.841	2.174	-6.364	-3.773	2.033	-0.453
	[0.920]	[0.664]		[0.854]	[0.725]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.055]	[0.142]	[0.604]	[0.964]
Kyrgyz	-0.197	-2.107		-0.342	-2.210	-2.319	-4.777	1.041	-0.180	3.557	2.991
	[0.791]	[0.000]		[0.633]	[0.000]	[0.002]	[0.000]	[0.284]	[0.668]	[0.000]	[0.000]
Region lived in 1992	yes	yes		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
FE	region	psu		region	psu	region	psu	region	psu	region	psu
Constant	12.127	-3.733	8.943	12.177	-4.299	11.531	-2.092	13.423	6.770	12.533	8.533
	[0.000]	[0.071]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.047]	[0.000]	[0.361]	[0.000]	[0.021]	[0.002]	[0.158]
Observations	416	416	426	416	416	224	224	192	192	131	131
R-squared	0.061	0.114	0.024	0.071	0.127	0.115	0.186	0.094	0.237	0.149	0.266
Mean dep. var.			9.742			9.0	035	10.	556	10.	.076

Table 5: Trustworthyness Regression Results

OLS regression

Dependent variable: Mean amount returned by second mover in the trust game

-	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
						Sub-s	ample	Sub-s	ample	Sub-s	sample
						Distant	t Village	Same	Village	12 or You	inger in Wa
Injured or Killed	0.687	-0.286	-0.110	1.365	0.486	0.235	-0.383	0.521	-0.629	0.636	-0.016
	[0.645]	[0.846]	[0.934]	[0.467]	[0.795]	[0.900]	[0.846]	[0.812]	[0.771]	[0.787]	[0.995]
Same Village	0.028	-0.811	0.470	0.360	-0.355					-0.058	0.580
	[0.977]	[0.529]	[0.618]	[0.710]	[0.775]					[0.973]	[0.778]
Same Vill. * Inj. or Kill.			-1.422	-1.579	-1.858					-0.042	-0.614
			[0.497]	[0.515]	[0.489]					[0.989]	[0.858]
Age	-0.035	-0.045		-0.035	-0.045	-0.055	-0.062	-0.024	-0.044	-0.111	-0.084
0	[0.341]	[0.232]		[0.340]	[0.234]	[0.281]	[0.266]	[0.645]	[0.390]	[0.510]	[0.678]
Gender	0.696	0.849		0.752	0.887	0.707	1.002	1.531	0.682	0.991	0.403
	[0.444]	[0.388]		[0.437]	[0.381]	[0.593]	[0.498]	[0.275]	[0.645]	[0.582]	[0.857]
Former comunist in HH	3.790	3.335		3.843	3.399	3.054	3.016	4.596	4.696	-0.786	-2.256
	[0.023]	[0.035]		[0.019]	[0.030]	[0.019]	[0.080]	[0.151]	[0.141]	[0.822]	[0.614]
Comp. edu	-1.967	-0.276		-2.004	-0.266	0.673	3.171	-2.616	-1.571	0.979	1.934
	[0.420]	[0.901]		[0.409]	[0.903]	[0.886]	[0.460]	[0.361]	[0.556]	[0.536]	[0.175]
Second edu	-2.500	-0.850		-2.584	-0.893	-0.066	1.875	-3.016	-1.803	2.439	5.486
	[0.339]	[0.724]		[0.319]	[0.706]	[0.990]	[0.710]	[0.384]	[0.551]	[0.323]	[0.132]
Higher edu	0.255	1.922		0.246	1.975	4.124	6.417	-2.318	-0.952	2.493	3.278
	[0.924]	[0.431]		[0.926]	[0.410]	[0.459]	[0.223]	[0.280]	[0.588]	[0.215]	[0.192]
Pamiri	1.039	0.359		1.078	0.419	-0.639	-1.481	6.065	4.647	-0.132	2.084
	[0.721]	[0.901]		[0.706]	[0.883]	[0.756]	[0.556]	[0.001]	[0.007]	[0.961]	[0.581]
Uzbek	-2.819	0.354		-2.728	0.385	-2.741	-0.147	0.231	2.058	-2.524	1.835
	[0.018]	[0.719]		[0.016]	[0.679]	[0.130]	[0.822]	[0.884]	[0.090]	[0.073]	[0.455]
Kyrgyz	-2.150	-2.024		-2.212	-2.104	-2.320	-3.495	-2.517	-1.410	0.956	1.655
	[0.040]	[0.005]		[0.029]	[0.003]	[0.025]	[0.002]	[0.041]	[0.222]	[0.297]	[0.007]
Region lived in 1992	yes	yes		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
FE	region	psu		region	psu	region	psu	region	psu	region	psu
Constant	19.022	-1.865	13.414	18.883	-1.590	16.528	-4.681	20.250	14.711	17.192	13.017
	[0.000]	[0.622]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.668]	[0.001]	[0.262]	[0.000]	[0.004]	[0.001]	[0.019]
Observations	416	416	426	416	416	224	224	192	192	131	131
R-squared	0.111	0.178	0.002	0.113	0.180	0.118	0.204	0.155	0.253	0.150	0.276
Mean dep. var.			13.496			13.	.386	13.	621	13	.358

Table 6: Trustworthyness Regression Results

OLS regression

Dependent variable: Mean amount returned by second mover in the trust game

-	(2)	(3)	(1)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
						Sub-s	ample	Sub-s	ample	Sub-s	sample
						Distant	t Village	Same	Village	18 or You	nger in Wa
Injured & Killed	1.353	0.226	0.427	2.675	1.824	1.668	1.177	0.144	-1.754	-0.772	-1.383
	[0.283]	[0.818]	[0.790]	[0.174]	[0.316]	[0.355]	[0.501]	[0.939]	[0.124]	[0.773]	[0.649]
Same Village	0.033	-0.794	0.567	0.445	-0.105					-0.287	0.401
	[0.974]	[0.541]	[0.528]	[0.620]	[0.923]					[0.868]	[0.842]
Same Vill. * Inj. & Kill.			-2.839	-3.186	-4.065					1.056	0.303
			[0.261]	[0.244]	[0.170]					[0.719]	[0.933]
Age	-0.036	-0.045		-0.039	-0.049	-0.059	-0.064	-0.022	-0.047	-0.111	-0.085
	[0.323]	[0.221]		[0.279]	[0.183]	[0.243]	[0.253]	[0.657]	[0.362]	[0.513]	[0.675]
Gender	0.631	0.843		0.713	0.894	0.650	0.979	1.547	0.735	1.066	0.517
	[0.480]	[0.387]		[0.458]	[0.383]	[0.618]	[0.500]	[0.276]	[0.625]	[0.552]	[0.818]
Former comunist in HH	3.812	3.353		3.838	3.380	3.084	3.096	4.614	4.653	-1.003	-2.352
	[0.022]	[0.034]		[0.020]	[0.034]	[0.021]	[0.080]	[0.150]	[0.147]	[0.774]	[0.602]
Comp. edu	-1.963	-0.375		-2.069	-0.404	0.373	2.691	-2.585	-1.511	1.060	1.951
	[0.427]	[0.868]		[0.396]	[0.854]	[0.939]	[0.543]	[0.359]	[0.567]	[0.507]	[0.172]
Second edu	-2.469	-0.969		-2.612	-1.037	-0.370	1.392	-2.943	-1.750	2.662	5.431
	[0.352]	[0.699]		[0.313]	[0.667]	[0.944]	[0.787]	[0.387]	[0.563]	[0.302]	[0.130]
Higher edu	0.290	1.844		0.157	1.779	3.867	6.039	-2.285	-0.995	2.525	3.294
D ''	[0.914]	[0.458]		[0.952]	[0.464]	[0.498]	[0.262]	[0.269]	[0.588]	[0.203]	[0.188]
Pamiri	0.968	0.386		1.011	0.4/2	-0.650	-1.410	6.018	4.786	-0.253	1.988
TT-1-1-	[0./3/]	[0.893]		[0.721]	[0.8/1]	[0.745]	[0.564]	[0.001]	[0.007]	[0.925]	[0.589]
UZDEK	-2./03	0.415		-2.003	0.555	-2.018	0.030	0.180	2.109	-2.704	1.802
Vareoutz	2 240	2 000		2 240	2 097	2 240	[0.956] 2 112	2 560	1 324	0.080	[0.450] 1.600
Kyigyz	-2.240 [0.026]	-2.000 [0.003]		-2.349 [0.013]	-2.087 [0.001]	-2.349 [0.014]	- 3.443 [0.000]	-2.300 [0.037]	-1.324	[0.271]	[0.004]
Region lived in 1992	ves	ves		ves	ves	ves	ves	ves	ves	ves	ves
FE	region	psu		region	psu	region	psu	region	psu	region	psu
Constant	19.114	-1.572	13.323	19.151	-2.052	17.004	-4.245	20.193	14.745	17.261	13.024
	[0.000]	[0.666]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.566]	[0.001]	[0.293]	[0.000]	[0.003]	[0.001]	[0.017]
Observations	416	416	426	416	416	224	224	192	192	131	131
R-squared	0.113	0.178	0.004	0.117	0.184	0.122	0.205	0.155	0.255	0.150	0.277
Mean dep. var.			13.496			13.	386	13.	621	13	.358

Table 7: Dictator Game Regression Results OLS regression

Dependent variable: Amount sent by first mover in the dictator game

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
						Sub-s	ample	Sub-s	ample	Sub-s	ample
						Distant	t Village	Same	Village	12 or You	nger in Waı
Injured or Killed	3.006	2.579	1.462	3.611	2.813	2.657	1.933	2.215	1.503	5.955	4.533
	[0.045]	[0.114]	[0.325]	[0.010]	[0.052]	[0.027]	[0.039]	[0.360]	[0.569]	[0.088]	[0.270]
Same Village	-0.100	-2.326	0.241	0.196	-2.188					-2.140	-4.028
	[0.930]	[0.054]	[0.820]	[0.866]	[0.100]					[0.509]	[0.374]
Same Vill. * Inj. or Kill.			-1.351	-1.409	-0.564					-8.483	-7.158
			[0.567]	[0.413]	[0.772]					[0.051]	[0.177]
Age	-0.040	-0.052		-0.040	-0.052	-0.111	-0.112	0.008	-0.018	0.098	0.170
	[0.187]	[0.097]		[0.189]	[0.098]	[0.065]	[0.063]	[0.879]	[0.755]	[0.640]	[0.465]
Gender	-1.261	-0.710		-1.210	-0.698	-0.883	-0.589	-0.503	-0.737	1.745	2.451
	[0.333]	[0.621]		[0.354]	[0.627]	[0.653]	[0.769]	[0.746]	[0.687]	[0.423]	[0.319]
Former comunist in HH	2.177	2.695		2.225	2.714	-2.381	-0.865	8.782	8.735	-4.887	-4.483
	[0.322]	[0.222]		[0.316]	[0.224]	[0.279]	[0.709]	[0.012]	[0.013]	[0.443]	[0.480]
Comp. edu	2.512	2.818		2.479	2.821	4.831	6.990	1.408	1.350	1.820	3.123
	[0.042]	[0.039]		[0.046]	[0.039]	[0.031]	[0.007]	[0.392]	[0.349]	[0.152]	[0.052]
Second edu	4.322	4.066		4.247	4.053	5.540	6.505	4.092	4.097	6.959	8.569
	[0.065]	[0.105]		[0.069]	[0.105]	[0.053]	[0.032]	[0.279]	[0.267]	[0.016]	[0.002]
Higher edu	4.290	4.854		4.282	4.870	5.649	6.913	2.683	3.757	0.563	2.261
	[0.014]	[0.015]		[0.013]	[0.014]	[0.079]	[0.079]	[0.299]	[0.205]	[0.745]	[0.243]
Pamiri	-3.873	-2.846		-3.838	-2.827	-5.439	-4.060	-0.229	-3.449	-4.097	-4.169
	[0.000]	[0.141]		[0.000]	[0.140]	[0.027]	[0.250]	[0.946]	[0.099]	[0.122]	[0.097]
Uzbek	-4.489	-1.656		-4.408	-1.647	-5.859	-2.469	1.861	2.017	-11.032	-11.094
	[0.005]	[0.220]		[0.005]	[0.216]	[0.016]	[0.000]	[0.065]	[0.256]	[0.011]	[0.190]
Kyrgyz	-1.174	-1.903		-1.230	-1.927	-9.348	-13.916	2.188	4.957	8.047	10.124
	[0.509]	[0.020]		[0.491]	[0.025]	[0.002]	[0.000]	[0.326]	[0.001]	[0.000]	[0.000]
Region lived in 1992	yes	yes		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
FE	region	psu		region	psu	region	psu	region	psu	region	psu
Constant	15.150	3.372	9.942	15.026	3.456	16.313	6.213	13.951	6.663	14.188	8.173
	[0.000]	[0.213]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.195]	[0.000]	[0.111]	[0.001]	[0.036]	[0.032]	[0.161]
Observations	416	416	426	416	416	224	224	192	192	131	131
R-squared	0.153	0.206	0.0023	0.154	0.207	0.177	0.264	0.238	0.301	0.349	0.425
Mean dep. var.			10.258			10.	307	10.	202	10.	.758

Table 8: Dictator Game Regression Results

OLS regression Dependent variable: Amount sent by first mover in the dictator game

1	(1)	(2)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
						Sub-s	ample	Sub-s	ample	Sub-s	sample
						Distant	t Village	Same	Village	18 or You	nger in Wa
Injured & Killed	3.068	2.521	1.367	4.275	3.250	3.630	2.823	1.666	0.598	7.096	5.441
	[0.018]	[0.069]	[0.449]	[0.001]	[0.003]	[0.013]	[0.070]	[0.547]	[0.833]	[0.018]	[0.130]
Same Village	-0.149	-2.403	0.295	0.227	-2.089					-2.680	-4.618
	[0.899]	[0.053]	[0.771]	[0.853]	[0.115]					[0.354]	[0.254]
Same Vill. * Inj. & Kill.			-3.129	-2.908	-1.855					-9.750	-7.377
			[0.271]	[0.221]	[0.424]					[0.013]	[0.135]
Age	-0.038	-0.050		-0.041	-0.052	-0.117	-0.117	0.015	-0.014	0.115	0.169
	[0.225]	[0.116]		[0.201]	[0.114]	[0.053]	[0.054]	[0.788]	[0.805]	[0.568]	[0.464]
Gender	-1.413	-0.860		-1.339	-0.837	-1.074	-0.752	-0.527	-0.773	1.540	2.135
	[0.293]	[0.558]		[0.323]	[0.571]	[0.596]	[0.716]	[0.749]	[0.676]	[0.475]	[0.378]
Former comunist in HH	2.208	2.738		2.231	2.751	-2.456	-0.845	8.884	8.794	-5.566	-4.888
	[0.301]	[0.202]		[0.298]	[0.203]	[0.241]	[0.710]	[0.011]	[0.012]	[0.358]	[0.425]
Comp. edu	2.739	3.079		2.643	3.066	4.945	7.010	1.549	1.565	1.913	3.264
	[0.031]	[0.020]		[0.040]	[0.022]	[0.030]	[0.008]	[0.356]	[0.260]	[0.160]	[0.047]
Second edu	4.773	4.545		4.643	4.514	5.874	6.736	4.351	4.389	8.736	10.051
	[0.043]	[0.067]		[0.052]	[0.071]	[0.042]	[0.030]	[0.258]	[0.242]	[0.000]	[0.000]
Higher edu	4.519	5.129		4.397	5.099	5.627	6.830	2.901	4.025	0.505	2.130
	[0.009]	[0.008]		[0.009]	[0.008]	[0.076]	[0.076]	[0.241]	[0.156]	[0.772]	[0.287]
Pamiri	-4.180	-3.098		-4.140	-3.059	-5.724	-4.288	-0.491	-3.584	-4.162	-4.217
	[0.000]	[0.115]		[0.000]	[0.116]	[0.023]	[0.234]	[0.882]	[0.080]	[0.109]	[0.076]
Uzbek	-4.655	-1.688		-4.544	-1.632	-5.818	-2.314	1.657	1.952	-11.285	-10.831
	[0.004]	[0.194]		[0.004]	[0.185]	[0.019]	[0.000]	[0.108]	[0.282]	[0.010]	[0.198]
Kyrgyz	-1.522	-2.181		-1.621	-2.221	-9.745	-14.220	1.978	4.790	7.877	10.029
	[0.394]	[0.010]		[0.349]	[0.008]	[0.001]	[0.000]	[0.373]	[0.001]	[0.000]	[0.000]
Region lived in 1992	yes	yes		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
FE	region	psu		region	psu	region	psu	region	psu	region	psu
Constant	15.198	0.909	10.103	15.232	0.690	16.873	4.665	13.746	6.042	14.076	8.506
	[0.000]	[0.669]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.744]	[0.000]	[0.177]	[0.001]	[0.028]	[0.031]	[0.141]
Observations	416	416	426	416	416	224	224	192	192	131	131
R-squared	0.150	0.204	0.0029	0.152	0.205	0.181	0.267	0.234	0.299	0.35	0.424
Mean dep. var.			10.258			10.	307	10.	202	10.	.758

Table 9: Egalitarian Regression Results

OLS regression

Dependent variable: 1 if first mover in the dictator game divides equally the endowment

-	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
						Sub-s	ample	Sub-s	ample	Sub-s	sample
						Distant	t Village	Same	Village	12 or You	nger in Wa
Injured or Killed	0.083	0.082	0.105	0.183	0.170	0.148	0.132	-0.038	-0.016	0.207	0.114
	[0.176]	[0.201]	[0.101]	[0.046]	[0.056]	[0.126]	[0.167]	[0.692]	[0.882]	[0.340]	[0.648]
Same Village	0.030	-0.036	0.063	0.079	0.015					-0.072	-0.076
	[0.523]	[0.512]	[0.169]	[0.063]	[0.750]					[0.479]	[0.524]
Same Vill. * Inj. or Kill.	. ,		-0.214	-0.233	-0.210					-0.352	-0.421
			[0.036]	[0.074]	[0.122]					[0.147]	[0.121]
Age	-0.001	-0.002		-0.001	-0.002	-0.002	-0.002	0.001	-0.001	-0.001	0.001
0	[0.585]	[0.235]		[0.599]	[0.249]	[0.285]	[0.271]	[0.733]	[0.764]	[0.943]	[0.915]
Gender	-0.036	-0.016		-0.028	-0.012	-0.063	-0.061	0.066	0.063	-0.019	0.007
	[0.332]	[0.721]		[0.435]	[0.792]	[0.323]	[0.354]	[0.195]	[0.284]	[0.849]	[0.945]
Former comunist in HH	0.003	0.004		0.011	0.012	-0.041	-0.039	0.045	0.053	-0.271	-0.264
	[0.960]	[0.950]		[0.868]	[0.876]	[0.590]	[0.702]	[0.709]	[0.675]	[0.072]	[0.098]
Comp. edu	0.105	0.111		0.100	0.112	0.150	0.233	0.090	0.056	0.024	0.077
	[0.101]	[0.091]		[0.113]	[0.086]	[0.005]	[0.002]	[0.289]	[0.500]	[0.809]	[0.548]
Second edu	0.075	0.084		0.062	0.079	0.066	0.112	0.138	0.149	0.025	0.094
	[0.312]	[0.267]		[0.371]	[0.274]	[0.288]	[0.104]	[0.444]	[0.432]	[0.941]	[0.800]
Higher edu	0.201	0.213		0.199	0.219	0.252	0.312	0.143	0.148	0.052	0.127
	[0.012]	[0.015]		[0.010]	[0.011]	[0.065]	[0.045]	[0.072]	[0.160]	[0.709]	[0.443]
Pamiri	-0.144	-0.196		-0.138	-0.189	-0.196	-0.229	0.080	-0.070	-0.188	-0.100
	[0.054]	[0.006]		[0.036]	[0.005]	[0.002]	[0.010]	[0.492]	[0.379]	[0.232]	[0.724]
Uzbek	-0.085	-0.002		-0.071	0.002	-0.109	-0.072	0.135	0.209	-0.392	-0.667
	[0.184]	[0.986]		[0.229]	[0.989]	[0.045]	[0.000]	[0.510]	[0.357]	[0.008]	[0.034]
Kyrgyz	-0.192	-0.099		-0.201	-0.108	-0.332	-0.300	-0.145	0.016	-0.227	-0.105
	[0.011]	[0.004]		[0.007]	[0.004]	[0.000]	[0.005]	[0.254]	[0.538]	[0.010]	[0.013]
Region lived in 1992	yes	yes		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
FE	region	psu		region	psu	region	psu	region	psu	region	psu
Constant	0.345	-0.410	0.193	0.325	-0.379	0.325	-0.276	0.382	0.059	0.587	0.272
	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.001]	[0.001]	[0.053]	[0.012]	[0.592]	[0.017]	[0.390]
Observations	416	416	426	416	416	224	224	192	192	131	131
R-squared	0.081	0.126	0.011	0.093	0.135	0.105	0.153	0.133	0.196	0.182	0.266
Mean dep. var.			0.228			0.2	219	0.2	237	0.1	273

Table 10: Egalitarian Regression ResultsOLS regression

Dependent variable: 1 if first mover in the dictator game divides equally the endowment

1	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
						Sub-s	ample	Sub-s	ample	Sub-s	sample
						Distant	Village	Same	Village	18 or You	nger in Wa
Injured & Killed	0.083	0.075	0.122	0.228	0.203	0.201	0.169	-0.114	-0.102	0.219	0.148
	[0.140]	[0.240]	[0.115]	[0.009]	[0.022]	[0.013]	[0.039]	[0.157]	[0.284]	[0.194]	[0.425]
Same Village	0.028	-0.039	0.060	0.073	0.017					-0.100	-0.109
	[0.548]	[0.490]	[0.166]	[0.064]	[0.715]					[0.189]	[0.247]
Same Vill. * Inj. & Kill.			-0.338	-0.349	-0.327					-0.319	-0.346
			[0.006]	[0.003]	[0.010]					[0.121]	[0.087]
Age	-0.001	-0.001		-0.001	-0.002	-0.002	-0.003	0.001	-0.001	-0.000	0.001
0	[0.634]	[0.270]		[0.470]	[0.191]	[0.224]	[0.223]	[0.768]	[0.740]	[0.999]	[0.954]
Gender	-0.040	-0.020		-0.031	-0.016	-0.074	-0.072	0.074	0.066	-0.030	-0.006
	[0.289]	[0.648]		[0.390]	[0.711]	[0.265]	[0.295]	[0.156]	[0.259]	[0.769]	[0.957]
Former comunist in HH	0.004	0.006		0.007	0.008	-0.046	-0.039	0.041	0.051	-0.299	-0.271
	[0.950]	[0.937]		[0.913]	[0.913]	[0.530]	[0.698]	[0.729]	[0.682]	[0.020]	[0.053]
Comp. edu	0.112	0.120		0.100	0.118	0.157	0.241	0.087	0.063	0.037	0.089
	[0.080]	[0.064]		[0.106]	[0.066]	[0.003]	[0.002]	[0.288]	[0.422]	[0.721]	[0.483]
Second edu	0.087	0.100		0.072	0.094	0.085	0.133	0.138	0.157	0.100	0.145
	[0.206]	[0.153]		[0.294]	[0.177]	[0.211]	[0.101]	[0.428]	[0.373]	[0.732]	[0.663]
Higher edu	0.207	0.223		0.192	0.217	0.251	0.312	0.133	0.149	0.058	0.130
	[0.009]	[0.010]		[0.010]	[0.009]	[0.067]	[0.051]	[0.077]	[0.139]	[0.682]	[0.426]
Pamiri	-0.152	-0.204		-0.148	-0.197	-0.211	-0.245	0.090	-0.063	-0.193	-0.103
	[0.042]	[0.005]		[0.030]	[0.005]	[0.000]	[0.005]	[0.451]	[0.445]	[0.217]	[0.717]
Uzbek	-0.090	-0.004		-0.076	0.006	-0.107	-0.065	0.137	0.211	-0.398	-0.658
	[0.151]	[0.975]		[0.190]	[0.955]	[0.046]	[0.001]	[0.503]	[0.353]	[0.004]	[0.032]
Kyrgyz	-0.201	-0.108		-0.213	-0.115	-0.354	-0.321	-0.140	0.018	-0.232	-0.108
D : 1: 1: 4000	[0.007]	[0.001]		[0.003]	[0.001]	[0.000]	[0.002]	[0.265]	[0.536]	[0.010]	[0.012]
Region lived in 1992	yes	yes		yes	yes						
FE C	region	psu	0.001	region	psu	region	psu	region	psu	region	psu
Constant	0.346	-0.489	0.201	0.350	-0.527	0.356	-0.383	0.382	0.051	0.581	0.288
	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.008]	[0.012]	[0.642]	[0.016]	[0.348]
Observations	416	416	426	416	416	224	224	192	192	131	131
R-squared	0.080	0.124	0.018	0.098	0.140	0.112	0.156	0.138	0.199	0.177	0.256
Mean dep. var.			0.228			0.2	219	0.2	237	0.2	273

					Trust	game			
		Injured o:	r Killed 2011 FF	Inj. or Kill*S	ameVillage	Injured 8	k Killed And FF	Inj. & Kill*S	ameVillage
Controls, full set	none	-1.55	-1.89	-9.27	-8.23 -8.23	0.92	0.02	-32.62	-1.1 psd -60.00
Extended set of	Restricted set (age,	-2.34	-2.83	-8.42	-13.16	1.43	0.04	-35.33	53.33
controls	gender, region lived in 92, ethnicity)								
Restricted set (age,	none	-2.60	-3.67	81.67	-20.27	4.31	1.53	-412.00	-28.76
gender, region lived in 92, ethnicity)									
					Dictato	r game			
		Injured o:	r Killed	Inj. or Kill*S	ameVillage	Injured 8	k Killed	Inj. & Kill*S	ameVillage
		region FE	psu FE	region FE	psu FE	region FE	psu FE	region FE	psu FE
Controls, full set	none	-301.00	-258.00	3.71	-5.60	-19.19	-7.64	4.69	-61.67
Extended set of	Restricted set (age,	13.68	10.32	-20.14	-2.07	51.17	126.00	11.19	12.33
controls	gender, region lived in 92, ethnicity)								
Restricted set (age,	none	-14.04	-10.88	2.98	1.71	-14.23	-7.26	8.81	-11.11
gender, region lived in 92, ethnicity)									
					Egalitar	ian split			
		Injured o:	r Killed	Inj. or Kill*S	ameVillage	Injured &	k Killed	Inj. & Kill*S	ameVillage
		region FE	psu FE	region FE	psu FE	region FE	psu FE	region FE	psu FE
Controls, full set	none	4.00	4.00	23.00	-21.00	8.00	na	35.00	-33.00
Extended set of	Restricted set (age,	na	8.00	-23.00	-10.50	na	na	na	па
controls	gender, region lived in 92, ethnicity)								
Restricted set (age,	none	4.00	9.00	11.00	19.00	8.00	na	35.00	-33.00
gender, region lived in 92. ethnicity)									

Table 9: Assessing the Bias due to Selection on Unobservables

Table 10: Market participation and Economic and Political Preferences

OLS regression

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Dependent	Importance	of knowing	Freedom in	n economy	Favor mark	et economy	Favor de	emocracy
Variable:	trader pe	ersonally		-		-		
Injured or Killed	0.6		-0.246		-0.193		-0.17	
,	[0.001]		[0.017]		[0.009]		[0.008]	
Injured and Killed		0.437		-0.309		-0.092		-0.175
		[0.040]		[0.002]		[0.136]		[0.012]
Extended controls	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Village FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	psu	psu
Observations	416	416	400	400	414	414	412	412
R-squared	0.184	0.158	0.259	0.263	0.203	0.188	0.303	0.299
Mean dep. var.	1.	80	0.	55	0.	55	0.	60

Table 11: Conflict resolution and kinshipOLS regression

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Dependent	turn to relatives if Should report		report	Support freedom to		
Variable:	cheated i	n markets	informatio	mation to police ma		rry
Injured or Killed	0.118		-0.378		-0.094	
,	[0.088]		[0.001]		[0.030]	
Injured and Killed		0.058		-0.345		-0.066
		[0.355]		[0.001]		[0.226]
Extended controls	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Village FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Observations	416	416	397	397	344	344
R-squared	0.084	0.072	0.122	0.094	0.555	0.551
Mean dep. var.	0.13		0.46		0.81	

Table 12: Participation in groups

OLS regression

C	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Dependent	attended community		Participation in groups		Member Mosque or	
Variable:	meetings p	oast month	and associations		religious group	
Injured or Killed	0.323		0.542		0.468	
	[0.004]		[0.000]		[0.000]	
Injured and Killed		0.219		0.408		0.401
		[0.030]		[0.000]		[0.002]
Extended controls	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Village FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Observations	405	405	402	402	337	337
R-squared	0.227	0.191	0.294	0.268	0.302	0.237
Mean dep. var.	0.38		0.79		0.33	

Table 13: Participation in Groups, War Experience and Trust

OLS regression

Dependent variable: Amount sent by first mover in the trust game

1	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
						<u>} / /</u>
Same Village	1.134	1.081	0.841	1.11	1.45	1.247
	[0.296]	[0.405]	[0.514]	[0.443]	[0.370]	[0.437]
Participation in gro	-0.164	-0.415	-0.559	-0.193	-0.431	-0.565
	[0.655]	[0.254]	[0.119]	[0.593]	[0.294]	[0.165]
Injured and Killed	-0.214	1.51	-7.478	0.111	1.99	-5.327
	[0.824]	[0.184]	[0.000]	[0.906]	[0.048]	[0.000]
Same Vill. *Part. Groups		0.822	1.131		0.791	1.066
	-	[0.165]	[0.042]		[0.268]	[0.108]
Same Vill. * Inj. and Kill.		-4.243	9.111		-4.834	5.607
		[0.032]	[0.073]		[0.033]	[0.260]
Part. Groups * Inj. and Kill.			9.816			7.973
			[0.000]			[0.000]
Same Vill. * Part. Groups * Inj. and Kill.		-15.287			-11.919	
			[0.009]			[0.045]
Extended Controls	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
FE	region	psu	region	psu	region	psu
Observations	399	399	399	399	399	399
R-squared	0.063	0.077	0.094	0.114	0.13	0.14

Notes to Tables 10 to 13: robust standard errors clustered at the village level. All regressions with a constant.

Extended individual controls are: age, gender, education, any household member of former communist party, ethnicity, region where lived in 1992

In columns 5 and 6 of Table 11, a control also for whether respondent were free him/herself to marry freely is also included.



Figure 1: Map of victimization and surveyed villages. Intensity of civil war violence: Proportion of respondents in our sample affected by conflict (Injured or Killed).





Figure 3: Dictator Game







Figure 5: Trustworthiness



54