

Research Article

Are People Selfish? Based on the Behavioral Economics Games, the Altruistic Behaviors of Waqf Founder the Ottoman Empire to Reduce Poverty

İnsanlar Bencil mi? Davranışsal İktisat Oyunlarından Hareketle Osmanlı'da Vâkıfların Yoksulluğu Azaltan Alturistik Davranışları

Hatime KAMİLÇELEBİ Asst. Prof., Kırklareli University, Faculty of Applied Science, hatimekamilcelebi@klu.edu.tr https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1028-7135	Çiğdem GÜRSOY Assoc.Prof., İstinye University Faculty of Economics cgursoy@istinye.edu.tr https://orcid.org/000-0001-9292-1963
--	--

Makale Gönderme Tarihi 02.07.2020	Revizyon Tarihi 21.10.2020	Kabul Tarihi 30.10.2020
---	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Abstract

It is known that people do not merely consider their interests but also have been thinking about other people with empathy in making decisions since the very first day of their existence. This type of positive social behavior is considered as altruism, empathy and love toward others. Altruistic behaviors, exhibited without expecting a reward or something in return, prioritize the benefit of the others. Although mainstream economics mentions individuals maximizing their own interests, any behavior that will increase the welfare of the other regardless of interest is essentially an economic action. The aim of the study is to investigate the behaviors of Ottoman waqf founders in favor of others or non-selfish behaviors in terms of altruistic features based on behavioral economics games and concepts. After all, it was determined that empathy-induced altruistic behavior that emerged in the ultimatum, dictator, trust and public good games, were the same as the waqf founders' altruistic behaviors.

Keywords: Behavioral economics games, Ottoman waqfs, Waqf founders, Altruism, Empathy.

JEL Classification Codes : D90, D91, D70, D64, P46

Öz

İnsanların var oldukları ilk günden beri aldıkları kararlarda sadece kendi faydalarını gözetmedikleri empati kurarak diğer insanları da düşündükleri bilinmektedir. Bu tarz olumlu sosyal davranışlar alturizm, empati ve başkalarını sevmek olarak değerlendirilmektedir. Alturizm olarak da kavramsallaştırılan ödül veya karşılık beklemeden sergilenen ve kişinin bir bedel ödeyebileceği alturistik davranış, diğerinin faydasını öncelemektedir. Ana akım iktisat bireylerin kendi çıkarlarını maksimize etmesinden bahsetmesine rağmen, çıkar gözetmeden diğerinin refahını arttıracak her türlü davranış da özünde iktisadi bir eylemdir. Çalışmanın amacı Osmanlı vakıf kurucularının başkalarının çıkarını gözeten veya bencil olmayan davranışlarını davranışsal iktisat oyunları ve kavramlarından yola çıkarak alturistik özellikler açısından araştırmaktır. Sonuç olarak, ultimatòm, diktatör, güven ve kamu malı oyunlarında ortaya çıkan empatiye bağlı alturistik davranışın vakıf kurucularının alturistik davranışlarıyla aynı olduğu belirlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Davranışsal iktisat oyunları, Osmanlı vakıfları, Vâkıf, Alturizm, Empati.

Önerilen Atf/Suggested Citation

Kamilçelebi, H., Gürsoy, Ç. 2020. Are People Selfish? Based on the Behavioral Economics Games, the Altruistic Behaviors of Waqf Founder the Ottoman Empire to Reduce Poverty, *Üçüncü Sektör Sosyal Ekonomi Dergisi*, 55(4), 2323-2340

1. Introduction

The term “altruism” was first coined by Auguste Comte. He described it as the tendency or desire of individuals to live for others by giving up their interests (Comte, (2017[1875]). Comte also coined another concept of *social eudemonism* that can be interpreted as “the ethics of social happiness”. According to Comte, altruism stands for a moral of social happiness. Numerous behaviors and actions such as donating blood in our daily life can be given as examples for this issue (Evans and Ferguson, 2014). Moreover, by stating altruism as the condition for the development of humanity in terms of morality and culture, Comte used the term altruism as the exact opposite of egocentrism.

Durkheim defines altruism as a voluntary movement of people regardless of personal interest (Dubeski, 2001). Although altruism is an ancient debate issue that had been studied in many disciplines, by courtesy of the recent developments in behavioral economics, it has begun to be studied also in this field. Over the centuries, the most frequently suggested source of altruistic motivation had been another emotional response which is often referred to as empathy (Batson, 1987) in line with the perceived well-being of another person. If someone else is needed, these empathetic emotions include affection, sympathy, fondness, and so on. The empathy-altruism hypothesis claims that these emotions evoke motivation for the person with whom empathy is felt, that is, altruistic motivation with a final purpose. Empathizing with a person in need leads to more help for that person (Eisenberg and Miller, 1987). Notwithstanding the feeling of increasing the well-being of the other persons that induces empathy; it can be a final goal that produces personal benefit or a goal to produce more personal benefits, it is also possible to motivate both goals simultaneously. In other words, the motivation that induces empathy can be sacrifice, egoism, or both.

Apart from empathy, sources of altruistic motivation may be inducing of altruism including a devoted personality (Oliner and Oliner, 1988) and internalized social merits. It is seen that the expression of altruism is sometimes used to refer to a subset of prosocial behaviors. Prosocial behavior involves a wide range of actions to benefit one or more people, as well as actions such as assistance, sharing, and collaboration. Altruism is also a motivational concept. Furthermore, altruism is the motivation to increase someone else’s well-being as much as it opposes egoism as well as the motivation of increasing one’s well-being (MacIntyre, 1967).

Upon considering the selfish human type *homo-economicus* who thinks of their interests instead of the altruistic human type, the transition period from mercantilism to liberalism is noted. In line with the newly generated economic paradigm; moral disintegration has also been accompanied by the change and transformation of traditional human type (Bulut, 2015). Since the dawn of neoliberalism in the mid-20th century, the process of lacking moral values has accelerated along with the sharing and prosperity levels that are not directly proportional to the growth figures of countries. By the end of the century, it is seen that states have gradually begun to move away from the public sphere and have been replaced by non-profit organizations (NGOs) and waqfs. By approaching the end of the first quarter of the 21st century, the foundation-public domain relation revealed a different sector, apart from the private and public sectors, called social initiative (Gürsoy, 2020). This sector, also called the third sector organizations, consists of NGOs constituted by civil initiatives that aim at providing social service and social assistance.

Considering the historical process of the Ottoman Empire as a sample, it is seen that the concept of altruism, which was first coined in Europe in the last quarter of the 19th century, existed for centuries. The behavior of caring for others instead of thinking about self-interests, empathy, creates the ground for social eudemonism along with the economic mentality. In this context, the Ottoman waqfs emerged as one of the primary areas in the application of social happiness as the source of social welfare. In the study, the behaviors of the waqf founder acting under the framework of the Ottoman waqf founder system and the behaviors underlying the economic decisions of people in today’s behavioral economics games are examined and their similarities are emphasized.

Upon considering the literature in which the relationship between the Ottoman waqfs and altruism is examined, it is determined that the number of conducted studies are limited. In the study of Bulut (2015), the emergence of the *homo-economicus* human type was examined within the historical perspective and the problems raised by this form of behavior were emphasized. Attention is drawn to the mentality issue, and the emphasis is made on the triangle of altruism, morals, and economics. In the study of Aktan and Bahçe (2015), the results revealed by the economic benevolence over some game matrices were examined. It is suggested that the social aids to be provided by the state in public domains are undertaken by voluntary organizations. Also, the state should bring voluntary philanthropy and third sector organizations to the fore by enacting regulatory, protective, and incentive laws in this field. In the study of Bulut and Korkut (2017), the altruistic finance model with cash waqfs was emphasized. It was pointed out that the cash waqfs, which operated similarly to micro-finance institutions where the Ottoman waqfs organized inter-personal solidarity and assistance, provide in-kind and cash aids, and transfer resources. As can be seen from the limited number of studies, it is determined that the behaviors that motivated the waqf founder within the general functioning of the Ottoman waqf system were not handled under the same framework with today's behavioral economics concepts and games.

From this point of view, the necessity to include the mentioned issues in interdisciplinary research has emerged. The study aiming to fill the gap in academic literature involves a general comparison of behavioral economics' concepts-games-experiments with waqf founders' behaviors. It should be noticed that the underlying factor of the waqf founders' behavior is the guidance of the Ottoman waqf system. In the study, a relationship is established between the emergence of various experiments such as ultimatum game, dictator game, public domain game and trust game, and the behaviors of the foes, under the framework of prosocial behavior, which takes place mostly in the field of behavioral economics. At the same time, the impact of individuals with observed egocentric empathy gaps on behavioral economics games as well as endowment effect has been handled to reveal the difference among the forms of waqf founder behavior. In the second part, the subject of behavioral economics is examined; in the third part, the operation of the Ottoman waqf system is elaborated to investigate the motivations under which the waqf founder has been established. Moreover, the roles of the waqfs in the Ottoman socio-economic life are investigated and the dimensions of their services in the public sphere are mentioned. In the final part, the behaviors of the waqf founder are compared with today's behavioral economics concepts and attention is drawn to their similarities.

2. Altruism in Behavioral Economics Games: Do Individuals Think Only of Their Interests?

Determinants of altruistic behavior have been tried to be explained by decades of research studies in economics and psychology. These long-standing assumptions of *homo-economicus*, which stated that individuals strive to maximize their incomes and are rational, began to be abandoned gradually in the late 1950s. It has been observed with experiments conducted through behavioral games that people behave more generously than the rational choice theory predicted (Güth et al., 1982).

In psychology studies, it is stated that altruism has a close relationship with empathy (Eisenberg and Miller, 1987; Batson, 1990; Eisenberg and Fabes, 1990; De Waal, 2007; Eisenberg and Fabes, 1990). The link between altruism and empathy was also constituted by Adam Smith. Ashraf et al. (2005) argued that Smith's study entitled "*The Theory of Moral Sentiments*" was the basis of contemporary behavioral economics. Smith stated that sometimes people experience a lack of empathy. According to him, the decrease in the population of China as a result of an earthquake in China is a lack of empathy for a European person. Because after listening to such news and getting upset, people would return to their own routine lives (Smith, 2010 [1759]). In some cases, people can have a great deal of empathy. An example of this situation is the concern of a mother upon the whimper of her child who cannot explain the pain he/she has when sick. The grief of the mother, who feels helpless over her child's whimper, may be higher than the suffering of the child (Smith, 2010 [1759]). Meta-analytical evidence from psychology verifies this historical proposition by revealing that empathic states and characteristics induced altruistic behavior (Eisenberg and Miller, 1987).

In the light of these findings, the empathy-altruism hypothesis (Batson, 1990) revealed that altruistic motivation emerged with empathy for a needy person. Empathy is defined as an ideal mechanism to constitute the basis of altruism in response to someone else's need, pain, and distress (De Waal, 2007). Collaboration based on altruism is the basic behavioral principle of people's social life. When the games are designed to collaborate, it is seen that the reward-related areas of the brain (NAcc, caudate nucleus, VMPFC / OFC and rostral anterior cingulate cortex) are activated (Rilling et al., 2002). In other words, people become happy when they inure to the benefit of other people. These observations are to be handled in terms of the altruistic behavior induced by the empathy that lies in the background of the ultimatum, dictator, trust, and public good games throughout the study.

In the ultimatum game, two players who do not know each other try to reach an agreement on how to share a certain amount of money. There are two parties in the game, who send and receive the money. Both players have full knowledge of the rules of the game. After the game is over, the information of who the other person was in the game is not revealed to either of the players. Initially, a certain amount of money is given to the player (sender) who is supposed to submit the offer. The sender decides how this money (for example, \$ 10) will be allocated between him/her and the other player (receiver) who responds to the proposal. The receiver, however, accepts or rejects this offer. If the receiver accepts the offer, the money is allocated accordingly. If the receiver rejects the sender's offer, both are not able to receive any money and the game is over. The Nash equilibrium in this game means that the sender keeps \$ 9 for him/herself and sends \$ 1 to the receiver. Based on the assumption that the receiver is rational in this offer, he/she must accept all the offers except that no money is sent to him by the sender because even if the amount he/she receives is \$ 1, it is still better than not having any money at all (Güth et al., 1982). The senders often send between 40 and 60 percent of the money fairly. Moreover, the senders do not make these fair offers due to fear of rejection (Thaler, 2000).

The ultimatum game reveals an element in people's choices. People care about other people and give up on their resources to help them. Because in a simple altruistic model, interpersonal relationships are merely a good thing (Mullainathan, 2016). According to the results of the games played in countries of different continents, it was revealed that the senders in these societies did not offer less than 25 percent of the total amount of money they initially endowed, and the actual amount ranged between 26 percent and 58 percent on average (Heinrich et al., 2005). Due to the possibility of the receiver to refuse the offer for the allocation in the ultimatum game, opinions have been made that the sender has not offered any money to the receiver considering the situation of not making any money and that this cannot be considered as altruistic or fair behavior. Nonetheless, the invalidity of this claim has been proved by the dictator game.

The dictator game has been developed later than the ultimatum game to demonstrate whether the allocation in the ultimatum game was for altruistic purposes. Altruistic behavior was explained with the dictator game. A participant named as the dictator in the game is expected to share a certain amount of money given to him before the game with an anonymous receiver. It should be noted here that the anonymous receiver has no choice but to accept the amount of money offered by the sender. Another point to note is that the dictator is free to offer –or not to offer– a certain amount of the money given to him/her. As would be understood, only the decision of the sender who holds the money in the game is important. The receiver does not have the right to make any decision in the game. The sender can offer the receiver either the full or a certain amount of money if he/she wishes to do so. In this case, the receiver accepts the amount of money sent and the game is over. The sender may not offer any amount of money to the receiver. In that case, the game ends in such a way that the receiver does not receive any money and all the money is retained by the sender. Thus, the Nash equilibrium here is that the sender keeps all the money because the receiver has no right to make any moves.

In the dictator game, it was observed that some of the senders offered a certain amount of money to the receiver. In this game, it was stated that the sender offered the money in his possession with an altruistic understanding, even though the receiver was not authorized to make any moves. In fact, both in the ultimatum and the dictator game, it has been observed that the sender did not

mean to act for the sake of fairness while offering the money (Forsythe et al., 1994). This result also supports that allocation is made with an altruistic approach. Along with the developments in behavioral economics, studies have begun to be conducted in this field to further advance the understanding of altruism. For instance; empathy was found to be positively associated with offerings in the dictator game (Edele et al., 2013).

While the homo-economicus assumption of mainstream economics predicts that participants would not offer any money to the receiver, a meta-analysis that takes into account hundreds of studies which observed the dictator game indicated that on average, the participants gave approximately 30% of the total amount of money in their possession (Engel, 2011). Since such an act happens to be much more munificent than anticipated, the experimental economists have substantially explicated the determinants of altruistic behavior. Findings of the conducted research studies have been the principal for the notion that social justice-related norms (i.e. the effort to achieve equal financial benefits for themselves and others) have important influences on altruism (Fehr and Schmidt, 1999; Andreoni and Bernheim, 2009).

Another game played in behavioral economics is the public goods game. Public goods experiments are frequently used instruments upon analyzing the degree of collaboration on their own, as well as which factors and institutional arrangements develop and maintain cooperation. However, in public goods games, some of the players usually transfer all the money they have to the pool, whereas some do not contribute at all, and some send only a small amount. The money which is not contributed to the pool would be kept by the players. In this case, the Nash equilibrium is not putting any money in the pool and expecting others to make contributions. The players are not informed about the contribution amounts of other players during the game. Later, the amount collected in the pool is multiplied by a common coefficient and allocated equally among the players. The reason for this behavior of “cooperators” is explained by the feeling of belonging to a certain group, social norm, and altruism (Ledyard, 1995).

Although it is observed that the amount of contribution made by the cooperators mostly ranges from 40% to 60% in the public goods game, the problem of free riding has also arisen. In other words, with this game, it is seen that people exhibit various behaviors ranging from completely egocentric to completely altruistic. Impure altruism, which has been proposed to explain cooperation, is included in the act of cooperation as opposed to its consequences. “Doing the right (good, honorable, etc.) thing” is a reason for many people. This situation, which is called impure altruism, is generally defined as conscience satisfaction or non-intrinsic ethical imperatives (Dawes and Thaler, 1988: 189-192).

In a study investigating whether or not “free riding” decreased when the game was played repeatedly, it was concluded that there was a serious difference between the first game and the fifth game, and the free-riding problem increased in repeated games (Isaac et al., 1985). It was observed that the altruistic punishment method has been developed to reduce the free-riding problem and increase the cooperation, and the altruistic punishment has significantly increased the cooperation in the public goods game, whereas the ones have been punished for being “free-riders” still have contributed to a lesser extent (Fehr and Gächter, 2000).

Another behavioral economics game in which altruistic behavior has been observed is the trust game. First, people belonging to two different groups included in the game were taken to the rooms A and B, being the sender and the receiver. Before starting the game, the sender and receiver were given full information about the game, and the identities of the players were not reported during and after the experiment. The senders were initially given \$ 10 at the beginning of the experiment and were informed about the presence of a receiver in the other room. The sender could have kept all the money and finished the game or offered some or all the money to the receiver. The sender was told that the amount to be offered to the receiver would have been multiplied by three and that the receiver could have sent some or all the money back to the sender if he/she decided to do so. The Nash equilibrium was that when the sender did not offer any money to the receiver, but the first amount offered in the game was 51.6% on average (Berg et al., 1995). Most laboratory studies in the trust game concluded that if the sender or the receiver

were male, less amount of money was offered. Innocenti and Paziienza (2006) argued that this behavior could be better explained by the fact that women are more altruistic than men. They measured the levels of altruism in the trust game they played and found that women were more altruistic than men, both in terms of trust and reliability. This outcome may also have arisen from informing the participants about the gender of the partner. The findings of Cox (2002) were different and the gender of the partner was not reported in the experiment. Accordingly, men and women were found as almost equivalently altruists.

So far, it has been observed that people have offered their money to other people they have never known through the altruistic behavior induced by empathy in the behavioral economics games. Whereas, as rationally expressed in mainstream economics, people are expected to consider their interests as in the Nash equilibrium. In the following, people who have egocentric empathy gaps have offered a price that they do not intend to sell the goods they own because they are unable to empathize with others, or they offered prices at which people who do not want to pay for their property (Van Boven et al., 2000). This concept, called the endowment effect, is defined as the fact that people demand more than the values of their belongings for which they are willing to pay to give up on them (Kahneman et al., 1990). In the experiment, a ballpoint pen with an average price of \$ 5 was given to one subject group and \$ 4.5 cash to another group of subjects. Later, both groups were given a series offers among which they could accept or reject. These offers are designed to determine the indifference curves. For example, people who were given a pen would be asked whether they would have given up the pen. Knetsch created an indifference curve for each participant and drew the average indifference curve for both groups (participants who were given pens and the ones who were given cash) by drawing the line between accepted and rejected offers. The pens yielded relatively higher revenues for the participants with pens than the participants with cash, and consequently, the drawn curves intersected (Knetsch, 1990; Kahneman, et al., 1991: 195-197). So, in this experiment, are the ones who were gifted with pens more valuable than other people? Loewenstein and Kahneman (1991) investigated this with an experiment as follows: About half of the 63 students in one class were given a pen, while others were given a token that could be used to pay for a gift that was not specified. Then, all participants were asked to evaluate the attractiveness of the six gifts as a reward in subsequent experiments. Consequently, all subjects were given a choice between a pencil and two chocolate bars. Here, the endowment effect has emerged. 56 percent of those who were initially given pens chose the pen, whereas only 24 percent of the other subjects chose the pen. Nonetheless, while ranking attractiveness points of gifts, the subjects who were given the pen did not rate pens as more attractive. As can be seen here, people who were initially given a pencil in the experiment are likely to consider themselves more valuable than other people. The participants cannot empathize with others (Kamilçelebi, 2019a).

Another experiment included “the choosers” as well as the buyers and the sellers. Buyers can purchase the coffee mug with their own money. The choosers can choose between receiving a coffee mug or that amount of money. Considering the results, the sellers determined the value of the cup at \$ 7.12. The chooser determined a lower amount than the sellers determined. The amount they set was \$ 3.12. The amount determined by the buyers for the coffee mug was lower than the other two groups, \$ 2.87. The discrepancy between prices determined by sellers and buyers is remarkable. The high price determination of the sellers for the coffee mug indicates the reluctance to give up an object they have. In various studies explaining the price difference determined by sellers and buyers, this situation is asserted to be associated with the egocentric empathy gap (Van Boven et al., 2000; Van Boven et al., 2003).

As a result, some of the people who have the goods given to them under the endowment effect tried to retain the goods, some wished to sell over the regular price of the goods they have and some wanted to give the goods to the others. It is also proven by these studies that those who preferred the first two options had egocentric empathy gaps and those in the third group, who could not replace themselves, acted with altruistic behavior induced by empathy.

3. Ottoman Waqf Institutions and Contribution of Waqf Founders' Behaviors to the Institution

Waqf involves the allocation of a property forever by the owner of the property, provided that it is religious, social, and charitable. Although the definition of the *waqf* varies according to sects, once the property mentioned in the Ottoman practice has been taken away from its owner, that is, it has been transferred to the property of the public and cannot be taken back (Günay, 2019). Although it is known that the main motivation source is religion-based in *waqfs* established to improve the living conditions of the others, the increase in needs over time has diversified the *waqfs* and directed them to different fields. Upon examining the areas of practice outside religion, it is seen that the public interest is frequently respected. As public service, *waqfs* have undertaken the sustainability of services by establishing infrastructure and superstructure institutions such as trade areas, places of worship, fountains, bridges, baths, hospitals, and libraries (İnalçık, 2009). In this context, to comprehend the extent of this *waqf* system, it should be noted that one-third of the total land in the Ottoman Empire in early in the 18th century and three-quarters of the arable land in the Turkish Republic as of 1923 belonged to the *waqfs* (Barkan, 1939). Kütükoğlu (1977), investigated the social services provided by the *waqfs* and stated that the number of higher education schools built by *waqfs* was more than 500 during the Ottoman period, from the conquest of Istanbul to the 19th century.

When the endowed goods are considered as permanent/eternal sources of capital, the return of these goods also plays an important role in sustaining the endowment purpose. In this context, the *waqf* has a continuous non-personal capital. The capital and purpose of the *waqf* had become official with the endowments (*vakfiye*) approved by the *qadi*. The endowment is the official document indicating the founder the *waqf*, the goods that were endowed, the sources of income obtained, to whom and where it would have been used, how to it would have been protected, and rendered sustainable (İnalçık, 2009). There are *waqfs* established by one person or more.

The *waqfs* were divided into two categories as securities and real estate according to the type of the goods involved. Securities consisted of movable goods, whereas real estate consisted of immovable land-related properties. The Ottoman subjects, who were eligible to establish a *waqf* determined by law, were given the authority to establish *waqfs* regardless of their gender, religious belief, age, or social class (Öztürk, 2005). There was no limitation on the value of movable and immovable properties to be endowed. It is understood that the *waqf* founders exhibited the positive social behaviors that might have been beneficial for the others or a group without any oppression. The important thing here is the desire to make someone else's living conditions better. As it is today, then, altruistic behaviors had been directed towards contributing to the welfare of relatives and disadvantaged groups in the neighborhood. It is also known that some of the *waqf* founders contributed to their families and met their needs. The fine line here is whether the family needs charity. In this context, the presence of some *waqf* founders through which most or all of the *waqfs*' revenue had been allocated among family members is also determined. It is also known that people tend to expose their wealth. At this point, the *waqfs* had stepped in, and they had properly associated the sense of personal satisfaction with the social benefit. Moreover, ostentation, luxury consumption, and waste would certainly decrease when wealth is directed towards social goals and needs (Öztürk, 2005). This view, which also reflects the view of Islam on life and assets, has been supported by social and cultural norms and has enabled the spread of altruistic behaviors throughout the society. The income and wealth transfers made by courtesy of the *waqfs* spreads their effect in a way to cover all the segments of the society, especially the disadvantaged groups, and made the Ottomans known as the *waqf* civilization (Bulut and Korkut, 2019).

These behaviors also match with the prosocial behavior pattern conceptualized in the 1960s. Upon examining the social aids of the *waqfs*, it is understood that the necessary care is provided to the elderly, the fallen, the poor, the patients, and the orphans under the titles such as education, food tax, and health. Considering that each of them has its subtitles, the details of the system could be emphasized better. For instance; it is possible to detail the subtitles of education from the clothes given to the students to the salaries of the teachers, the course materials, and the fuel-lighting-

repair costs. Furthermore, it is determined that some *waqfs* had paid more than one person for several months or even years without any duty in return out of their excess revenues. In five of the 17th-century *waqfs* under examination, the money paid to 85 people, 28 of which were women, had been identified, and it is possible to handle these expenses under the heading of social charity to disadvantaged people (Koyunoğlu, 2008).

Although it is known that some *waqfs* had been established to help those who could not afford to work, the presence of *waqfs* that had pioneered the employment of people in need are also frequently emphasized. In other words, it is stated that a *waqf* that makes efforts to include those people in the production process and develop continuous opportunities instead of the *waqf* only to provide the housing and food of the poor is better (Öztürk, 2005). In this context, while the *waqfs* helped the disadvantaged groups, they also contributed to employment by creating new job opportunities for those who could work within those groups (Gürsoy, 2020).

There were also artisan funds and janissary squad funds. Securities and real estate endowed to the funds had contributed to the needs of the neighborhood, janissaries, and artisans. It should be noted here that regardless of who endowed and how much was endowed, and the person who needed charity was given the necessary amounts. Some of the funds were available to everyone, as well as some were specifically set up to meet the needs of their members (Yağcı and Gürsoy, 2019). For example; an artisan could have benefited from the services of the individual *waqfs*, from the neighborhood funds, and from the artisan funds of which he was a member. There was no religious discrimination on the condition of being an Ottoman subject (Gürsoy, 2020).

Public services performed by the *waqfs* had also been documented with financial data from the 16th to 19th centuries. As shown in Table 1, the budget expenditures of the 16th century were mainly collected under the headlines of salaries, exports, and deliveries, and among them, the first item with the most expenditure item was the salaries. The salaries earned by the soldiers, payments made to artisans, craftsmen, caretakers working in the palace, and those working in shipyards were registered under the headline of salaries. Under the headline of delivery, the food and ammunition expenses of the state, the palace and the military institutions were listed. The export headline included the pilgrimage costs, stationery expenses, clothing expenses of senior executives, as well as repairs for the palace and other institutions. As it is detected, there was no expense item for public services provided by the municipalities/the state (Özvar, 2006).

Table 1: Budget Expenditures of the 16th Century (Coin)

Year	Total Expenditure	Salaries	Deliveries	Donation, Ceremonies etc.	Yearly Tax	Salaries of Castle Soldiers	Purchases
1509-10	72.937.945	37.275.806	14.405.988	6.080.017			3.934.929
1523-24	118.783.849	67.272.819	38.785.126	5.754.737			4.887.457
1524-25	126.581.347	68.797.803	48.658.008	3.701.955			5.423.581
1527-28	185.620.549	65.882.940	45.775.362	3.860.664	6.646.006	58.521.450	4.934.127
1546-47	171.872.357	82.079.039	83.410.899	5.307.948			1.065.678
1547-48	111.997.449	76.650.017	28.222.053	5.398.369	597.379		1.130.185
1566-67	207.932.516	100.597.149	72.745.777	3.759.422	517.768	27.822.024	1.700.598
1567-68	221.532.453	127.316.983	73.068.949	4.242.152	551.157	15.573.463	779.749
1582-83	277.578.755	133.614.856	125.958.947	7.984.618			6.938.626

Source: Özvar, E., (2006). "Osmanlı Devleti'nin Bütçe Harcamaları (1509-1788)", Osmanlı Maliyesi Kurumlar ve Bütçeler 1, Osmanlı Bankası Arşiv ve Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, İstanbul.

As shown in Table 2 indicating the budget of the years 1846-1876, it is seen that the expenses were slightly more diversified than the 16th-century budget, but still, items such as health-education-infrastructure services-transportation constituted a very low percentage. In other words, even in the middle of the 19th century, it is understood that basic public services other than

security and control of the state were carried out by waqfs. This means that between the 1850s-1875s, in contrast to the general economic agenda in the world, the waqfs were still performing altruistic behaviors instead of maximizing their profits and benefits to increase their savings. Undoubtedly, the economic mentality patterns underlie these behaviors of the waqf founders (Yağcı and Gürsoy, 2019).

Table 2: Budget Expenditures 1846/47, 1861/62, 1875/76

Expenditure	1846-1847		1861-1862		1875-1876	
	A thousand piaster	%	A thousand piaster	%	A thousand piaster	%
Military Expenditures	294.408	46,4	525.383	37,7	550.291	19,0
Internal Affairs	123.290	19,5	207.699	14,9	293.377	10,1
Foreign Affairs	4.561	0,7	14.809	1,1	17.500	0,6
Sultan's Expenditures	62.500	9,9	129.864	9,3	133.776	4,6
Finance			80.744	5,8	174.190	6,0
Internal Dept Payments	64.017	10,1	222.257	16,0	766.605	26,5
Foreign Dept Payments			104.750	7,5	720.320	24,9
Health					8.539	0,3
Justice			10.664	0,8	47.897	1,7
Public Works, Transportation, etc.	18.844	3,0	4.609	0,3	101.443	3,5
Education	4.253	0,7	2.468	0,2	12.706	0,4
Waqfs and Holy Places	18.739	3,0	60.960	4,4	3.500	0,1
Other	42.600	6,7	29.200	2,1	62.765	2,1
Total	633.212	100,0	1.393.407	100,0	2.892.909	100,0

Source: Güran, T. (2003), Osmanlı Malî İstatistikleri Bütçeler 1841-1981, DİE Yayınları, Ankara.

4. Investigation of the Altruistic Behaviors of Ottoman Waqf Founders within the Scope of Behavioral Economics

Research studies on the psychological basis of our economic behavior were mostly conducted after the mid-20th century. Upon examining the relationship between economics and psychology throughout the historical process, it is seen that today's behavior patterns also existed in the past. Altruistic behavior is one of them. Many different motives such as religion, morality, ostentation, egoism, pity, and compassion may be the basis of these behaviors. Among them, religious belief advises one to help others or even think of others before themselves whenever necessary. Here, the waqfs that emerged for religious purposes indicate a typical example of altruism, considering other needs of people. Moreover, it is possible to consider altruism among the forms of prosocial behaviors such as cooperation and sacrifice (MacIntyre, 1967). As an indicator of altruism, the waqf founder did not consider the decrease in their well-being while exhibiting voluntary behavior and action that would have increased the welfare of others (Aktan and Bahçe, 2015). The trust game also indicates this in some sense. Although there is no obstacle for the player to keep all the money in the game knowing that the money would be given to the other player by threefold, it is altruism that more than half of the players send a certain amount of money to the other party.

Behaviors that lead people to do charity can take different forms throughout their lives. Altruistic behavior aimed at helping someone else and generating benefits also includes many positive

social behaviors such as aid, responsibility, donation, empathy, and fairness (Kamilçelebi, 2019b). These behaviors that result in the benefit of others against one's own, and any behavior that would increase the welfare of others without expecting anything in return ultimately express an economic action (Gürsoy, 2020). As it can be noticed from behavioral economics games, mainstream economics is in the opposite direction, for instance, in the dictator game, people send a certain portion of the cash to their players with altruistic behavior. Nevertheless, mainstream economics prioritizes the individual's interest and assumes it reasonable to take the full amount of cash given to the game or the highest amount required by the game per se. Despite this fact, we see that in behavioral economics games designed especially after 1980, people act by thinking about the other side, their empirical behaviors are induced by empathy, and accordingly, they are likely to share a portion of their money by "getting out of logical behavior". This manner of behavior also explains the underlying reasons why the desires of waqf founders to voluntarily bestow their goods for the benefit of another person. One of the most important of these involves the fact that waqf founders had benefited from the waqfs which had been established by thousands of other waqf founders with whom they did not get acquainted who have engaged in such altruistic behaviors throughout their lives. The waqf founder might be studying in a waqf school, perhaps residing in a waqf house or be employed in a shop owned by the waqfs.

Moreover, the altruistic behavior was followed by the contributions of the same family members to waqfs established by the same family members or waqfs founded by others, from father to son, to grandchildren and other generations of the family. Besides, the transition from individuality to sociality involves observing each other, being affected, blending them with social-cultural and socio-economic norms. Although establishing a waqf initially started as an individual movement, it is known that it continued as a family and social movement. Although establishing waqf began at the first stage as individual movements, it is known that it continued as a family and social movement. There is no doubt that it contributes to the welfare of the people thanks to these forms of behavior that have become social movements (Öztürk, 2005).

Ultimatum and dictator games were also designed based on which behaviors people give some of their money to other parties. It was found that in both the ultimatum game and the dictator game developed for testing it, the money given to the people during the game was shared with the altruistic feelings. Even in the game where the receiver could refuse the offered money and finish the game, the senders offered about half of the money to the receivers without being selfish. These kinds of games give clues about feelings and thoughts on which the waqf founders spent a certain portion of their incomes for the well-being of people whom they have never known. The details of the subject were tried to be explained with the endowment effect. It is a common occurrence in the daily life of the Ottoman Empire that a waqf founder permanently relinquish his/her property and put it into use for education or reserves a portion of his/her wealth to meet the water need of the neighborhood. In other words; the altruistic behavior pattern expressed with the dictator game of behavioral economics was an integral part of Ottoman daily life.

Another subject of behavioral economics is explained in the endowment effect, why people do not want to share the goods they have, or for what reasons they share it. Subsequently, it is found that, in general, people who lack empathy do not share an owned good. If they were able to empathize, they would have shared their property with other people or, at least, offered them more reasonable prices to sell them. It is precisely, once again, considered that the people who share their property have a sense of empathy. With the altruistic behavior induced by empathy, the waqf founders gave up the property rights of their goods, expanded the opportunities of the waqf by collaborating with other people when necessary, and fulfilled the needs of disadvantaged people by implementing various social responsibility projects (Bulut, 2015). In this context, it is possible to claim that the waqf founders exhibit prosocial behavioral features that include elements such as altruism, aid, volunteering, cooperation, and responsibility. It is embedded in the details of the Ottoman waqf institution how prosocial behaviors such as establishing a voluntary waqf, taking into consideration the goodness of another, can be learned when combined with socio-cultural norms.

Here, the state must create environments in which these behaviors would flourish. Just like the environment created by the Ottoman waqf system in terms of what, how much, where to endow, and to whom they would be offered through legal regulations. It should not be too unfounded to assert that, based on thousands of waqfs, people who induced each other with an altruistic way of behavior are likely to get rid of the endowment effect more quickly. Getting rid of egocentrism also brings about abstemiousness in an economic sense. This decrease stems from one of the main objectives of the waqf which is to contribute to the welfare of others (Öztürk, 2005). In the meantime, without imposing any restrictions of a sexist approach, the boundaries of participation / comprehensiveness were expanded, allowing everyone to establish waqfs and benefit from the established waqfs (Yağcı and Gürsoy, 2019). The conclusions drawn from the games usually endorse such situation (Innocenti and Paziienza, 2006; Cox, 2002).

Another game where the concepts of waqfs and behavioral economics are compared is a public goods game. The game is about the participants contributing money into a common pool and sharing this money in equal proportions to each participant at the end of the game. One point to note is that since there is no restriction on the amount that the participants would put into the pool, some of the players can get a share from the pool even though they do not contribute at all. This information is already known to all players. The reason for this behavior of those who put money is explained by the feeling of belonging to a certain group, social norms, and altruism. It is also known from the previous game that they put all their money at the expense of economically weakening by getting rid of egocentrism. The functioning of the aid funds created by cash waqfs in the Ottoman waqf system had similarities with human behavior in the public goods game (Gürsoy, 2020). Since there was no restriction on the amount of endowed money put into the boxes, people could have endowed as many goods as they desired. At the stage of sharing the money, since the allocated amounts are not measured by the amounts contributed by the participants, each takes as much as one would desire. Here, it is likely that there is a free-rider effect emphasized in the public goods game. In other words, there is no obstacle for the people who do not contribute to the common pool to utilize the proceedings of the fund upon need. Undoubtedly, it is possible to see ways of behavior ranging from selfishness to altruism in the public goods game and the functioning of the Ottoman waqf funds. To reduce the impact of free-rider behavior, while seeking help from waqfs, these expectations were responded to, and on the other hand, efforts were made to create environments in which those individuals could make continuous profits by attracting them. In this context, it should not be difficult to claim that free-rider behavior is absorbed even more easily than the public goods game in the waqf system to provide charity services. On the other hand, based on the feeling of empathy, not turning back to the fact that people with real needs may exist would be considered as an example of altruistic behavior.

Also, from public goods experiments; it is understood that guiding and reassuring institutional arrangements lead individuals to cooperate with others and exhibit altruistic behaviors with empathy. In terms of the sustainability of the Ottoman waqf system; it is known that the state takes necessary measures if it deems necessary by making appropriate legal arrangements and then activating the control mechanism. After the waqf law was enacted, it was seen that public domains were shaped according to the wishes and degree of cooperation of those who exhibited intensive altruistic behavior. In these domains, it is possible to see waqf institutions in the sustainability of all kinds of services starting from the neighborhoods (Öztürk, 2005). As of today, states make the public domain spending. In this form of behavior conceptualized as public altruism, individuals pay taxes to the state, and the government spends these taxes on the places-individuals they wish. In the case of waqfs, however, there is no third person between the donor and the receiver. Also, public altruism is likely to give priority to certain groups. Instead of this system which does not have personal responsibility, the waqf system requiring voluntary philanthropy, commitment to personal rules, and a sense of responsibility come to the fore. Furthermore, as the philanthropy assumed by the state expands, the public expenditure item in the budget would also increase (Aktan and Bahçe, 2015). It is also questionable whether these items seen in transfer expenditures are spent on those who need it. It is worth remembering the Ottoman budget records once again. The state's insistence in the waqf system instead of public altruism

could cover the expenses of basic needs such as education-health-shelter-infrastructure-infrastructure by the waqfs, not by the state's budget. It was revealed that the altruistic behavior triggered by the empathy that emerged with the behavioral economics games discussed in the study also caused people to give away their money or property to people with whom they never were acquainted. Similarly, upon examining the waqf examples, it is observed that the waqfs behaved just like the players in those games. The difference is that the waqfs exhibit altruistic behaviors in real-life, not during such a game.

5. Conclusion

Even though people are tried to be put into the pattern of rational and interest-seeking *homo-economicus* in mainstream economics, they also exhibit behaviors within behavioral economics games. In the historical periods when behavioral economics has not been conceptualized, it was explained through the Ottoman waqf system that people exhibited altruistic behaviors with empathy. So much so that even though the giving/sharing of the wealth of the people to the people with no hidden agenda has continued from the past to the present, mathematical expression of the mainstream economics and marginalization of these feelings and behaviors did not mitigate the economic presence of this behavior. If people lack the behavior that attends to others' interests, their lack of empathy is associated with the value of the goods in their possessions. The underlying basic behavior of the waqfs established in the past and today is that individuals give up on their property rights without being influenced by anyone. Upon considering the establishment years of the waqfs and the endowed property/real estate mentioned in research studies, it is seen that the Ottomans persisted in the type of altruistic behavior until almost the 20th century by courtesy of the waqf institution. It is understood that behavioral economics examines behaviors that do not approach human behavior with a general perspective with the help of games-experiments via induction methods. As a result of the examination, it is determined that people behaved altruistically by putting themselves in the place of other people. This determination indicates that as in the Ottoman waqfs if there are necessary regulations and directions in today's institutions, altruistic feelings can even flourish more. Considering the prevalence of the Ottoman waqf system, it is possible to say that people's empathy has a inducing effect. Moreover, it is understood that the behavior of endowing the possessed properties for the needs of the other unconditionally also contributes to social welfare by keeping the society intact. It is believed that the underlying factor in the investigation of such altruistic behaviors in recent years stems from the strengthening of social associations. Besides, these behaviors-orientations may be the precursor for the paradigm shifts in social policies. It seems that there is a need for people who act in an altruistic manner, which would benefit the society as in the Ottoman waqf system. At this point, while increasing the number of social enterprises, the legal regulations that would encourage unpaid benevolence, the areas of study should be expanded. Moreover, the issue of transparency and accountability should be clarified through the revision of legal regulations and the proper use of in-kind and cash donations to voluntary aid organizations. Whenever necessary, institutions should be established for this purpose. It is observed that certain concepts and the behavioral economics games mentioned throughout the study are related to the behavior of the waqf founders that had been the implementer of the Ottoman waqf system. Other behavioral economics issues, which cannot be addressed due to the intensity of the relationship, should also be examined as research topics. There is a need for interdisciplinary comparative studies in which Ottoman waqfs and behavioral economics relationships are handled together.

References

- Aktan, C. C., Bahçe, A. B., (2015). "A Critique of Altruism from the Perspectives of Public Choice and Game Theory", *Journal of Law and Economics Research*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 25-56. (in Turkish).
- Andreoni, J., Bernheim, B. D., (2009). "Social image and the 50-50 norm: a theoretical and experimental analysis of audience effects", *Econometrica*, Vol. 77, pp. 1607-1636.
- Ashraf, N., Camerer C. F., Loewenstein, G., (2005). "Adam Smith, Behavioral Economist", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp. 131-145.

- Barkan, O. L., (1939). "Les Problemes Fonciers dans l'Empire Ottoman au Temps de sa Fondation", 1 Annales d'Histoire Sociale, pp. 233-237.
- Batson, C. D., (1987). "Prosocial motivation: Is it ever truly altruistic?", in L. Berkowitz (ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Vol. 20, pp. 65–122.
- Batson, C. D., (1991). *The Altruism Question: Toward a Social-Psychological Answer*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, New Jersey.
- Batson, C. D., Bolen, M. H., Cross, J. A., Neuringer-Benefiel, H. E., (1986). "Where is the altruism in the altruistic personality?", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 50, No. 1, pp. 212-220.
- Batson, C. D., (1990). "How social an animal? The human capacity for caring", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 45, No. 3, pp. 336-346.
- Berg, J., Dickhaut, J., McCabe, K., (1995). "Trust reciprocity and social history", *Games and Economic Behavior*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 122-142.
- Bulut, M., Korkut, C., (2017). "A Look to The Ottoman Cash Waqfs As Altruistic Finance Model", *Philanthropy for Humanitarian Aid (CONPHA)*.
- Bulut, M., Korkut, C., (2019). "A Look to Cash Waqfs as an Indicator of Ottoman Financial Mentality", *The Journal of Waqfs, Special Issue*.
- Bulut, M., (2015). "Ethics and Economics", *ADAM Academy Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 105-123. (in Turkish).
- Carlo, G., Eisenberg, N., Troyer, D., Switzer, G., Speer, A. L., (1991). "The altruistic personality: In what contexts is it apparent?", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 61, No. 3, pp. 450–458.
- Comte, A., (2017[1875]). *System of Positive Polity*, Forgotten Books, USA.
- Cox, J., (2002). "Trust, Reciprocity, and Other-Regarding Preferences: Groups vs. Individuals and Males vs. Females," in R. Zwick and A. Rapoport (eds.), *Advances in Experimental Business Research*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston.
- Dawes, R., Thaler, R., (1988). "Cooperation", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 2, N. 3, pp. 187-197.
- De Waal, F. B., (2007). "Putting the Altruism Back into Altruism: The Evolution of Empathy", *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 59, pp. 279-300.
- Dubeski, N., (2001). "Durkheim's Altruism as the Source of His Social Holism: A Discussion of the Viability of a Social Basis for Moral Principles", *Electronic Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 5, No. 3. <https://www.sociology.org/content/vol005.003/dubeski.html>.
- Edele, A., Dziobek, I., Keller, M., (2013). "Explaining altruistic sharing in the dictator game: The role of affective empathy, cognitive empathy, and justice sensitivity", *Learning and Individual Differences*, Vol. 24, pp. 96–102.
- Eisenberg, N., Miller, P. A., (1987). "The relation of empathy to prosocial and related behaviors", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 101, No. 1, pp. 91-119.
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., (1990). "Empathy: Conceptualization, measurement, and relation to prosocial behavior", *Motivation and Emotion*, Vol. 14, pp. 131-149.
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R., C. Shea., (1989). "Gender differences in empathy and prosocial moral reasoning: Empirical investigations", in M. M. Brabeck (ed.), *Who cares?: Theory, research, and educational implications of the ethic of care*, Praeger Publishers, USA, pp. 127–143.

- Engel, C., (2011). "Dictator games: a meta study", *Experimental Economics*, Vol. 14, pp. 583-610.
- Evans, R., Ferguson, E., (2014). "Defining and measuring blood donor altruism: A theoretical approach from biology, economics and psychology", *Vox Sanguinis*, Vol. 106, pp. 118-126.
- Fehr, E., Gächter, S., (2000). "Cooperation and punishment in public goods experiments", *American Economic Review*, Vol. 90, No. 4, pp. 980-994.
- Fehr, E., Schmidt, K. M., (1999). "A Theory of Fairness, Competition, and Cooperation", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 114, No. 3, pp. 817-868.
- Forsythe, R., Horowitz, J. L., Savin N. E., Sefton. M., (1994). "Fairness in Simple Bargaining Experiments", *Games and Economic Behavior*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 347-369.
- Günay, H. M., (2012[2019]). "Vakıf" Web Sitesi: TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi Yayımcı: TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, Date of Access: 27.01.2020, <<https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/vakif#1>>
- Güran, T., (2003). *Osmanlı Malî İstatistikleri Bütçeler 1841-1981*, DİE Yayınları, Ankara.
- Gürsoy, Ç., (2020). "Neither Directly in the Sectors nor Entirely Out of Them within A State of Single Piece; It is in the Shatterless Flow of A Wide Area: From The Ottoman Cash Waqfs To Social Enterprises", *Third Sector Social Economic Review*, Vol. 55, No. 1, pp. 76-92, (in Turkish).
- Güth, W., Schmittberger, R., Schwarze, B., (1982). "An experimental analysis of ultimatum bargaining", *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 367-388.
- Innocenti, A., Paziienza, M. G., (2006). "Altruism and Gender in the Trust Game", *SSRN Electronic Journal*, pp. 1-20.
- İnalçık, H., (2009). *Devlet-i Aliyye Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Üzerine Araştırmalar I*, İş Bankası Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Isaac, R. M., McCue, K. F., Plott, C. R., (1985). "Public goods provision in an experimental environment," *Journal of Public Economics*, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 51-74.
- Kahneman, D., Knetsch J. L., Thaler, R. H., (1990). "Experimental Tests of the Endowment Effect and the Coase Theorem", *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 98, No. 6, pp. 1325-1348.
- Kahneman, D., Knetsch J. L., Thaler, R. H., (1991). "Anomalies: The Endowment Effect, Loss Aversion, and Status Quo Bias", *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 193-206.
- Kamilçelebi, H., (2019a). *Davranışsal İktisat*, London: IJOPEC Publication.
- Kamilçelebi, H., (2019b). "Framing Effect and Decision-Making in the Market: A Research on Profit-Seeking and Religiousness in Turkey", *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, Vol. 9, No. 7, pp. 417-425. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18488/journal.1.2019.97.417.425>
- Knetsch, Jack L., (1990). "Derived Indifference Curves," *Simon Fraser University: Working Paper*.
- Koyunoğlu, H., (2008). *Muhasebe Defterlerine Göre Vakıflar 1633-1731 Yılları İstanbul Örneği*, Ahenk Yayınları.
- Kütükoğlu, M. S., (1977). "1869'da Faal İstanbul Medreseleri", İstanbul. <<http://hdl.handle.net/11498/51890>>
- Ledyard, J. O., (1995). "Public Goods: A Survey of Experimental Research", *The Handbook of Experimental Economics*, J. Kagel & A. Roth (eds.), Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp. 111-194.

- Loewenstein, G., Kahneman, D., (1991). "Explaining the Endowment Effect," Carnegie Mellon University: Working Paper.
- MacIntyre, A., (1967). "Egoism and Altruism", P. Edwards (ed.), The Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2, Macmillan Publishing Co., New York, pp. 462-466.
- Mullainathan, S., (2016). "Psikoloji ve Kalkınma İktisadı", Davranışsal İktisat ve Davranışsal İktisadın Uygulamaları, Hatime Kamilçelebi (ed.), Nobel Akademik Yayınları, Ankara.
- Oliner, S. P., Oliner, P. M., (1992). The altruistic personality: Rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe, MacMillan, New York.
- Öztürk, N., (2005). İslâm ve Türk Kültüründe Vakıflar, Vakıflar Dergisi, XXIX, pp. 7-21.
- Özvar, E., (2006). "Osmanlı Devleti'nin Bütçe Harcamaları (1509-1788)", Osmanlı Maliyesi Kurumlar ve Bütçeler 1, Osmanlı Bankası Arşiv ve Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, İstanbul, pp. 197-239.
- Rilling, J. K., Gutman, D. A., Zeh, T. R., Pagnoni, G., Berns, G. S., Kilts, C. D., (2002). "A neural basis for social cooperation", Neuron, Vol. 35, No. 2, pp. 395-405.
- Smith, A., (2010[1759]). The Theory of Moral Sentiments, Harriman House Limited, United Kingdom.
- Thaler, R. H., (2000). "From Homo Economicus to Homo Sapiens", Journal of Economic Perspectives, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 133-141.
- "Waqf" (2019). TRF Islamic Encyclopedia, <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/vakif#1>, 27.01.2020. (in Turkish).
- Van Boven, L., Dunning, D., Loewenstein, G., (2000). "Egocentric Empathy Gaps Between Owners and Buyers: Misperceptions of the Endowment Effect", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 79, No. 1, pp. 66-76.
- Van Boven, L., Loewenstein, G., Dunning, D., (2003). "Mispredicting the endowment effect: underestimation of owners' selling prices by buyer's agents", Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, Vol. 51, No. 3, pp. 351-365.
- Yağcı, M., Gürsoy, Ç., (2019). "Economic mentality Institutions and Cash Waqfs in the Ottoman State", ADAM Academy Journal of Social Sciences, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 37-67. (in Turkish).

Araştırma Makalesi

Are People Selfish? Based on the Behavioral Economics Games, the Altruistic Behaviors of Waqf Founder the Ottoman Empire to Reduce Poverty

İnsanlar Bencil mi? Davranışsal İktisat Oyunlarından Hareketle Osmanlı'da Vâkıfların Yoksulluğu Azaltan Alturistik Davranışları

<p>Hatime KAMİLÇELEBİ Asst. Prof., Kırklareli University, Faculty of Applied Science, hatimekamilcelebi@klu.edu.tr https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1028-7135</p>	<p>Çiğdem GÜRİSOY Assoc.Prof., İstinye University Faculty of Economics cgursoy@istinye.edu.tr https://orcid.org/000-0001-9292-1963</p>
---	--

Genişletilmiş Özet

1. Giriş

Alturizm, birçok bilim dalında incelenen kadim bir tartışma konusu olmakla birlikte son zamanlara davranışsal iktisattaki gelişmeler sayesinde bu alanda da çalışılmaya başlanmıştır. İhtiyacı olan bir kişiye yönelik empati kurmanın o kişiye daha fazla yardım edilmesine yol açmaktadır (Eisenberg ve Miller, 1987). Ancak empatiyi tetikleyen diğer kişinin refahını artırma duygusu; kişisel fayda üreten nihai bir hedef ya da daha fazla kişisel fayda üretme hedefi olabileceği gibi her iki hedefe de aynı anda motive olabilmek mümkündür.

Örneklem olarak alınan Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun tarihsel sürecine bakıldığında alturizm kavramının yüzyıllardır var olduğu görülmektedir. Kendi yerine başkasını düşünme davranışı yani empati, iktisadi zihniyetle birlikte toplumsal alana çıktığında sosyal mutluluk ahlakının zeminini hazırlamaktadır. Bu kapsamda Osmanlı vakıfları toplumsal refahın kaynağı olan sosyal mutluluğun uygulamasında başat alanlardan biri olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Çalışmada, son yıllarda çokça araştırılan davranışsal iktisat oyunlarındaki insanların iktisadi kararlarının altında yatan davranışlar ile Osmanlı vakıf sisteminin çatısı altında hareket eden vâkıfların davranışları ele alınmış ve aralarındaki benzerlikler üzerinde durulmuştur.

Osmanlı vakıfları ve alturizm ilişkisinin birlikte ele alındığı literatüre bakıldığında çalışmaların kısıtlı olduğu vakıf sisteminin genel işleyişi içerisinde vâkıfları motive eden davranışların günümüzün davranışsal iktisat kavramları ve oyunları ile aynı çatı altında ele alınmadığı tespit edilmiştir. Buradan hareketle, bahsi geçen konuları disiplinler arası araştırmaya dahil etme gereği doğmuştur. Akademik yazın alanındaki boşluğu doldurabilmek amaçlı çalışma, davranışsal iktisat kavramları-oyunları-deneyleri ile vâkıf davranışlarının genel bir karşılaştırmasıdır. Çalışmada, davranışsal iktisat çalışmalarında yoğunlukla yer alan empatiye bağlı alturizmin, ultimatoyu, diktatör oyunu, kamu malı oyunu ve güven oyunu gibi yapılan çeşitli deneyler ile ortaya çıkması ve vâkıfların davranış biçimleri arasında ilişki kurulmuştur. İkinci bölümde davranışsal iktisatta alturizm konusu incelenmiş, üçüncü bölümde Osmanlı vakıf sistemi işleyişi detaylandırılarak vâkıfların hangi motivasyonlar altında sahip oldukları şeylerden vazgeçerek vakıf kurdukları araştırılmıştır. Ayrıca vakıfların Osmanlı sosyo-ekonomik hayatındaki rolleri araştırılarak kamusal alanda yaptıkları hizmetlerin boyutlarına değinilmiştir. Dördüncü bölümde ise vâkıfların davranışları günümüzün davranışsal iktisat kavramları ile karşılaştırılıp benzerliklere dikkat çekilmiştir.

2. Davranışsal İktisat Oyunlarında Alturizm: Bireyler sadece kendi çıkarını mı düşünür?

Anaakım iktisat insanları bencil ve kendi faydasını maksimize eden bireyler olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Davranışsal iktisadın ultimatòm, diktatör, güven ve kamu malı oyunlarının arka planında ise insanların empati yaparak alturistik davranışlar sergiledikleri ortaya çıkarılmıştır. Ültimatòm, diktatör ve güven oyunlarında birbirini tanımayan iki oyuncu her bir oyunda farklı uygulamalarla belli bir parayı nasıl paylaşacakları ile ilgili bir anlaşmaya varmaya çalışırlar (Güth vd., 1982; Berg vd., 1995; Forsythe vd., 1994). Oyunda parayı gönderen ve alan olmak üzere iki taraf bulunur. Deney için göndericilere verilen bu parayı göndericilerin oyun dizaynına göre hiç paylaşmama veya minimum düzeyde paylaşma hakları olmasına rağmen, göndericiler bu paranın neredeyse yarısına yakınına hiç tanımadıkları bir kişiye alturistik duygularla göndermektedir. (Thaler, 2000). Kamu malı oyununda ise bireylere oyun için verilen para ortak bir havuzda toplanmakta, elde edilen para miktarı belli bir katsayıyla çarpılıp bireyler arasında eşit bir şekilde paylaşılmaktadır (Ledyard, 1995). Bu oyunda da hiç katkı sağlamayanlara katkı sağlayan grup üyelerince alturistik ceza adı verilen bir ceza verilmekte, bedavacılık sorununun ortadan kalkması sağlanmaktadır (Fehr ve Gächter, 2000). Bu oyunlar insanların diğer insanları önemseydiğini ve onlara yardım etmek için kendi kaynaklarından vazgeçtiğini göstermektedir. Bireylerin sahip oldukları malları başkalarıyla paylaşmak istemedikleri durumlar (mülkiyet etkisi) ise bireylerin benmerkezci empati boşluğuna sahip olduğu şeklinde açıklanmaktadır (Van Boven vd., 2000).

3. Osmanlı Vakıf Kurumu ve Vâkıf Davranışlarının Kuruma Katkısı

Vakıf; bir malın sahibi tarafından dini, toplumsal ve hayır amaçlı olmak şartı ile sonsuza kadar geri alınmamak üzere tahsis edilmesidir. (Günay, 2019). Diğerinin yaşam şartlarını iyileştirmek amaçlı kurulan vakıflarda ana motivasyon kaynağının din temelli olduğu bilinmekle beraber zaman içinde ihtiyaçların artması vakıfları da çeşitlendirerek farklı alanlara yöneltmiştir. Din dışındaki uygulama alanlarına bakıldığında sıklıkla kamu yararının gözetildiği görülmektedir. Kamu hizmeti olarak ticaret alanları, ibadet yerleri, çeşme, köprü, hamam, hastane, kütüphaneler gibi halkın sosyal-kültürel ve ekonomik ihtiyacını karşılayacak tüm yapıların diğer bir deyişle alt yapı ve üst yapı kurumlarının kurulması ile hizmetlerin sürdürülebilirliği görevini vakıflar üstlenmiştir (İnalçık, 2009) Kamusal alandaki bu hizmetlerin vakıflar tarafından yerine getirdiği 16. ve 19. yüzyıllara ait mali verilerde kamusal alan harcamalarının yok denecek kadar az olmasından anlaşılmaktadır. (Özvar, 2006). Vakıfların kişi bazlı yardımlarının; öncelikle yaşlılara, düşkünlere, fakirlere, hastalara ve yetimlerin ihtiyaçlarına yönelik olduğu bilinmekle beraber bu kişileri üretime dahil edip sürekli kazanç sağlayacak imkanları da geliştirmek için çaba sarf etmişlerdir. (Öztürk, 2005).

4. Davranışsal İktisat Kapsamında Osmanlı Vâkıflarının Alturistik Davranışlarının İncelenmesi

Alturizm göstergesi olarak vâkıflar başkalarının refahını arttıracak gönüllü davranış ve eylemde bulunurken kendi refahındaki azalmayı dikkate almazlar (Aktan ve Bahçe, 2015). Güven oyunu da bir bakıma bunu göstermektedir. Oyuncunun oyundaki paranın tamamını alıp gidebilmesinde bir engel yokken ve paranın diğer oyuncuya üçle çarpılarak verileceğini bilmelerine rağmen yarıdan fazlasının bir miktar parayı karşı tarafa göndermesi alturizmi gösterir.

Ültimatòm ve diktatör oyunlarında alıcının kendisine gönderilen parayı geri çevirip oyunu bitirmesinin mümkün olduğu oyunda dahi göndericiler bencil davranmadan elindeki paranın yaklaşık yarısını alıcılara göndermişlerdir. Bu tarz oyunlar vâkıfların hangi duygu ve düşüncelerle gelirlerinin bir kısmını hiç tanımadığı kişilerin refahı için harcadıkları hakkında ipucu vermektedir. Konunun detayları mülkiyet etkisi ile açıklanmak istenmiştir. Bireylerin sahip oldukları malı neden paylaşmak istemedikleri açıklanmıştır. Sahip olunan bir malı genellikle empati duygusundan yoksun kişilerin paylaşmadığı görülmüştür (Van Boven vd., 2000). Tam da burada mallarını paylaşan vâkıfların empati duygusuna sahip olduğu bir kez daha ele alınmalıdır. Vâkıflar empatinin tetiklediği alturistik davranışla mallarının mülkiyet haklarından vazgeçmiş, gerektiğinde başka kişilerle iş birliği yaparak vakfın imkanlarını genişletmiş ve çeşitli sosyal sorumluluk projelerini hayata geçirerek dezavantajlı kişilerin ihtiyaçlarını karşılamışlardır (Bulut, 2015).

Ayrıca kamu malı oyunu deneylerinden; yol gösterici ve güven verici kurumsal düzenlemelerin kişileri diğerleri ile iş birliği yapmaya, empati duyarak alturistik davranışlar sergilemeye yönelttiği anlaşılmıştır. Osmanlı vakıf sisteminin sürdürülebilirliği açısından bakıldığında; devletin uygun yasal düzenlemeleri yaparak ardından kontrol mekanizmasını devreye soktuğu gerekli gördüğü hallerde ise işleyişi rahatlatıcı önlemler aldığı bilinmektedir. Vakıf hukuku oluşturulduktan sonra alturistik davranışı yoğun gösteren kişilerin isteklerine ve iş birliği derecelerine göre kamusal alanların şekillendiği görülmüştür. Bu alanlarda mahallelerden başlayarak şehirlerin kuruluşu ve sonrasında her türlü hizmetin sürdürülebilirliğinde vakıf kurumlarını görmek mümkündür (Öztürk, 2005). Bahsi geçen kamusal alan harcamalarını günümüzde devletler yapmaktadır. Kamusal alturizm olarak kavramsallaştırılan bu davranış biçiminde, kişiler devlete vergi vermekte devlet bu vergileri istediği yerlere-kişilere harcamaktadır. Vakıflarda ise alan ve veren arasında üçüncü bir kişi yoktur. Ayrıca, kamusal alturizmin belli gruplara öncelik vermesi olasıdır. Kişisel sorumluluğun olmadığı bu sistem yerine gönüllü hayırseverlik, kişisel kurallara karşı bağlılık ve sorumluluk duygusu gerektiren vakıf sistemi ön plana çıkmaktadır. İlâveten, devletin üstlendiği yardımseverlik giderek artan boyutlara geldiğinde bütçede kamu harcaması kaleminin artmasına sebep olacaktır (Aktan ve Bahçe, 2015). Transfer harcamalarının içinde görülen bu meblağların gerçekten ihtiyacı olanlara gerektiği kadar gidip gitmediği de sorgulanmaya muhtaçtır. Tam da burada Osmanlı bütçe kayıtlarını bir kez daha hatırlatmakta yarar vardır. Devletin kamusal alturizm yerine vakıf sisteminde ısrar etmesi temel ihtiyaçlar olarak adlandırılan eğitim-sağlık-barınma-alt yapı gibi harcamaların devlet bütçesinden değil vakıflar tarafından karşılanmasına imkân verilmiştir.

5. Sonuç

Anaakım iktisatta insanların rasyonel ve çıkarıcı oldukları düşünülse de bunun dışında da davranışlar sergilediği davranışsal iktisat oyunlarında görülmektedir. İnsanların empati kurarak alturistik davranışlar gösterdiğinin açıklandığı davranışsal iktisat çalışmaları Osmanlı vakıf sistemi örnekleriyle açıklanmıştır. Öyle ki, insanların ellerindeki servetlerini hiçbir çıkarının olmadığı insanlara karşılıksız vermesi/paylaşması geçmişten günümüze kadar devam ettiği halde anaakım iktisadın insanların bu duygu ve davranışlarını bir kenara itmesi bu davranışın iktisadi varlığını ortadan kaldırmamıştır. İnsanların karşısındakini gözetmemesi ve mülkiyetindeki mallara değerinden daha fazla değer biçmesi empati yoksunluğu ile ilişkilendirilmiştir. Geçmişte ve günümüzde kurulan vakıfların altında yatan temel davranış biçimi, bireylerin kimsenin etkisi altında kalmadan sahip olduğu malları üzerindeki mülkiyet haklarından vazgeçmesidir. Yapılan araştırmalarda vakıfların kuruluş yılları ve vakfedilen menkul ve gayrimenkullere bakıldığında Osmanlı'nın vakıf kurumu sayesinde neredeyse 20. yüzyıla kadar alturistik davranış tipinde sebat ettiği görülmektedir. İnceleme sonucunda insanların empati yaparak alturistik davrandığı tespit edilmiştir. Bu tespit, Osmanlı vakıflarında olduğu gibi günümüz kurumlarında da gerekli düzenlemeler ve yönlendirmeler olduğu takdirde alturistik duyguların daha fazla gün yüzüne çıkabileceğini göstermektedir. Osmanlı vakıf sisteminin yaygınlığı göz önüne alındığında insanların empati duygularının teşvik edici olduğunu söylemek mümkündür. Dahası sahip olunan malları herhangi bir çıkar amacı gözetmeden karşısındakinin ihtiyaçları için vakfetme davranışının toplumu bir arada tutarak aynı zamanda sosyal refaha da katkı sağladığı anlaşılmıştır. Bu tür alturistik davranışlar toplumsal birlikteliklerin güçlenmesinin ve iş birliği temelli sosyal politikalara geçişin habercisi olabilir. Karşılıksız yardımseverliği teşvik edecek yasal düzenlemeler ile bir yandan sosyal girişimlerin sayıca artması teşvik edilirken diğer yandan çalışma alanları genişletilmelidir. Çalışma boyunca bahsi geçen davranışsal iktisadın belli kavramları ve oyunlarında gözlemlenen alturistik davranışın vâkıfların davranışları ile aynı olduğu ortaya çıkarılmıştır. Osmanlı vakıfları ve davranışsal iktisat ilişkisinin birlikte ele alınacağı disiplinler arası karşılaştırmalı çalışmalara ihtiyaç bulunmaktadır.