Article

Strategic Synergies: Unveiling the Interplay of Game Theory and Cultural Dynamics in a Globalized World

Yufei Wang [1], Mangirdas Morkūnas [2,*] and Jinzhao Wei [3]

[1] Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Vilnius University, 10222 Vilnius, Lithuania
[2] Business School, Vilnius University, 10225 Vilnius, Lithuania
[3] University International College, Macao University of Science and Technology, Macao 999078, China
[*] Correspondence: mangirdas.morkunas@evaf.vu.lt

Abstract: This literature review focuses on cultural-related studies and game theory. First of all, it analyzes how social dynamics and strategic interactions can be shaped by different cultural environments. Secondly, it examines how cultural norms can affect strategic decision making and how game theory could predict cooperations and conflicts. Overall, this study aims to highlight the applicability of game theory in the modeling of cultural transformation and its interaction with behavioral economics. Moreover, this study also attempts to underscore the significance of game theory and cultural diversity in communication methods, plus the process of policy formulation. In addition to the above topics, the robustness of cross-cultural social norms, the economic study of different cultural heritage, and the cultural effects of tourism under game theory are also focal points of this study. Finally, this review delves into how game theory can represent social interactions, emphasizing the need to incorporate extensive cultural knowledge in order to enhance the efficacy of game-theoretic model's applications.

Keywords: game theory; cultural influence; strategic decisions; social dynamics; policy design; behavioral economics

1. Introduction

The study of human behavior, more specifically in the areas of social sciences and economics, was revolutionized by the implementation of game theory [1]. Game theory is a systematized mathematical instrument that models strategic interactions that occur amongst rational individuals [2]. Throughout the years, game theory has been implemented in a variety of disciplines, such as economic markets [3], political processes, and many other disciplines [4]. It has become evident, however, that one of the most significant factors in those processes is culture. Culture, defined as a composite concept that represents a collection of values, beliefs, and norms [5], does not play a passive role in the background of game theory but, rather, is an active player that determines both the rules and strategies of the game and players' motivations [6,7]. This study looks into how to deconstruct the complicated interplay of game theory and culture and assess the path which strategic decision making and social interaction patterns could be affected by diverse cultural contexts. Indeed, cultural diversity could influence various aspects of interactions between individuals, and this phenomenon has been expanding concurrently with the globalization of society [8]. This makes the intersection of cultural studies and game theory exceptionally relevant. If one could combine insights from cultural studies and the discipline of games, it would be possible to create a far more elaborate study approach for decision making in diversified cultural settings. Notably, one of many areas where culture studies and game theory could meet is the field of strategic interaction [9,10]. Cultural norms, beliefs, or expectations can predetermine what strategies individuals would consider appropriate or efficient and, as a result, influence the outcomes of the [11,12]. Take the well-known game of the Prisoner's Dilemma for example. Normally speaking, norms and values of a collectivist

culture tend to promote cooperative methods [7,13], whereas an individualist culture would lean more towards competition [14]. The above example of strategic interaction has practical applications in social collaboration, corporate negotiations, and international relations. Another vital area where culture and game theory converge is cooperation and conflict [15]. Cooperation can be aided or hindered by cultural norms and beliefs [16]. The Tragedy of the Commons is another example of a social dilemma, which also relates to game-theoretic models' interpretation process [17]. Comprehending these cultural subtleties can result in more efficacious approaches to fostering collaboration and settling disputes [18]. Game theory's analysis on social norms' evolution procedure provides a framework for scholars to understand the formation of new norms. It also delivers insights into how particular behaviors become dominant within a culture [19,20]. When examining how cultures evolve throughout time in response to shifting social, economic, and environmental circumstances, this evolutionary perspective is useful [21]. Furthermore, game theory could predict outcomes in multicultural negotiations and diplomatic engagements [22,23]. Success in international business, diplomacy, and global governance requires the ability to effectively negotiate cultural differences and communicate in an increasingly interconnected world [24]. Another area where game theory and culture collide is mechanism design [25], where rules are designed to achieve certain social objectives while preserving cultural norms [26,27]. For instance, creating financial incentives with cultural awareness in mind can improve success and conformity [28,29]. Policymakers in culturally varied countries intending to solve issues in domains such as public health, economic development, and environmental protection may find game theory helpful [30,31]. As stated by Hunter et al. [32] and Gelfand et al. [33], game theory may also be used to model and predict cultural evolution, reflecting changes in cultural practices and beliefs as societies develop. Whether in the context of market trends, consumer behavior, or social movements, this theory can offer valuable information to businesses and individuals seeking to adjust to shifting cultural environments [34]. Game theory helps scholars to facilitate the understanding of how culture influences decision making. This combines both psychology and cognitive science [35,36]. According to Schulze-Horn et al. [37] and Burr et al. [38], it takes into consideration the limited rationality and emotional impulses that are frequently molded by cultural factors. This point of view leads to the accurate and practical understanding of human behavior since is elucidates why people sometimes arrive at decisions that differ from those predicted by conventional game theory [39,40]. Cultural economics can shed light on the strategic choices made by consumers, cultural institutions, and artists in the cultural market by using game theory in the analysis of cultural goods and services [10,41]. As for legislators and business executives looking to foster diversity in culture, game theory can offer insightful information. By predicting outcomes within a cultural context, game theory can help to develop suitable policies [42,43]. For instance, in a diverse cultural setting, where governments and international organizations handle troublesome social, economic, and environmental issues, they may find game theory useful because it provides a structured framework for analyzing strategic interactions, predicting outcomes, and understanding decision-making processes. The dynamic relationships within a culture, including coalition formation and reactions to social pressure, can also be modeled by game theory [11]. With businesses and individuals looking for ways to understand and impact social dynamics in fields such as social transformation, business management, and community development, this could provide insightful information [32,44]. For more complicated but useful applications in social science fields and real-life scenarios, it is necessary to understand how culture and game theory intersect [20]. This examination of the literature will systematically investigate these links by referencing an extensive range of academic works, from sociology and anthropology to political science and economics.

This review shall address three research questions:

How do cultural norms affect strategic decisions made in varied cultures, and how can game theory be used to estimate these decisions?

How does game theory contribute to the understanding of cultural evolution, and what roles can it play in modeling forthcoming cultural transformations?

How could the integration of game-theoretic models and cultural studies impact the development of policies in diverse culture settings?

This study methodically examines the literature to show how game theory can be used to project cultural occurrences in a variety of contexts, including video games and cultural heritage.

2. Literature Review

As previously mentioned, the intersection of game theory and culture occurs in the examination of strategic interactions. Game theory has been used to examine the evolution of social standards and the spread of religious ideas, outside its conventional application to economic and political settings. Game theory and transaction cost theory are used to analyze historical missionary texts in the study of religion and cultural interaction. Transaction cost theory is an economic concept that was initially developed to explain the costs associated with the exchange of goods and services, and it is particularly concerned with the costs incurred in searching for exchange partners, negotiating and monitoring contracts, and enforcing agreements [45]. This provides a new perspective on the cultural exchanges between the East and the West during the Catholic Church's spread in the late 1500s and early 1600s [46].

Game theory has been applied to mimic buyer–seller negotiations in green production in the parameters of environmental legislation, exposing the existence of greenwashing and highlighting the significance of encouraging pro-environmental values among clients [47]. Additionally, with the development of the pandemic mitigation responsiveness index (PMRI), it gives governments a strategic framework to control surges in cases, and game theory is being utilized for examining behavioral patterns during pandemics [48]. This example demonstrates how game theory can be used to anticipate and control the social and cultural dynamics that emerge in emergency situations. The Morality-as-Cooperation (MAC) theory in moral psychology makes the use of game theory to distinguish between different forms of cooperation and proposes that each kind gives rise to a distinct moral domain [49]. This instance illustrates the importance of game theory for comprehending the interplay of moral behavior and social influences.

In addition, in terms of hospitality businesses, in order to maximize profit and to understand how strategic choices and visitor preferences are impacted by cultural factors, game theory is also essential, since it supports heritage hotels to have effective pricing strategies [50]. Hotels can use game theory to model how different cultural groups value various amenities (e.g., room size, food options, recreational facilities). By analyzing the strategic choices of customers from different cultures, hotels can determine the optimal mix of amenities to offer. Game theory can also model the price sensitivity of different cultural groups, helping hotels to set prices that maximize revenue while remaining competitive and culturally sensitive [51–53]. This use case demonstrates how game theory may incorporate cultural aspects into economic models to give a thorough knowledge of market behavior. Additionally, game theory is employed to investigate the robustness of social norms across cultural contexts; findings indicate that social norms are more strongly developed in groups that experience greater threats [54]. This demonstrates the adaptive nature of cultural variances and the evolutionary foundation of social standards. Game theory is used to address the homogenization of travel destinations in the tourism industry, providing methods to improve destination income and control tourist flows while preserving cultural distinctiveness [55]. The common-pool approach to managing tourism realizes that destinations, like all resources, are subject to overuse and mechanical degradation unless managed properly, ultimately putting at risk their very sustainability [56,57].

Game theory, after all, is fundamentally a theory of strategic decisions. Whereas it was originally, and still is, largely an economic and social theory, it has applications in the creative fields of movies and literature [58]. Interdisciplinary work of this sort gives

the analyst a different perspective for use in examining narrative structures, character relationships, and the depth of themes. A work by Herbert De Ley [59], entitled "The name of the game: Applying game theory in literature", came out in 1988. By emphasizing the strategic aspects that are part of stories, de Ley shows how the complicated interactions of characters are powered by the background processes of game-theoretic logic as the source of narrative development [59]. Jan Simons [60] also writes about the use of game theory for film analysis in "Narrative, games, and theory" 2007. He demonstrates that knowledge of the strategic games that characters are involved in can give information about the reasons for their acts as well as about conflict resolution within the film narratives [60]. The use of game theory in movies and literature not only deepens the appreciation of these creative products but is also a symptom of the broader cultural consequences of game-theoretic thinking.

Game theory has many applications in understanding social and cultural dynamics and provides insights into a wide range of fields. Game theory is applied in the field of video game analysis to examine the narrative structures and game design, demonstrating how games influence societal norms and behavior. This approach analyzes video games as textual representations of cultural environments, combining procedural rhetoric with social semiotics [61]. An alternative to traditional game studies is the hermeneutics of computer games, which investigates video games as cultural artifacts through the lens of game theory. This viewpoint explores the narrative patterns and literary qualities of games. It highlights the significance of game theory in recognizing the fictional elements of video games [62]. Particularly in Trust–Revenge games, game theory is used to assess the behavior of autonomous agents in order to comprehend how they interact with agents who do not behave in accord with the assumptions of rational behavior typically assumed in game theory models. According to research, autonomous agents behave like human players, which makes it possible to use game-theoretic models to anticipate cultural variety in interpersonal interactions [63]. Roos et al. [54] states that game-theoretic models can explain the adaptive nature of cultural differences in cooperation and social norms. Evolutionary game theory's asymmetric interactions offer a more complex explanation of natural interactions. This method highlights the intricacy of social interactions and their evolutionary consequences by exposing disparities between genetic and cultural evolution models [64]. Game theory—specifically, the stag hunt game—is used to examine the roles that tolerance and diversity play in the construction of the social contract. Researchers uncovered a profound relationship between diversity, tolerance, and social agreement, suggesting that game theory may be used to enable cooperation in heterogeneous societies [65]. Other scholars suggested improving the field of social epidemiology by incorporating evolutionary notions and game theory tools, which provide insights into the dynamics of society. When addressing the effects of social exposures, a multidisciplinary approach can result in more successful interventions [66].

To further elucidate the diverse applications of game theory across various academic disciplines, Table 1 presents a concise summary of how game theory is applied and its role in different fields.

Table 1. Interdisciplinary applications of game theory in cultural studies.

Discipline	Application of Game Theory	Role of Game Theory in the Discipline
Economics	Modeling market behaviors	Analyzing strategic interactions among rational agents
Political Science	Predicting policy outcomes	Understanding the dynamics of power and influence
Sociology	Analyzing social structures	Revealing the underlying strategies in social interactions
Psychology	Studying decision-making processes	Exploring the interplay between rationality and emotion
Anthropology	Examining cultural practices	Identifying patterns of cooperation and conflict across cultures

Table 2 below gives a comparative cross-section to indicate the similarities and dissimilarities in applications of game theory in different disciplines. For instance, the application of game theory in anthropology and cultural studies deals with cultural phenomena, though anthropology applies the game theory more broadly in understanding social norms and values, whereas cultural studies may draw attention to details in different expressions of culture. This contrast suggests the flexibility and depth of game-theoretic applications in this extended tradition of work within the social sciences and humanities.

Table 2. Comparative analysis of game theory's impact across disciplines.

Discipline Comparison	Similarities in Game Theory Application	Differences in Game Theory Application
Economics and Political Science	Both utilize game theory to predict strategic interactions and outcomes in decision-making processes	Economics often focuses on market behaviors and consumer choices, while Political Science centers on policymaking and power dynamics
Sociology and Psychology	Both apply game theory to understand social behaviors and strategic interactions within groups	Sociology examines social structures and group-level interactions, whereas Psychology delves into individual decision-making processes and cognitive strategies
Anthropology and Cultural Studies	Both disciplines use game theory to analyze cultural practices and their evolution, as well as the dynamics of cultural exchange	Anthropology typically investigates broader cultural norms and values across different societies, while Cultural Studies might concentrate on specific cultural artifacts, media, or symbolic interactions

The work by Elinor Ostrom [67] on common-pool resources is seminal, "Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action", and gives a person an outline within which one can know how communities can self-organize to manage shared resources. Ostrom's [67] insights provide a critical lens through which we can examine the cultural dynamics and strategic interactions that underpin the governance of common-pool resources across diverse societies [67]. Ostrom's work underlines the crucial role of monitoring and communication mechanisms in effective common-pool resource management [68]. Monitoring and communication are necessary to detect instances of norm violation, which is then followed by "graduated sanctions" or systems of escalating penalties for repeated violations. The presence of such mechanisms in cultural practices further complicates the game-theoretical models of social interactions, where agents and groups properly balance the costs and benefits of compliance and enforcement [67,69]. Some of the most dramatically influential contributions that Ostrom's research has are her studies about the ways norms and rules of societies' cultures evolve adaptively [70,71]. And her game-theoretical analysis uncovers that in many cases, communities can evolve and further improve their institutions over time in reaction to changing environmental and social conditions [72,73]. Ostrom's [70] case studies, meant to present empirical evidence of how communities have successfully interacted in the complex interplay of first-order and second-order dilemmas, draw from these real-world examples. The cases show that, with the right combination of social mechanisms, cultural norms are not only sustained but transformed in ways that enhance the resilience and sustainability of communal resource management. These dilemmas are often overcome because community members are able to effectively cooperate, communicate, and coordinate their actions, indicating the power of collective agency in driving cultural evolution [67,74,75].

3. Results

Synthesizing the literature on the intersection of game theory and cultural studies offers a plethora of insights to be gleaned. Researchers have used a range of game-theoretic

models to shed light on the intricacies of cultural phenomena. A thematic analysis of the results is presented in this section, with particular attention on how game theory has been applied to comprehend and project cultural norms, diversity, change, and the strategic interactions that support these aspects. We reveal the diverse contributions of game-theoretic techniques to the field of cultural studies by looking at the strategic actions within cultural contexts, the way that game theory shapes our knowledge of cultural artifacts, and the economic consequences of cultural legacy.

3.1. Cultural Norms and Social Interactions

Game-theoretic models have emerged as an effective analytical tool in the study of cultural norms, used to search for the strategic behaviors that could contribute to the establishment of common social norms [76,77]. These models have proven informative when analyzing the complex dynamics that give rise to cultural norms [78] and the complex mechanisms that guarantee such standards' continued applicability in a society [79]. Investigating cooperative behaviors, which frequently form the basis for many cultural norms [80], is one of the primary uses of game-theoretic models in this field [81]. Researchers have been able to model the circumstances in which cooperative tactics can emerge as the prevailing approach, even in the face of defection by using the iterated Prisoner's Dilemma [82]. This has provided insight into how repeated encounters can cause people to be more cooperative [83], also resulting in establishing norms that promote social harmony and group well-being [84]. Another field where game-theoretic models have provided useful insights is the maintenance of these norms. Research has repeatedly demonstrated that the prospect of punishment for deviating from accepted practices may act as an effective deterrent, encouraging obedience and adherence to social standards [16,85]. This trend has been seen even in online communities where people are anonymous, indicating that norm maintenance may be largely influenced by fear of punishment rather than self-identification [86]. In addition, offering incentives for following the norm might act as a reinforcement mechanism, strengthening the norm's position within the cultural framework [87].

The analysis of social networks has considerably enhanced the knowledge of cultural norms. For instance, according to De et al. [76], a game-theoretic study has shown that the structure of these social networks is vital to the propagation and stabilization of norms. However, within a network, fragile connections can introduce diversity, preventing quick fixation on a single norm [88]. Network structure determines information pathways and pathways of influence that greatly impact the spreading and stabilization of cultural norms [89]. Different types of networks, homogeneous, heterogeneous, small-world, and random networks would all have different outcomes with certain structures; for example, small-world networks allow for fast norm spread but, at the same time, have norms locally reinforce themselves. The interplay between network structure and norm dynamics suggests taking into account the broader social context in which cultural norms evolve [90–92]. Conversely, strong ties can promote the acceptance of a novel standard [93]. How network structure and norm dynamics interact highlights the importance of taking the larger social context into account in which norms form and change. Furthermore, the application of the game-theoretic model explained how cultural norms could be adjusted based on population variability [78]. According to Rasmussen and Yaouzis [94] and Liu et al. [95], the game-theoretic model has contributed to the understanding of norm change and how minority norms can influence or even replace majority norms. Game-theoretic models proved especially helpful in investigating cultural drift, claiming that minor variations in individual behaviors can compound, hence leading to large shifts in cultural norms [96–98]. These models have cast doubt on the idea of a fully deterministic approach of norm development by stressing the significance of random chance and stochastic processes in cultural change [99]. Apart from these, game-theoretic models have also been employed to study how information transmission could contribute to the establishment and preservation of cultural norms [100]. Research shows that the spread and adoption of norms can be greatly

influenced by the information flow within a social network [101], and the existence of powerful "opinion leaders" frequently plays an integral part in the transmission of norms [102]. In addition, study data indicate that humans are more likely to adopt a norm if they observe others in their network doing so [40]. These models have been utilized to explore the influence of social learning and imitation on norm adoption [103]. Game-theoretic models have enhanced the understanding of the creation and changes of cultural norms [104]. They offer approaches to anticipate cultural shifts and provide a valid theoretical framework [105]. Lastly, game-theoretic models have provided a perspective on the interaction of variables that mold cultural norms, integrating social learning, information flow, individual strategic actions, and social network structure [106].

In conclusion, incorporating game-theoretic models can facilitate the understanding of the intricate social norm formation and modification process. Future studies can construct effective methods to improve social cohesion and harmony to gain deeper insights into the culture-shaping process.

3.2. Cultural Diversity and Strategic Behavior

Game theory has revealed the complexity presented by cultural diversity in strategic relationships, which focuses on simulating rational decision making in engaging settings [11,107], and cultural variety causing a larger set of strategic choices is one of the major findings [108]. The unique values, beliefs, and conventions from different cultural origins could influence the preferences and strategies when individuals engage in strategic interactions, thus resulting in diversified behaviors [109,110]. For instance, studies have demonstrated that cultural variations in views of fairness, trustworthiness, and risk-taking can have a major influence on how cooperative tactics are formed in games such as public goods games or the Prisoner's Dilemma [111,112]. In addition, the literature also reveals the significance of cultural variation in influencing the processes of social learning and norm adoption [113]. According to game-theoretic models, people are likely to adopt techniques that have worked in their cultural context [114,115]. One such model is the "imitation of successful strategies" model. This may cause many cultural groups to develop their own unique strategic norms, which may then have an impact on the general dynamics of strategic interactions [116]. In the context of bargaining and negotiations, the influence of cultural diversity on strategic conduct is also clear [117]. The effects of cultural differences in the preferences for equality, competitiveness, and cooperation on the bargaining process and its results have been examined through the lens of game-theoretic models of bargaining, such as the Nash bargaining solution [118,119]. Studies have shown that different behaviors, such as the propensity to make concessions, and the willingness to use competitive tactics, can be caused by cultural diversity [120–122]. One study also emphasizes the importance of considering cultural diversity when creating systems which encourage collaboration in strategic interactions [123]. Another study has proven reputation systems and communication channels can affect an institution's effectiveness [124]. For example, in cultures that prioritize harmony and consensus, institutions that rely heavily on punishment are less effective than those that encourage communication and deliberation, which may lead to greater success in fostering cooperation [125–127]. In collective harmony and consensus-oriented East Asian cultures, institutions that work best at enhancing cooperation are more likely to be communication- and deliberation-based [128]. For example, in Japanese organizations, the concept of "renkei" underscores the emphasis on personal relationships and a search for agreement that would foster higher levels of collaboration and mutual support [129]. The employment of community-based "gacaca" courts that depend on dialogue and confession, as opposed to punishment, has been tried in some African societies, with certain success in resolving conflicts and reconciling after bouts of civil unrest [130,131]. In this approach, there is a coherence that stays very close to the cultural norms, substantially emphasizing communal harmony and forgiveness [132]. Although some studies have highlighted the role of culture, the real integrations of how

different cultural norms and values affect strategic interactions and the possible promotion of cooperative behaviors are yet to be fully revealed.

Finally, by bringing game theory to cultural diversity and strategic actions research, new understandings of different cultural backgrounds in strategic interactions were acquired. Research has demonstrated that cultural diversity impacts strategic behaviors through mechanisms, including establishing norms and preferences, influencing learning processes, affecting bargaining behaviors, and evaluating the success of institutions.

3.3. Cultural Change and Game-Theoretic Anticipatory Analysis

Game-theoretic models can provide insights into how cultural traditions arise, endure, or disappear by modeling the strategic interactions among individuals within a society [133,134]. The study of social norms surrounding environmental protection is a well-known application of game-theoretic analysis to the study of cultural change [135,136]. These models have been used to estimate the spread of sustainability norms under social pressures and economic incentives. To better grasp how recycling became the norm, a game-theoretic approach can be helpful. Game-theoretic models were applied in models of cultural diffusion to predict the spreading of cultural practices, such as the uptake of new technologies or the popularity of particular cultural behaviors. Recent criticism pointed out how simplicity can come to reside in arguably the most pervasive assumption of all: that individuals always imitate the more successful peers among them [137]. This assumption underpins the network of public goods games [138], often without the necessary empirical foundations to do justice to the complicated ways in which humans may behave. Building on Graeber's [139] notion of "creative refusal", it was recognized that such irregularities may stem from individuals and groups, arising from complicated reasons. Therefore, divergence in behaviors from peers can manifest as a means of cultural expression, reaction to historical experience, or strategic choice founded on unique local knowledge [139].

Game theory becomes an addition to this agent-based modeling in the sense that it provides, to the agents, ways of choosing between different kinds of decisions and strategies, depending on the potential actions of the other agents [140]. It shapes the decision-making process of each of the agents, whereby the concepts of game theory guide it, such as payoffs and strategies that are in a state of equilibrium. Agents can use game-theoretic strategies to maximize their individual outcomes in this simulated environment [141]. Researchers can, therefore, study the emergent behaviors that result from such strategic interactions. Carrignon et al. [142] demonstrated how cultural traits can spread via social networks, displacing old practices and fostering the creation of new norms. Moreover, the study of language evolution also indicates the explanatory capacity of game-theoretic models [143]. One example is that scholars have predicted changes in linguistic preferences and the circumstances in which a language might become dominant or endangered by examining the strategic decisions people make while using language [144,145]. This can assist in determining the tipping thresholds at which a language might stop being a live component of a culture's communication practices [146]. It is imperative to acknowledge the constraints of game-theoretic models in terms of their ability to estimate cultural shifts. However, according to Khosravifar et al. [147], the drawback of game-theoretic models is that they assume people behave rationally and make decisions based on maximizing their utility, and this cannot represent the complexity of human behavior accurately. For example, experimental studies on the ultimatum game show a deep multitude of influences on an individual's decision to accept or reject unfair offers [148,149]. These factors include genetic similarities, as evidenced by the fact that even zygotic twins are more likely to accept unfair offers as compared to any other pair, belonging to the same social group, and the degree of intoxication, with highly intoxicated individuals demonstrating a higher rate of refusal of unfair offers [150]. In addition to such experimental game theory, scholars have also evaluated the varying levels of acceptance of unfair offers across different cultures and have established a wide range of varying responses for varying societies. This has further added to the understanding that, in any analysis of decision-making behavior, the cultural context

also has to be considered, as this very factor defines the perceived fairness and cooperation of individuals who are in the business of cooperative behaviors [151]. Furthermore, the quality of data and the specific cultural environment in which they are employed affect forecast accuracy [152]. When market conditions and economic policies are subject to rapid changes, the quality of economic data can be a critical factor in the accuracy of forecasts [153]. The cultural variables, attitudes toward risk and investments, are also likely to affect the economic behaviors and outcomes of forecasts [154,155]. Notwithstanding these drawbacks, game-theoretic models continue to be an effective means for antipicating cultural change [16]. For instance, these models can be used to find ways to preserve cultural heritage in the face of globalization in the field of cultural preservation research [156]. They can provide guidance for international development policies that support social cohesiveness and cultural variety [157,158].

Recognizing the limitations of game theory models in capturing the complexity of cultural shifts, researchers have explored innovative approaches to enhance theoretical insight and applicability. One such approach is the incorporation of narrative-based models that acknowledge the role of storytelling in shaping cultural perceptions and behaviors [159]. These models suggest that the stories individuals tell about their experiences and the narratives that cultures propagate can significantly influence decision-making processes, an aspect often overlooked by traditional game theory.

Researchers have explored innovative approaches to enhance accuracy and applicability, recognizing the limitations of game theory models in capturing the complexity of cultural shifts [160]. One of them is the incorporation of narrative-based models that acknowledge the role of storytelling in shaping cultural perceptions and behaviors [161]. It was suggested that the stories individuals tell about their experiences can influence decision-making processes [162], and this has been often overlooked by traditional game theory. Additionally, by comparing cultural shifts across different societies, researchers can identify universal patterns as well as culture-specific factors, enhancing the generalizability and specificity of game theory models [163,164].

3.4. Culture and Game Design

According to Guay-Bélanger [165] and Styhre et al. [166], video games are cultural objects that reflect societal values and interactions, not just entertainment items. Game theory is a sophisticated framework to analyze the connection between game design and cultural ecosystems [167]. Narrative frameworks in video games are one of the most significant ways that game theory and culture interact [168,169]. As noted by Romanzi [170], video games such as "The Last of Us" use a narrative to delve into fundamental societal themes, namely the nature of love and violence in a post-apocalyptic world. In order to tailor the cultural experience and promote re-playability to investigate different cultural opinions, game theory aids analysts and designers in understanding how players' strategic decisions within the game could end up in different narrative outcomes [171]. Game design adds to the challenge of cultural stereotypes and representations [172,173]. In the gaming business, for example, game theory can be used to analyze how gender is portrayed in "Grand Theft Auto V". It shows how the narrative structure and gameplay mechanics support or challenge conventional gender stereotypes [174]. Understanding these relationships is essential to creating inclusive and culturally aware games. One factor contributing to games' cultural impact is their ability to imitate social interactions [175,176]. Renowned for its complex player-driven politics and economy, "EVE Online" is known for betrayals and galactic-scale strategic alliances [177,178]. Applying game theory to emergent behavior analysis in these games provides insights into real-world social and political dynamics [179]. An important use of game theory has been to analyze the phenomenon of "casual games" in popular culture, such as "Candy Crush Saga". Because of the simple gameplay and user-friendly design, casual games have broadened the gaming audience to include individuals who were not interested in video games [180,181]. The success of such games can be attributed to game-theoretic models of player retention and incentive

schemes, thus yielding cultural implications for game design and marketing [182,183]. While video games can have cultural significance, there are negative aspects as well. Even with its strengths, game theory may fall short in capturing the depth of feeling and cultural diversity that players experience. With the rise of "walking simulators" like "Firewatch", which prioritize narrative and exploration above tactical action, game-theoretic analysis faces unique challenges [184]. Game design can perpetuate cultural stereotypes; therefore, it must navigate to avoid reinforcing harmful biases [172]. Assembling development teams with diverse cultural backgrounds can help in identifying and mitigating potential stereotypes in game narratives and mechanics [185].

Game theory, in the case of video games as cultural artifacts, is actually applied both in the process of development by game designers in order to produce a balanced gameplay experience and by academics when looking at player strategies and cultural narratives that the game represents. Not all video games have an explicit application of game theory within the design. Nevertheless, this theoretical framework facilitates an understanding of the strategic interactions occurring within a game and its wider cultural consequences.

3.5. The Role of Game Theory in Preserving Cultural Heritage

Game theory and economic models offer a detailed way to understand the complex connections between cultural heritage and economic activities [186]. According to Roth and Wilson [187], these models are especially good at capturing the strategic interactions between many stakeholders in the field of cultural heritage, including governments, local communities, tourists, and private investors. Game theory enables scholars to estimate the different actions various parties might take regarding the upkeep and utilization of cultural heritage sites, as each party has distinct objectives [188,189]. Additionally, in terms of economics, cultural heritage sites are widely recognized as an asset that can stimulate various forms of investment, including tourism and development projects [190]. Heritage sites can create revenue directly through the promotion of tourism or indirectly by strengthening a region's fame [191,192]. The core of using game theory in this situation is analyzing the possible strategic choices each stakeholder might make in terms of the possible financial gains that could result. The restoration of iconic landmarks such as Rome's Colosseum involves navigating a complex web of considerations, including the site's cultural significance, preservation costs, and potential tourism benefits [193,194]. Balancing the necessity for economic development with the need for preservation is one of the main issues in maintaining cultural resources [195,196]. With the aid of game-theoretic models, policymakers can grasp the fundamental trade-offs inherent in decisions concerning cultural heritage sites. For instance, local tourism authorities frequently weigh the preservation costs of historic sites against the anticipated benefits, such as a rise in tourist numbers [197,198]. The trade-offs between economic growth and the sustainable management of cultural assets can be simulated by these models, hence helping to guide policy decisions [199]. Cultural heritage impacts market behavior, affecting investment decisions, property values, and the growth of linked sectors [200]. A more detailed knowledge of the economic impact on local and regional markets can be achieved by using game-theoretic models to project how market actors will react to the existence of cultural assets [201]. According to Zhang et al. [101], the existence of a World Heritage site, for instance, may encourage more investment in the hospitality sector and the creation of products related to cultural tourism. Developing policies about cultural heritage is another area in which game theory is useful. Policymakers can use it to predict how various stakeholders will respond to policy interventions [202], like enacting regulatory frameworks to safeguard heritage sites or offering tax incentives for preservation efforts [203–205]. Empirical instances, such as the financial evaluation of the restoration of Pompeii, showcase how game-theoretic economic models can be used for cultural assets. These models consider the strategic choices made by a range of parties with an interest in the preservation of the site and the revenue it brings in from tourists, such as the European Union, the Italian Government, local governments, and private investors [206]. Game-theoretic models are useful, but there

are obstacles to applying them. Some of these include the intricacy of estimating human behavior over extended time, the difficulty of measuring non-economic values, and the requirement for solid data on stakeholder preferences [207–209]. To overcome these issues, researchers frequently combine quantitative and qualitative methods, carry out in-depth fieldwork, and make use of case studies to establish the models' applicability in real-world situations [210].

Recent advancements have begun to address the associated problems of applying game theory to economic models and cultural heritage, in particular, the difficulty of quantifying non-economic values [211,212]. Nevertheless, with the integration of multi-criteria decision analysis, it allows for a holistic understanding of cultural heritage, which considers economics and social aspects [213]. In addition, the integration of big data analytics further equips scholars with more enhanced datasets for modeling approaches to obtain insights regarding visitor behaviors and changes in market trends [214].

In addition, Optimal Foraging Theory (OFT) has been a part of the anthropological toolkit for a long time. OFT assumes that individuals and groups will optimize behaviors in such a way as to maximize gains while minimizing costs; this principle applies equally well to the adoption and transmission of cultural practices and technologies [215]. Nowhere does this seem more appropriate than when applying OFT to cultural and technological change, as OFT provides a useful lens through which scholars can view the strategic adoption of innovation [216]. Anthropologists usually apply OFT to why one cultural practice or technology has preference over another [217,218]. This is done in relation to such factors as efficiency, resource availability, and energy expended learning and implementing new practices [219,220]. While game theory has proven to be a sufficient tool for modeling strategic interaction among rational actors, it has been criticized for failing to capture non-rational behavior [207,208]. While game theory generally treats the motivations of actors as being driven by economic self-interest, OFT recognizes a broader range of motivations that include social, cultural, and environmental matters [218]. One of the most powerful insights to come out of OFT is that, sometimes, the best way to detect complexity is by how much models are diverging from actual behavior [221]. The deviations from expected behaviors, as OFT points out, may actually serve as a guide for where to find non-economic values and more complex motivations that enrich an understanding of socio-cultural dynamics behind the technological adoption or cultural evolution [222,223]. For instance, in the use of agricultural practices, OFT can explain why some communities chose to engage in labor-intensive techniques over obviously less straining ones. This may be due to cultural significance, social cohesion, or any other non-economic factor that game theory fails to catch [224–226].

3.6. Cross-Cultural Interactions with Game Theory

The analytical framework of game theory was developed in the Western hemisphere [227] and was then applied to different cultures across the globe as a tool that shaped economic and social behaviors [11]. In East Asia, where the cultural emphasis on collective well-being is paramount, game theory provides a valuable lens through which to explore cooperative behaviors that are prevalent in both daily life and business conduct [228]. As for the sustainability of long-term business networks, the Chaebols is a system of business conglomerates that began in South Korea in the 1960s and gave rise to enormous multinational corporations [229], or Keiretsu, a group of businesses that have controlled the Japanese economy since the latter half of the 20th century and have interconnected business links and shareholdings [230], all of which can be understood by game-theoretic models of repeated interactions, which stress the benefit of cooperation rather than self-interest [231]. Taking North America as an example, game theory is employed to analyze strategic behaviors in red ocean markets and various political settings [205]. One case is the labor negotiations in the US, where this model is applied to estimate the result and guiding strategies in collective bargaining while considering the potential of impending strikes or lockouts [232,233]. The game-theoretic models could assist negotiators from

both sides to understand the dynamics of other parties, labor unions or employers, thus aiming for mutually beneficial arrangements [234]. As for Europe, the use of game theory in international relations or the field of economic cooperation becomes evident in the EU's Emissions Trading Systems (ETC), where game-theoretic models could be used to comprehend the strategic compliance among all member states and to develop policies that could encourage cooperative environmental protection [205,235]. This method shows how game theory could be utilized to address international challenges, which require coordinated global action. Unlike more developed regions such as Europe, North America, or East Asia, in Latin America, where personal relationships have a rather "informal" network, it often has a significant role in business deals [236], and game theory is used to study the dynamics of both trust and cooperation in all sorts of trade agreements and economical partnerships [237,238]. Despite its Western origins, game theory's formalism can accommodate diverse cultural priorities, though the types of games and behaviors modeled might vary to align with local contexts [54]. The key challenge is to ensure that cross-cultural applications of game theory are sensitive to and inclusive of the unique values and social dynamics of each culture. This can be achieved by combining quantitative models with qualitative insights and conducting in-depth, culture-specific research [239].

Applying game theory in the context of international relations is not altogether new. Early applications date back to the Cold War days, in which scholars used game-theoretic models to study strategic interaction between nuclear powers. Important concepts that resulted from research conducted on game theory and strategy include mutually assured destruction and the stability of diverse strategic postures [240,241]. Game-theoretical approaches to global environmental policymaking have been central in deepening the understanding of the dynamics behind global cooperation and the basic problems of collective action, as can be seen in the case of climate change. These models have helped to delineate more transparently the free-rider problem, the tragedy of the commons, and when international agreements can succeed [242–244]. Moreover, the strategic interactions between farmers and the market have been analyzed using game-theoretic models to understand the stability of supply chains [245,246]. In situations where tribal affiliations and family ties are understood to play an especially important role in business relationships, as has been observed in the Middle East, game theory is used to learn the formation and overall stability of business coalitions [247]. The study of joint ventures in the petroleum industry, such as the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), has been informed by game-theoretic models, which could account for the complicated interplay of loyalties between family and tribe [248]. Game theory has been applied to study the strategic interactions between the government and international aid organizations in Africa [249–251]. To allocate the resource and to establish aid programs in regions and countries devastated by conflicts, game-theoretic models can better understand the cultural and political nuances of each specific region, since it can predict strategic choices of government, aid organizations, local communities, and sometimes armed groups as well [116,252,253]. Game-theoretic models can also assist in predicting upcoming conflicts and design mitigation strategies, optimize resource allocation, and to ensure aid programs are indeed culturally sensitive and, in the meantime, sustainable [254,255].

Drawing from the general explanation offered in the main body of the text, an overview of how this theoretical framework is applied across the globe can be found in Table 3. In this way, Table 3 identifies essential regions and applications of game theory within these regions and the main insights drawn from such analysis. In this way, the table can be a ready reference for the reader to understand the scope and breadth of impacts that game theory may have across various cultural and strategic landscapes.

Table 3. Global applications of game theory.

Region/Culture	Key Applications	Core Focus and Insights	Adapted/Extended Game Theory Dynamics/Mechanisms
East Asia	Business Networks	Emphasizes long-term sustainability and cooperative behavior in conglomerate systems like Chaebols and Keiretsu.	Mechanisms that value repeated interactions and trust-building over time in conglomerate systems.
North America	Labor Negotiations	Analyzes strategic behaviors in collective bargaining, considering potential strikes or lockouts.	Dynamics that account for the potential economic and social impacts of strikes or lock-outs.
Europe	Environmental Policy	Used in EU's Emissions Trading Systems to understand strategic compliance and develop cooperative environmental policies.	Models that integrate the complexity of international agreements and the role of incentives in environmental cooperation.
Latin America	Trade Agreements	Studies trust and cooperation dynamics in informal networks and trade agreements, focusing on supply chain stability.	Mechanisms that address the unique challenges of trust-building in less formalized trade environments.
Middle East	Business Coalitions	Examines formation and stability of business coalitions influenced by tribal affiliations and family ties.	Dynamics that consider the influence of tribal affiliations and family ties on coalition formation and loyalty.
Africa	Aid Allocation	Applies game theory to interactions between governments and aid organizations for resource allocation in conflict-affected regions.	Mechanisms that model the negotiation processes and the allocation of resources in conflict-affected regions, considering the role of power and negotiation strategies.

3.7. Application of Game Theory in Cultural Domains

Game theory provides a well-developed framework for the study of strategic interactions under a cultural setup. This includes a variety of techniques and models that are especially useful in the analysis of the dynamics of cultural systems [256]. The very basics of game theory can be divided in two: cooperative and non-cooperative games [257]. Cooperative games are in situations where players are able to sign binding contracts—a scenario often found in culture [258]. A shared identity or value system creates a situation where the players sign binding contracts in order to realize their common goal, namely the creation or enforcement of certain social norms [183]. Non-cooperative games serve for the appropriate study of situations where players act either on their own or only for their interests, which can confront different aspects and create competition in cultural stories [259]. Another important classification is between static and dynamic games. Static games, as the classic example of the Prisoner's Dilemma, give insights into one-shot cultural interactions or one-shot decisions, for example, to follow or not to follow a given cultural rule [260]. Dynamic games are characterized by several stages of decisions and are important in the description of the developing cultural practices and the strategy, like the language strategy, in the course of the development of cultural influence [261,262]. The derivation of game theory also depends on certain concepts of solutions, an important one being the Nash equilibrium, which states that under a strategy of others, no player can unilaterally better his position by changing his strategy [263]. It helps to spot stable configurations in cultural interactions, such as the one between the retention of tradition and innovation [264,265]. The subgame perfect equilibrium is a refinement used for dynamic games, under which the strategy profile is a Nash equilibrium in every subgame and is an appropriate tool for the examination of multi-stage cultural processes, such as bargaining over cultural resources [266–268].

Evolutionary game theory adds an additional dimension in modeling the cultural process as an evolutionary dynamic, wherein strategies are selected based on their success in

a given environment. This is particularly useful for studying the emergence and persistence of cultural norms.

3.8. Quantifiability of Behavior and Culture

The discussions of behavior and culture quantifiability constitute a visibly huge dichotomy in the entire discipline of social sciences [269,270]. At one end, there are those scholars who question the so-called "rational choice" framework and, because of what appears to be the complexity and intricacy of their nature, seek to classify such behaviors and cultural elements as unquantifiable [271,272]. On the other hand, computational scientists and modelers are attempting to devise operationalizations as they seek to measure and simulate the complex mechanisms that underlie human behavior and cultural evolution [273–275]. According to some social scientists, the quantification of culture is resisted on the very basis of its values, beliefs, and further social norms because it is embedded in the cloth of human experience and is, therefore, constantly being reinterpreted and changed [276,277]. Basing on the other side of the subject, computational models already showed that even most abstract aspects can be put into code and analyzed to a certain extent, albeit to a limited level [275]. The latest research is indeed debunking strict unquantifiability. What all of these developments do, for example, is make it possible to quantify and assess cultural sentiments and values present in large-scale text data, through advances that have been made in machine learning and computational linguistics. In the same manner, network analysis has provided tools to quantify social interactions and the diffusion of cultural practices [278,279]. In fact, what such studies point toward is the fact that although certain elements of culture would inherently be resistant to quantification, there are others that can gainfully be modeled and analyzed. Based on the survey results, it was found that behavior and cultural quantifiability are less a question of 'yes' or 'no' but rather lie in the continuum. Some things, like economic transactions and demographic data, are easily amenable to quantification [280], while others—emotional expressions or symbolic meanings among them—are certainly harder but by no means impossible for computational models [281,282].

The next frontier in this endeavor will be the integration of qualitative insights with quantitative analysis. This would involve the creation of hybrid models capable of capturing both the measurable and unmeasurable features of culture and behavior [283]. One area that holds promise for exploration of this next frontier is in the use of agent-based models. These simulate the decisions of individuals within a social context [158].

4. Materials and Methods

On 25 April 2024, a set of keywords were used in the quest to find the junction of cultural studies and game theory in the Web of Science Core Collection database. (Game theory OR strategic interaction OR evolutionary game theory) AND (culture diversity OR cultural norms OR cultural change OR cultural stud*) were the keyword strings used in the search query. Subsequently, 1421 peer-reviewed articles were selected. To ensure the selected materials are considered high-quality and relevant, the following standards were applied. Level of Authority: Incomplete articles, duplicate research, meeting archives, guidelines, dialogue/discussion records, and transcripts were excluded. Language: To guarantee a consistent understanding, only English-published articles were included in the collection. Peer Review: In order to preserve the academic credibility and dependability of the source material, only peer-reviewed articles were included. Relevance: Articles had to deal specifically with the relationship between game theory and cultural phenomena, such as the examination of norms, diversity, change, and larger cultural studies. In order to assess the initial search results' applicability to the research topic, article titles and abstracts were considered. After that, full-text publications were obtained and carefully examined to determine if they met the predetermined standards for eligibility or not. Systematic data extraction was carried out, with the study design, methodology, important conclusions, and any relevant theoretical contributions noted. Qualitative synthesis was used to examine

and interpret gathered data. The data patterns were found, examined, and reported using thematic analysis method. The key emphasis areas of the studies, such as the use of game theory to understand cultural norms or the significance of strategic interaction in cultural transformation, were used to categorize the research. One of the study's shortcomings is that the search was limited to English-language publications, which could lead to a bias in favor of research conducted in English-speaking nations, or those who place a high priority on English publications. Additionally, relying solely on peer-reviewed literature could potentially omit current research yet to undergo the peer review process, as well as pertinent gray literature.

5. Conclusions

The interrelationship between game theory and cultural studies has been explored in this literature review, which discusses how cultural diversity and change can affect individual engagement. Through thematic analysis, we have gained comprehensive insights into three aspects: first, how cultural contexts influence strategic behaviors; second, how game theory estimates cooperation and conflict; and third, how cultural practices undergo evolution. The thematic analysis yielded important discoveries. Initially, as we have seen, cultural norms and values are a major influence on how strategic decisions are made, and game-theoretic models offer a reliable framework for projecting results in cross-cultural interactions. Second, through employing game theory to examine cultural diversity, scholars were able to clarify the complex behaviors that result from different cultural origins and offer a deeper awareness of social learning, bargaining, and negotiating processes. Ultimately, the hypothetical outcome of game-theoretic models has been instrumental in understanding cultural shifts, including the dissemination of social norms and the adaptation of cultural norms in response to changes in society and the environment.

Regardless of the deeply intertwined relationship between game theory and cultural studies, there are still a few areas that future studies could investigate. Multicultural Validation: Scholars can prioritize the validation of game-theoretic models in multicultural settings to ensure that these models could be applied to a diverse range of cultures. Non-Rational Behavior: Since game theory mostly assumes individuals behave based on logic and rationality, having additional research to analyze the non-rational or emotional aspects of human decision making could be deemed beneficial. Longitudinal Studies: Because cultural shift is rather long term, longitudinal studies can track the evolution of norm changes with the help of game-theoretic models. Social Media and Digital Culture: The relationship between social media and digital culture remains underexplored. With the use of game theory, which is a valuable tool for understanding online interactions and the spread of cultural phenomena, it models the strategic interactions between users on social media platforms. Global Events and Cultural Change: Recent events such as pandemics and economic crises in different regions have impacted cultural norms. Game theory can be used to predict how well people can adapt to these challenges. One should also identify and understand the longer-term continuing changes in culture, which are quite independent of such shocks. More often than not, such processes are propagated by deeper aspects, like globalization, technological progress, and changing demographics, which may have an indelible mark on social values and behavior.

In a nutshell, the combination of game theory and cultural studies has enhanced our ability to identify potential outcomes and brought us a greater, deeper knowledge of the cultural processes underpinning strategic action. As these models are enhanced and broadened to include an increased understanding of human behavior and social circumstances, we will be better able to manage the intricacies of our multicultural society, create inclusive laws, and promote harmony and collaboration between disparate groups.

6. Acknowledgment of Limitations

In developing this discussion regarding the intricate relationship between game theory and cultural dynamics, we tried to be as comprehensive and balanced in our approach as

possible. But, we also remain aware of the fact that our study is far from being devoid of limitations. An example is the possible bias toward literature presented in the English language, which would indirectly support works completed in English-speaking countries. Because we are writing this paper in English, and there has been an effort to include different sources of information, our review of the literature may still be biased by the intense presence of English in scholarly publishing.

The non-inclusion of non-English-language literature delimits this work's findings in the universal scope. We appreciate that there may still be helpful contributions and relevant data from sources that are not in the English language, which this research cannot access. Furthermore, cross-cultural uses stemming from game theory lead to relatively complex settings. Even though extensive, our scope of analysis may not exhaust all dynamics regarding how culture shapes strategic engagements. The fact that cultures are dynamic and always in transition means that applying static game-theoretic models may face some inherent challenges. We sought to incorporate an evolutionary perspective where applicable, though the rapidly shifting cultural landscapes may still outpace our models.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, M.M.; Formal analysis, Y.W.; Investigation, Y.W.; Data curation, J.W.; Writing—original draft, Y.W.; Writing—review & editing, J.W.; Supervision, M.M. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Data Availability Statement: Data will be made available on request.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Sandholm, W.H. Evolutionary Game Theory. *Complex Soc. Behav. Syst.* **2020**, *48*, 573–608. [CrossRef]
2. Grigoryan, G.; Collins, A.J. Game theory for systems engineering: A survey. *Int. J. Syst. Syst. Eng.* **2021**, *11*, 121. [CrossRef]
3. He, J.; Li, Y.; Li, H.; Tong, H.; Yuan, Z.; Yang, X.; Huang, W. Application of Game Theory in Integrated Energy System Systems: A Review. *IEEE Access* **2020**, *8*, 93380–93397. [CrossRef]
4. Battaglini, M.; Harstad, B. The Political Economy of Weak Treaties. *J. Political Econ.* **2020**, *128*, 544–590. [CrossRef]
5. Lansford, J.E. Annual Research Review: Cross-cultural similarities and differences in parenting. *J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry* **2021**, *63*, 466–479. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
6. Cotter, K. Playing the Visibility game: How Digital Influencers and Algorithms Negotiate Influence on Instagram. *New Media Soc.* **2019**, *21*, 895–913. [CrossRef]
7. Lopez-Fernandez, O.; Williams, A.J.; Griffiths, M.D.; Kuss, D.J. Female Gaming, Gaming Addiction, and the Role of Women Within Gaming Culture: A Narrative Literature Review. *Front. Psychiatry* **2019**, *10*, 454. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
8. Hajisoteriou, C.; Karousiou, C.; Angelides, P. Successful components of school improvement in culturally diverse schools. *Sch. Eff. Sch. Improv.* **2018**, *29*, 91–112. [CrossRef]
9. King, B.G.; Jasper, J.M. Strategic interactions and arenas: A sociological perspective on strategy. *Strateg. Organ.* **2022**, *20*, 810–820. [CrossRef]
10. Babu, S.; Mohan, U. An integrated approach to evaluating sustainability in supply chains using evolutionary game theory. *Comput. Oper. Res.* **2018**, *89*, 269–283. [CrossRef]
11. van Dijk, E.; De Dreu, C.K.W. Experimental Games and Social Decision Making. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* **2021**, *72*, 415–438. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
12. Bicchieri, C.; Muldoon, R.; Sontuoso, A. Social Norms. 2018. Available online: https://www.sas.upenn.edu/ppe-repec/ppc/wpaper/0015.pdf (accessed on 16 May 2024).
13. Olivola, C.Y.; Kim, Y.; Merzel, A.; Kareev, Y.; Avrahami, J.; Ritov, I. Cooperation and coordination across cultures and contexts: Individual, sociocultural, and contextual factors jointly influence decision making in the volunteer's dilemma game. *J. Behav. Decis. Mak.* **2019**, *33*, 93–118. [CrossRef]
14. Wildavsky, A. *Indispensable Framework or Just Another Ideology? Prisoner's Dilemma As an Antihierarchical Game 1*, 1st ed.; Routledge: London, UK, 2018; pp. 217–230.
15. Ismail, M. The Story of Conflict and Cooperation. *SSRN Electron. J.* **2020**, 2–5. [CrossRef]
16. Roos, D.; Hahn, R. Understanding Collaborative Consumption: An Extension of the Theory of Planned Behavior with Value-Based Personal Norms. *J. Bus. Ethics* **2019**, *158*, 679–697. [CrossRef]
17. Bezin, E.; Ponthiere, G. The tragedy of the commons and socialization: Theory and policy. *J. Environ. Econ. Manag.* **2019**, *98*, 102260. [CrossRef]

18. Curry, O.S.; Mullins, D.A.; Whitehouse, H. Is It Good to Cooperate? Testing the Theory of Morality-as-Cooperation in 60 Societies. *Curr. Anthropol.* **2019**, *60*, 47–69. [CrossRef]
19. Legros, S.; Cislaghi, B. Mapping the Social-Norms Literature: An Overview of Reviews. *Perspect. Psychol. Sci.* **2020**, *15*, 62–80. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
20. Newton, J. Evolutionary Game Theory: A Renaissance. *Games* **2018**, *9*, 31. [CrossRef]
21. Vuong, Q.-H. The semiconducting principle of monetary and environmental values exchange. *Econ. Bus. Lett.* **2021**, *10*, 284–290. [CrossRef]
22. Rudvin, M. Mediated Multilingual Interactions. Suggestions for a game theoretic framework. *Cu/Tus* **2018**, *10*, 19–56.
23. Guggenbühl, A. Bargaining in the European Union: Theoretical and Practical Perspectives on Multilateral Negotiation Processes. *Stud. Univ. Babes-Bolyai-Stud. Eur.* **2018**, *63*, 339–380. [CrossRef]
24. Chukwu, E.; Adu-Baah, A.; Niaz, M.; Nwagwu, U.; Chukwu, M.U. Navigating Ethical Supply Chains: The Intersection of Diplomatic Management and Theological Ethics. *Int. J. Multidiscip. Sci. Arts* **2023**, *2*, 127–139. [CrossRef]
25. Kwon, Y.; Pongmala, K.; Qin, K.; Klages-Mundt, A.; Jovanovic, P.; Parlour, C.; Gervais, A.; Song, D. What Drives the (In)stability of a Stablecoin? *arXiv* **2023**. [CrossRef]
26. Koçak, Ö.; Puranam, P. Decoding Culture: Tools for Behavioral Strategists. *Strategy Sci.* **2023**, *9*, 18–37. [CrossRef]
27. Bednar, J.; Page, S.E. When Order Affects Performance: Culture, Behavioral Spillovers, and Institutional Path Dependence. *Am. Political Sci. Rev.* **2018**, *112*, 82–98. [CrossRef]
28. Algan, Y.; Malgouyres, C.; Mayer, T.; Thoenig, M. The Economic Incentives of Cultural Transmission: Spatial Evidence from Naming Patterns Across France. *Econ. J.* **2021**, *132*, 437–470. [CrossRef]
29. Venkatesh, V.G.; Zhang, A.; Deakins, E.; Mani, V. Drivers of sub-supplier social sustainability compliance: An emerging economy perspective. *Supply Chain. Manag. Int. J.* **2020**, *25*, 655–677. [CrossRef]
30. Gephart, J.A.; Golden, C.D.; Asche, F.; Belton, B.; Brugere, C.; Froehlich, H.E.; Fry, J.P.; Halpern, B.S.; Hicks, C.C.; Jones, R.C.; et al. Scenarios for Global Aquaculture and Its Role in Human Nutrition. *Rev. Fish. Sci. Aquac.* **2020**, *29*, 122–138. [CrossRef]
31. Clune, W.H.; Zehnder, A.J.B. The Three Pillars of Sustainability Framework: Approaches for Laws and Governance. *J. Environ. Prot.* **2018**, *9*, 211–240. [CrossRef]
32. Hunter, R.F.; Montes, F.; Murray, J.M.; Sanchez-Franco, S.C.; Montgomery, S.C.; Jaramillo, J.; Tate, C.; Kumar, R.; Dunne, L.; Ramalingam, A.; et al. MECHANISMS Study: Using Game Theory to Assess the Effects of Social Norms and Social Networks on Adolescent Smoking in Schools—Study Protocol. *Front. Public Health* **2020**, *8*, 377. [CrossRef]
33. Gelfand, M.J.; Jackson, J.C.; Pan, X.; Nau, D.; Pieper, D.; Denison, E.; Dagher, M.; Lange PA, M.V.; Chiu, C.-Y.; Wang, M. The relationship between cultural tightness–looseness and COVID-19 cases and deaths: A global analysis. *Lancet Planet. Health* **2021**, *5*, 135–144. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
34. Currie, T.E.; Campenni, M.; Flitton, A.; Njagi, T.; Ontiri, E.; Perret, C.; Walker, L. The cultural evolution and ecology of institutions. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **2021**, *376*, 20200047. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
35. Nagatsu, M.; Lisciandra, C. *Why Is Behavioral Game Theory a Game for Economists? The Concept of Beliefs in Equilibrium*; Springer: Singapore, 2021; pp. 289–308. [CrossRef]
36. Cheng, H.; Agbanyo, G.K.; Zhu, T.; Pan, H. Internationalization of Multinational Companies and Cognitive Differences Across Cultures: A Neuroeconomic Perspective. *Front. Psychol.* **2022**, *13*, 807582. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
37. Schulze-Horn, I.; Hueren, S.; Scheffler, P.; Schiele, H. Artificial Intelligence in Purchasing: Facilitating Mechanism Design-based Negotiations. *Appl. Artif. Intell.* **2020**, *34*, 618–642. [CrossRef]
38. Burr, C.; Cristianini, N.; Ladyman, J. An Analysis of the Interaction Between Intelligent Software Agents and Human Users. *Minds Mach.* **2018**, *28*, 735–774. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
39. Krueger, J.I.; Heck, P.R.; Evans, A.M.; DiDonato, T.E. Social game theory: Preferences, perceptions, and choices. *Eur. Rev. Soc. Psychol.* **2020**, *31*, 222–253. [CrossRef]
40. Chang, S.L.; Piraveenan, M.; Pattison, P.; Prokopenko, M. Game theoretic modelling of infectious disease dynamics and intervention methods: A review. *J. Biol. Dyn.* **2020**, *14*, 57–89. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
41. DiMaggio, P. *Social Structure, Institutions, and Cultural Goods: The Case of the United States*, 1st ed.; Routledge: London, UK, 2021; pp. 133–166.
42. Ye, M.; Zino, L.; Rizzo, A.; Cao, M. Game-theoretic modeling of collective decision making during epidemics. *Phys. Rev. E* **2021**, *104*, 024314. [CrossRef]
43. Sinayi, M.; Rasti-Barzoki, M. A game theoretic approach for pricing, greening, and social welfare policies in a supply chain with government intervention. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2018**, *196*, 1443–1458. [CrossRef]
44. Moafi, M.; Ardeshiri, R.R.; Mudiyanselage, M.W.; Marzband, M.; Abusorrah, A.; Rawa, M.; Guerrero, J.M. Optimal coalition formation and maximum profit allocation for distributed energy resources in smart grids based on cooperative game theory. *Int. J. Electr. Power Energy Syst.* **2023**, *144*, 108492. [CrossRef]
45. Cuypers, I.; Hennart, J.-F.; Silverman, B.; Ertug, G. Transaction Cost Theory: Past Progress, Current Challenges, and Suggestions for the Future. *Acad. Manag. Ann.* **2021**, *15*, 111–150. [CrossRef]
46. Peng, R. The Approval and Rejection of Catholicism by Late Ming Chinese: An Analysis of Kouduo richao and Poxieji from the Perspective of Social Cooperation. *Logos Pneuma* **2017**, *47*, 225–257.

47. von Flüe, L.; Efferson, C.; Vogt, S. Green preferences sustain greenwashing: Challenges in the cultural transition to a sustainable future. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B* **2023**, *379*, 20220268. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
48. Premkumar, P.; Bahan Chakrabarty, J.; Rajeev, A. Impact of sustained lockdown during COVID-19 pandemic on behavioural dynamics through evolutionary game theoretic model. *Ann. Oper. Res.* **2023**, 1–17. [CrossRef]
49. Curry, O.S.; Alfano, M.; Brandt, M.J.; Pelican, C. Moral Molecules: Morality as a Combinatorial System. *Rev. Philos. Psychol.* **2021**, *13*, 1039–1058. [CrossRef]
50. Mathur, S.; Dewani, P.P. Influence of cultural heritage on hotel prices, occupancy and profit. *Tour. Econ.* **2016**, *22*, 1014–1032. [CrossRef]
51. Binesh, F.; Belarmino, A.; Singh, A.K.; Raab, C. Forecasting hotel room prices when entering turbulent times: A game-theoretic artificial neural network model. *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag.* **2024**, *36*, 1044–1065. [CrossRef]
52. Mousavi, E.S.; Hafezalkotob, A.; Makui, A.; Sayadi, M.K. Hotel pricing decision in a competitive market under government intervention: A game theory approach. *Int. J. Manag. Sci. Eng. Manag.* **2021**, *16*, 83–93. [CrossRef]
53. Chen, X. Location Strategies of Multinational Hotel Groups in China: An Application of Game Theory. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Plymouth, Plymouth, UK, 2022. [CrossRef]
54. Roos, P.; Gelfand, M.; Nau, D.; Lun, J. Societal threat and cultural variation in the strength of social norms: An evolutionary basis. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.* **2015**, *129*, 14–23. [CrossRef]
55. Ding, F.; Ma, T. Dynamic Relationship Between Tourism and Homogeneity of Tourist Destinations. *IEEE Access* **2018**, *6*, 51470–51476. [CrossRef]
56. Alipour, H.; Arefipour, T. Rethinking potentials of Co-management for sustainable common pool resources (CPR) and tourism: The case of a Mediterranean island. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* **2020**, *183*, 104993. [CrossRef]
57. Gössling, S.; Hall, C.M.; Scott, D. *The Routledge Handbook of Tourism and Sustainability*; Routledge: London, UK, 2015; pp. 92–104.
58. Elsaesser, T.; Buckland, W.; Polan, D.; Jeong, S. *The Mind-Game Film*; Routledge: London, UK, 2021; pp. 89–112. [CrossRef]
59. de Ley, H. The Name of the Game: Applying Game Theory in Literature. *SubStance* **1988**, *17*, 33. [CrossRef]
60. Simons, J. Narrative, Games, and Theory. 2007. Available online: https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1andtype=pdfanddoi=f5ca89fcfd1fe50183268f2990a188a61439c5f7 (accessed on 20 May 2024).
61. Pérez-Latorre, Ó.; Oliva, M.; Besalú, R. Videogame analysis: A social-semiotic approach. *Soc. Semiot.* **2017**, *27*, 586–603. [CrossRef]
62. Juul, J. *Half-Real: Video Games between Real Rules and Fictional Worlds*; MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2011.
63. Azaria, A.; Richardson, A.; Rosenfeld, A. Autonomous agents and human cultures in the trust–revenge game. *Auton. Agents Multi-Agent Syst.* **2016**, *30*, 486–505. [CrossRef]
64. McAvoy, A.; Hauert, C. Asymmetric Evolutionary Games. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **2015**, *11*, e1004349. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
65. Bruner, J.P. Diversity, tolerance, and the social contract. *Politics Philos. Econ.* **2015**, *14*, 429–448. [CrossRef]
66. Nishi, A. Evolution and social epidemiology. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **2015**, *145*, 132–137. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
67. Ostrom, E. Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 1990.
68. Bednarik, P.; Linnerooth-Bayer, J.; Magnuszewski, P.; Dieckmann, U. A Game of Common-pool Resource Management: Effects of Communication, Risky Environment and Worldviews. *Ecol. Econ.* **2019**, *156*, 287–292. [CrossRef]
69. Kinzig, A.P.; Ehrlich, P.R.; Alston, L.J.; Arrow, K.; Barrett, S.; Buchman, T.G.; Daily, G.C.; Levin, B.; Levin, S.; Oppenheimer, M.; et al. Social Norms and Global Environmental Challenges: The Complex Interaction of Behaviors, Values, and Policy. *BioScience* **2013**, *63*, 164–175. [CrossRef]
70. Ostrom, E. Do institutions for collective action evolve? *J. Bioecon.* **2014**, *16*, 3–30. [CrossRef]
71. Forsyth, T.; Johnson, C. Elinor Ostrom's legacy: Governing the commons, and the rational choice controversy. *Dev. Chang.* **2014**, *45*, 1093–1110. [CrossRef]
72. Montes, N.; Osman, N.; Sierra, C. A computational model of Ostrom's Institutional Analysis and Development framework. *Artif. Intell.* **2022**, *311*, 103756. [CrossRef]
73. Batie, S.; Mercuro, N. *Alternative Institutional Structures*; Routledge: London, UK, 2008; pp. 66–94.
74. Cumming, G.S.; Epstein, G.; Anderies, J.M.; Apetrei, C.I.; Baggio, J.; Bodin, Ö.; Chawla, S.; Clements, H.S.; Cox, M.; Egli, L.; et al. Advancing understanding of natural resource governance: A post-Ostrom research agenda. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* **2020**, *44*, 26–34. [CrossRef]
75. del Delgado-Serrano, M.M.; Oteros-Rozas, E.; Ruiz-Mallén, I.; Calvo-Boyero, D.; Ortiz-Guerrero, C.E.; Escalante-Semerena, R.I.; Corbera, E. Influence of community-based natural resource management strategies in the resilience of social-ecological systems. *Reg. Environ. Chang.* **2018**, *18*, 581–592. [CrossRef]
76. De, S.; Nau, D.; Gelfand, M. Understanding Norm Change: An Evolutionary Game-Theoretic Approach. 2017. Available online: https://www.ifaamas.org/Proceedings/aamas2017/pdfs/p1433.pdf (accessed on 25 April 2024).
77. Bednar, J.; Page, S. Can Game(s) Theory Explain Culture? *Ration. Soc.* **2007**, *19*, 65–97. [CrossRef]
78. Pan, X.; Gelfand, M.; Nau, D. Integrating evolutionary game theory and cross-cultural psychology to understand cultural dynamics. *Am. Psychol.* **2021**, *76*, 1054–1066. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
79. Chen, Y.; Cao, X.; Liu KJ, R. Community detection in networks: A game-theoretic framework. *EURASIP J. Adv. Signal Process.* **2019**, *2019*, 60. [CrossRef]

80. Fehr, E.; Schurtenberger, I. Normative foundations of human cooperation. *Nat. Hum. Behav.* **2018**, *2*, 458–468. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
81. Yazan, D.M.; Yazdanpanah, V.; Fraccascia, L. Learning strategic cooperative behavior in industrial symbiosis: A game-theoretic approach integrated with agent-based simulation. *Bus. Strategy Environ.* **2020**, *29*, 2078–2091. [CrossRef]
82. Wang, J.; Wang, R.; Yu, F.; Wang, Z.; Li, Q. Learning continuous and consistent strategy promotes cooperation in prisoner's dilemma game with mixed strategy. *Appl. Math. Comput.* **2020**, *370*, 124887. [CrossRef]
83. Hoffmann, W.; Lavie, D.; Reuer, J.J.; Shipilov, A. The interplay of competition and cooperation. *Strateg. Manag. J.* **2018**, *39*, 3033–3052. [CrossRef]
84. Liang, W.; Song, H.; Sun, R. Can a professional learning community facilitate teacher well-being in China? The mediating role of teaching self-efficacy. *Educ. Stud.* **2020**, *48*, 358–377. [CrossRef]
85. van Kleef, G.A.; Wanders, F.; Stamkou, E.; Homan, A.C. The social dynamics of breaking the rules: Antecedents and consequences of norm-violating behavior. *Curr. Opin. Psychol.* **2015**, *6*, 25–31. [CrossRef]
86. Berger, J.; Hevenstone, D. Norm enforcement in the city revisited: An international field experiment of altruistic punishment, norm maintenance, and broken windows. *Ration. Soc.* **2016**, *28*, 299–319. [CrossRef]
87. Pickup, M.A.; Kimbrough, E.O.; Rooij, E.A. Identity and the Self-Reinforcing Effects of Norm Compliance. *South. Econ. J.* **2020**, *86*, 1222–1240. [CrossRef]
88. Guilbeault, D.; Becker, J.; Centola, D. Complex Contagions: A Decade in Review. In *Complex Spreading Phenomena in Social Systems*; Computational Social Sciences; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2018; pp. 3–25. [CrossRef]
89. Scholtes, I. When is a Network a Network? *arXiv* **2017**. [CrossRef]
90. Zhang, Y.; Wu, Y. How behaviors spread in dynamic social networks. *Comput. Math. Organ. Theory* **2012**, *18*, 419–444. [CrossRef]
91. Gulati, R.; Sytch, M.; Tatarynowicz, A. The Rise and Fall of Small Worlds: Exploring the Dynamics of Social Structure. *Organ. Sci.* **2012**, *23*, 449–471. [CrossRef]
92. Zhang, Y.; Leezer, J. Emergence of Social Norms in Complex Networks. *Int. Conf. Comput. Sci. Eng.* **2009**, *4*, 549–555. [CrossRef]
93. Wellman, B.; Frank, K. *Network Capital in a Multilevel World: Getting Support from Personal Communities*, 1st ed.; Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group: Abingdon, UK, 2017; pp. 233–273.
94. Rasmussen, K.; Yaouzis, N. The Tyranny of Political Correctness? A Game-Theoretic Model of Social Norms and Implicit Bias. *J. Appl. Philos.* **2023**, *41*, 122–144. [CrossRef]
95. Liu, Q.; Zheng, H.; Li, W.; Liu, J.; Yan, B.; Su, H. A Model of Minority Influence in Preferential Norm Formation. In *Knowledge and Systems Sciences*; Communications in Computer and Information Science; Springer: Singapore, 2019; pp. 106–121. [CrossRef]
96. Henrich, J. Game Theory in Cultural Evolution. In Nobel Symposium. 2021. Available online: https://henrich.fas.harvard.edu/files/henrich/files/nobel_symposium_revised_final.pdf (accessed on 25 April 2024).
97. Barrett, B.J. Equifinality in empirical studies of cultural transmission. *Behav. Process.* **2019**, *161*, 129–138. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
98. Brooks, J.S.; Waring, T.M.; Borgerhoff Mulder, M.; Richerson, P.J. Applying cultural evolution to sustainability challenges: An introduction to the special issue. *Sustain. Sci.* **2018**, *13*, 1–8. [CrossRef]
99. Cantor, M.; Chimento, M.; Smeele, S.Q.; He, P.; Papageorgiou, D.; Aplin, L.M.; Farine, D.R. Social network architecture and the tempo of cumulative cultural evolution. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **2021**, *288*, 20203107. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
100. Przepiorka, W.; Diekmann, A. Parochial cooperation and the emergence of signalling norms. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B* **2021**, *376*, 20200294. [CrossRef]
101. Zhang, J.; Centola, D. Social Networks and Health: New Developments in Diffusion, Online and Offline. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* **2019**, *45*, 91–109. [CrossRef]
102. Rehman, A.U.; Jiang, A.; Rehman, A.; Paul, A.; Din, S.; Sadiq, M.T. Identification and role of opinion leaders in information diffusion for online discussion network. *J. Ambient. Intell. Humaniz. Comput.* **2020**, *14*, 15301–15313. [CrossRef]
103. Le Coent, P.; Préget, R.; Thoyer, S. Farmers Follow the Herd: A Theoretical Model on Social Norms and Payments for Environmental Services. *Environ. Resour. Econ.* **2021**, *78*, 287–306. [CrossRef]
104. Bicchieri, C.; Sontuoso, A. *Game-Theoretic Accounts of Social Norms: The Role of Normative Expectations*; Edward Elgar Publishing: Cheltenham, UK, 2020; pp. 241–255. [CrossRef]
105. Roman, S. Dynamic and Game Theoretic Modelling of Societal Growth, Structure and Collapse. 2018. Available online: https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/447928/ (accessed on 25 April 2024).
106. Golman, R.; Bugbee, E.H.; Jain, A.; Saraf, S. Hipsters and the cool: A game theoretic analysis of identity expression, trends, and fads. *Psychol. Rev.* **2022**, *129*, 4–17. [CrossRef]
107. Merrick, K. Evolution of intrinsic motives in a multi-player common pool resource game. In Proceedings of the IEEE Symposium on Computational Intelligence for Human-like Intelligence (CIHLI), Orlando, FL, USA, 9–12 December 2014; pp. 1–8. [CrossRef]
108. Tarba, S.Y.; Ahammad, M.F.; Junni, P.; Stokes, P.; Morag, O. The Impact of Organizational Culture Differences, Synergy Potential, and Autonomy Granted to the Acquired High-Tech Firms on the MandA Performance. *Group Organ. Manag.* **2019**, *44*, 483–520. [CrossRef]
109. AOTA. Educator's Guide for Addressing Cultural Awareness, Humility, and Dexterity in Occupational Therapy Curricula. *Am. J. Occup. Ther.* **2020**, *74* (Suppl. 3), 7413420003p1–7413420003p19. [CrossRef]
110. Adler, N.J.; Graham, J.L. Cross-cultural Interaction: The International Comparison Fallacy? In *Language in International Business*; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2017; pp. 33–58. [CrossRef]

111. Rostovtseva, V.V.; Weissing, F.J.; Mezentseva, A.A.; Butovskaya, M.L. Sex differences in cooperativeness—An experiment with Buryats in Southern Siberia. *PLoS ONE* **2020**, *15*, e0239129. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

112. Bartke, S.; Bosworth, S.J.; Snower, D.J.; Chierchia, G. Motives and comprehension in a public goods game with induced emotions. *Theory Decis.* **2019**, *86*, 205–238. [CrossRef]

113. Legare, C.H. Cumulative cultural learning: Development and diversity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **2017**, *114*, 7877–7883. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

114. Zhang, M.; Huang, Y.; Jin, Y.; Bao, Y. Government regulation strategy, leading firms' innovation strategy, and following firms imitation strategy: An analysis based on evolutionary game theory. *PLoS ONE* **2023**, *18*, e0286730. [CrossRef]

115. Liu, Z.; Zhou, Z.; Chen, M.; Liao, S. Business Model Innovation or Imitation? Strategy Study Based on Real Option Game Theory. *Foreign Econ. Manag.* **2018**, *40*, 79–91. [CrossRef]

116. Crawford, V.P. New Directions for Modelling Strategic Behavior: Game-Theoretic Models of Communication, Coordination, and Cooperation in Economic Relationships. *J. Econ. Perspect.* **2016**, *30*, 131–150. [CrossRef]

117. Gunia, B.C.; Brett, J.M.; Gelfand, M.J. The science of culture and negotiation. *Curr. Opin. Psychol.* **2016**, *8*, 78–83. [CrossRef]

118. Gaffal, M.; Padilla Gálvez, J. *Bargaining and Game Theory*; Springer Nature: Cham, Switzerland, 2024; pp. 41–60. [CrossRef]

119. Binmore, K. Bargaining and fairness. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **2014**, *111* (Suppl. 3), 10785–10788. [CrossRef]

120. Caputo, A.; Ayoko, O.B.; Amoo, N.; Menke, C. The relationship between cultural values, cultural intelligence and negotiation styles. *J. Bus. Res.* **2019**, *99*, 23–36. [CrossRef]

121. Paquin, S. Trade Paradiplomacy and the Politics of International Economic Law: The Inclusion of Quebec and the Exclusion of Wallonia in the CETA Negotiations. *New Political Econ.* **2021**, *27*, 597–609. [CrossRef]

122. Hegetschweiler, K.T.; de Vries, S.; Arnberger, A.; Bell, S.; Brennan, M.; Siter, N.; Olafsson, A.S.; Voigt, A.; Hunziker, M. Linking demand and supply factors in identifying cultural ecosystem services of urban green infrastructures: A review of European studies. *Urban For. Urban Green.* **2017**, *21*, 48–59. [CrossRef]

123. Awan, U.; Kraslawski, A.; Huiskonen, J. Governing Interfirm Relationships for Social Sustainability: The Relationship between Governance Mechanisms, Sustainable Collaboration, and Cultural Intelligence. *Sustainability* **2018**, *10*, 4473. [CrossRef]

124. Wang, L.; Schuetz, C.G.; Cai, D. Choosing Response Strategies in Social Media Crisis Communication: An Evolutionary Game Theory Perspective. *Inf. Manag.* **2021**, *58*, 103371. [CrossRef]

125. Acemoglu, D.; Robinson, J.A. *Culture, Institutions and Social Equilibria: A Framework*; National Bureau of Economic Research: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2021. [CrossRef]

126. Wong, D.B. Soup, Harmony, and Disagreement. *J. Am. Philos. Assoc.* **2020**, *6*, 139–155. [CrossRef]

127. Claw, K.G.; Anderson, M.Z.; Begay, R.L.; Tsosie, K.S.; Fox, K.; Garrison, N.A. A framework for enhancing ethical genomic research with Indigenous communities. *Nat. Commun.* **2018**, *9*, 2957. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

128. Tang, B. Deliberating Governance in Chinese Urban Communities. *China J.* **2015**, *73*, 84–107. [CrossRef]

129. Domoto, Y. An Action Research on Collaborative Curriculum Development of English Lessons in Elementary and Junior High Schools. 2010. Available online: https://hyogo-u.repo.nii.ac.jp/record/5578/files/YY-M07150D.pdf (accessed on 26 April 2024).

130. O'Reilly, C.; Zhang, Y. Post-genocide justice: The Gacaca courts. *Dev. Policy Rev.* **2018**, *36*, 561–576. [CrossRef]

131. Thomson, S. Rwanda's Gacaca Courts. *Témoigner Entre Hist. Mémoire* **2015**, *121*, 143–144. [CrossRef]

132. Ugorji, B. Indigenous Dispute Resolution and National Reconciliation: Learning from the Gacaca Courts in Rwanda. *J. Living Together* **2019**, *6*, 153–161.

133. Baronchelli, A. The emergence of consensus: A primer. *R. Soc. Open Sci.* **2018**, *5*, 172189. [CrossRef]

134. Menon, A. Bringing cognition into strategic interactions: Strategic mental models and open questions. *Strateg. Manag. J.* **2018**, *39*, 168–192. [CrossRef]

135. Farrow, K.; Grolleau, G.; Ibanez, L. Social Norms and Pro-environmental Behavior: A Review of the Evidence. *Ecol. Econ.* **2017**, *140*, 1–13. [CrossRef]

136. Manfredo, M.J.; Bruskotter, J.T.; Teel, T.L.; Fulton, D.; Schwartz, S.H.; Arlinghaus, R.; Oishi, S.; Uskul, A.K.; Redford, K.; Kitayama, S.; et al. Why social values cannot be changed for the sake of conservation. *Conserv. Biol.* **2017**, *31*, 772–780. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

137. Apesteguia, J.; Huck, S.; Oechssler, J.; Weidenholzer, E.; Weidenholzer, S. Imitation of Peers in Children and Adults. *Games* **2018**, *9*, 11. [CrossRef]

138. Cartwright, E.; Patel, A. Imitation and the Incentive to Contribute Early in a Sequential Public Good Game. *J. Public Econ. Theory* **2010**, *12*, 691–708. [CrossRef]

139. Graeber, D. Culture as Creative Refusal. *Camb. J. Anthropol.* **2013**, *31*, 1–19. [CrossRef]

140. DeAngelis, D.L.; Diaz, S.G. Decision-Making in Agent-Based Modeling: A Current Review and Future Prospectus. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* **2019**, *6*, 237. [CrossRef]

141. de Marchi, S.; Page, S.E. Agent-Based Models. *Annu. Rev. Political Sci.* **2014**, *17*, 1–20. [CrossRef]

142. Carrignon, S.; Coto-Sarmiento, M.; Bentley, R.A.; O'Brien, M.J. An introduction to papers from workshops on the evolution of cultural complexity. *Adapt. Behav.* **2020**, *28*, 317–322. [CrossRef]

143. Tripodi, R. Evolutionary Game Theoretic Models for Natural Language Processing. 2016. Available online: http://dspace.unive.it/handle/10579/8351 (accessed on 25 April 2024).

144. Bromham, L.; Dinnage, R.; Skirgård, H.; Ritchie, A.; Cardillo, M.; Meakins, F.; Greenhill, S.; Hua, X. Global predictors of language endangerment and the future of linguistic diversity. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **2021**, *6*, 163–173. [CrossRef]

145. Sperlich, S.; Uriarte, J.-R. The economics of minority language use: Theory and empirical evidence for a language game model. *arXiv* **2019**. [CrossRef]
146. John, A. Dynamic Models of Language Evolution: The Economic Perspective. Palgrave Macmillan: London, UK, 2016; pp. 101–120. [CrossRef]
147. Khosravifar, B.; Bentahar, J.; Mizouni, R.; Otrok, H.; Alishahi, M.; Thiran, P. Agent-based game-theoretic model for collaborative web services: Decision making analysis. *Expert Syst. Appl.* **2013**, *40*, 3207–3219. [CrossRef]
148. Akdeniz, A.; van Veelen, M. Mutation-selection Equilibria for the Ultimatum Game. *SSRN Electron. J.* **2021**, *74*, 1. [CrossRef]
149. Calvillo, D.P.; Burgeno, J.N. Cognitive reflection predicts the acceptance of unfair ultimatum game offers. *Judgm. Decis. Mak.* **2015**, *10*, 332–341. [CrossRef]
150. Segal, N.L.; Hershberger, S.L. Cooperation and Competition between Twins. *Evol. Hum. Behav.* **1999**, *20*, 29–51. [CrossRef]
151. Feng, C.; Luo, Y.-J.; Krueger, F. Neural signatures of fairness-related normative decision making in the ultimatum game: A coordinate-based meta-analysis. *Hum. Brain Mapp.* **2015**, *36*, 591–602. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
152. Martin, T.; Hofman, J.M.; Sharma, A.; Anderson, A.; Watts, D.J. Exploring limits to prediction in complex social systems. In Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on World Wide Web—WWW '16, Montreal, QC, Canada, 11–15 April 2016; pp. 683–694. [CrossRef]
153. Wei, Y.; Liu, J.; Lai, X.; Hu, Y. Which determinant is the most informative in forecasting crude oil market volatility: Fundamental, speculation, or uncertainty? *Energy Econ.* **2017**, *68*, 141–150. [CrossRef]
154. Ganbat, M.; Batbaatar, E.; Bazarragchaa, G.; Ider, T.; Gantumur, E.; Dashkhorol, L.; Altantsatsralt, K.; Nemekh, M.; Dashdondog, E.; Namsrai, O.-E. Effect of Psychological Factors on Credit Risk: A Case Study of the Microlending Service in Mongolia. *Behav. Sci.* **2021**, *11*, 47. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
155. Jia, S.; Zhang, W.; Li, P.; Feng, T.; Li, H. Attitude toward money modulates outcome processing: An ERP study. *Soc. Neurosci.* **2013**, *8*, 43–51. [CrossRef]
156. Sun, C.; Chen, H.; Liao, R. Research on Incentive Mechanism and Strategy Choice for Passing on Intangible Cultural Heritage from Masters to Apprentices. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 5245. [CrossRef]
157. Hafiz, A.; Xu, X.; Sun, C. Dynamics of group grievances from a global cohesion perspective. *Socio-Econ. Plan. Sci.* **2023**, *87*, 101606. [CrossRef]
158. Bianchi, F.; Squazzoni, F. Agent-based models in sociology. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Comput. Stat.* **2015**, *7*, 284–306. [CrossRef]
159. Miller, K.A.; Munro, G.R.; Sumaila, U.R.; Cheung, W.W.L. Governing Marine Fisheries in a Changing Climate: A Game-Theoretic Perspective. *Can. J. Agric. Econ./Rev. Can. d'Agroecon.* **2013**, *61*, 309–334. [CrossRef]
160. Bednar, J.; Page, S.E. Complex Adaptive Systems and Comparative Politics: Modeling the Interaction between Institutions and Culture. *Chin. Political Sci. Rev.* **2016**, *1*, 448–471. [CrossRef]
161. Lee, H.; Fawcett, J.; DeMarco, R. Storytelling/narrative theory to address health communication with minority populations. *Appl. Nurs. Res.* **2016**, *30*, 58–60. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
162. Wortmann, C. Can stories change a culture? *Ind. Commer. Train.* **2008**, *40*, 134–141. [CrossRef]
163. Gelfand, M.J. Universal and culture-specific patterns of tightness-looseness across the 31 Chinese provinces. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **2019**, *116*, 6522–6524. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
164. Richerson, P.; Baldini, R.; Bell, A.V.; Demps, K.; Frost, K.; Hillis, V.; Mathew, S.; Newton, E.K.; Naar, N.; Newson, L.; et al. Cultural group selection plays an essential role in explaining human cooperation: A sketch of the evidence. *Behav. Brain Sci.* **2016**, *39*, e30–e71. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
165. Guay-Bélanger, D. Assembling Auras: Towards a Methodology for the Preservation and Study of Video Games as Cultural Heritage Artefacts. *Games Cult.* **2021**, *17*, 659–678. [CrossRef]
166. Styhre, A.; Szczepanska, A.M.; Remneland-Wikhamn, B. Consecrating video games as cultural artifacts: Intellectual legitimation as a source of industry renewal. *Scand. J. Manag.* **2018**, *34*, 22–28. [CrossRef]
167. Kuo, Y.-T.; Kuo, Y.-C.; Whittinghill, D.M. Exploring the Reliability of a Cross-Cultural Model for Digital Games: A Systematic Review. *Int. J. Emerg. Technol. Learn. (IJET)* **2022**, *17*, 217–234. [CrossRef]
168. Dubbelman, T. Narrative Game Mechanics. In *Interactive Storytelling*; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2016; pp. 39–50. [CrossRef]
169. de Mul, J. *The Game of Life: Narrative and Ludic Identity Formation in Computer Games*; Palgrave Macmillan: London, UK, 2015; pp. 159–187. [CrossRef]
170. Romanzi, V. Staying Human in the Post-Apocalypse: The Frontiers of Individualism in The Last of Us and Its Sequel. *J. Austrian Assoc. Am. Stud.* **2023**, *4*, 311–330. [CrossRef]
171. Mochocki, M.; Koskimaa, R. Story beats in videogames as value-driven choice-based unit operations. *Int. J. Eur. Film.* **2021**, *29*, 5–31. [CrossRef]
172. Tompkins, J.E.; Martins, N. Masculine Pleasures as Normalized Practices: Character Design in the Video Game Industry. *Games Cult.* **2021**, *17*, 399–420. [CrossRef]
173. McKernan, B. The meaning of a game: Stereotypes, video game commentary and color-blind racism. *Am. J. Cult. Sociol.* **2015**, *3*, 224–253. [CrossRef]
174. Daniel, M.; Garry, C. *Video Games as Culture*; Routledge: London, UK, 2018. [CrossRef]
175. Vlachopoulos, D.; Makri, A. The effect of games and simulations on higher education: A systematic literature review. *Int. J. Educ. Technol. High. Educ.* **2017**, *14*, 22. [CrossRef]

176. Seibt, J. Towards an Ontology of Simulated Social Interaction: Varieties of the "As If" for Robots and Humans. In *Sociality and Normativity for Robots*; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2017; pp. 11–39. [CrossRef]

177. Johnson, M.R.; Mejia, R. Making Science Fiction Real: Neoliberalism, Real-Life and Esports in Eve Online. *J. Virtual Worlds Res.* **2018**, *10*, 5–10. [CrossRef]

178. Taylor, N.; Bergstrom, K.; Jenson, J.; de Castell, S. Alienated Playbour: Relations of Production in EVE Online. *Games Cult.* **2015**, *10*, 365–388. [CrossRef]

179. Dwivedi, Y.K. Metaverse beyond the hype: Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy. *Int. J. Inf. Manag.* **2022**, *66*, 102542. [CrossRef]

180. Giokarini, A. Level Design Complexity in Match-Three Games: A Study of Level Design Structural Complexity in Modern, Casual, Mobile Match-Three Puzzle Games. 2020. Available online: https://aaltodoc.aalto.fi/handle/123456789/44811 (accessed on 25 April 2024).

181. Chesham, A.; Wyss, P.; Müri, R.M.; Mosimann, U.P.; Nef, T. What Older People Like to Play: Genre Preferences and Acceptance of Casual Games. *JMIR Serious Games* **2017**, *5*, e7025. [CrossRef]

182. Hamari, J.; Alha, K.; Järvelä, S.; Kivikangas, J.M.; Koivisto, J.; Paavilainen, J. Why do players buy in-game content? An empirical study on concrete purchase motivations. *Comput. Hum. Behav.* **2017**, *68*, 538–546. [CrossRef]

183. Morschheuser, B.; Riar, M.; Hamari, J.; Maedche, A. How games induce cooperation? A study on the relationship between game features and we-intentions in an augmented reality game. *Comput. Hum. Behav.* **2017**, *77*, 169–183. [CrossRef]

184. Bogost, I. The secret lives of MOOCs. In *MOOCs and Their Afterlives: Experiments in Scale and Access in Higher Education*; The University Of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL, USA, 2017.

185. Richard, G.T. Video Games, Gender, Diversity, and Learning as Cultural Practice: Implications for Equitable Learning and Computing Participation through Games. *Educ. Technol.* **2017**, *57*, 36–43.

186. Samuelson, L. Game Theory in Economics and Beyond. *J. Econ. Perspect.* **2016**, *30*, 107–130. [CrossRef]

187. Roth, A.E.; Wilson, R.B. How Market Design Emerged from Game Theory: A Mutual Interview. *J. Econ. Perspect.* **2019**, *33*, 118–143. [CrossRef]

188. Ross, D. Game Theory (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy). 2023. Available online: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/game-theory/ (accessed on 25 April 2024).

189. Creanza, N.; Kolodny, O.; Feldman, M.W. Cultural evolutionary theory: How culture evolves and why it matters. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **2017**, *114*, 7782–7789. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

190. Petronela, T. The Importance of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Economy. *Procedia Econ. Financ.* **2016**, *39*, 731–736. [CrossRef]

191. Vegheș, C. Cultural Heritage and Nation Branding: A Marketing Driver for Sustainable Development. *Eur. J. Sustain. Dev.* **2022**, *11*, 42. [CrossRef]

192. Bassano, C.; Barile, S.; Piciocchi, P.; Spohrer, J.C.; Iandolo, F.; Fisk, R. Storytelling about places: Tourism marketing in the digital age. *Cities* **2019**, *87*, 10–20. [CrossRef]

193. Okpoko, P.U.; Emeafor, O.F.; Ukaegbu, M.O.; Obianuju Onyeka, A. Propelling enduring heritage tourism in Nigeria: Lessons from Rome. *Int. J. Inst. Afr. Stud.* **2021**, *22*, 1–15.

194. Galbo, J. Renovating the Roman Colosseum: Politics, urban restructuring, and the value of heritage in neoliberal times. *Eur. J. Cult. Political Sociol.* **2019**, *6*, 288–316. [CrossRef]

195. Labadi, S.; Giliberto, F.; Rosetti, I.; Shetabi, L.; Yildirim, E. Heritage and the Sustainable Development Goals: Policy Guidance for Heritage and Development Actors. ICOMOS. 2021. Available online: https://kar.kent.ac.uk/89231/ (accessed on 25 April 2024).

196. Guzmán, P.C.; Roders AR, P.; Colenbrander, B.J.F. Measuring links between cultural heritage management and sustainable urban development: An overview of global monitoring tools. *Cities* **2017**, *60*, 192–201. [CrossRef]

197. Hao, Z.; Wang, Y.; Yang, Y.; Gong, E. Evolutionary game analysis of stakeholders in Villages-in-City reconstruction: Pazhou village as an example. *Int. J. Constr. Manag.* **2023**, *24*, 31–43. [CrossRef]

198. Qingyun, P.; Mu, Z. Evolutionary game analysis of land income distribution in tourism development. *Tour. Econ.* **2021**, *27*, 670–687. [CrossRef]

199. Collins, B.C.; Kumral, M. Game theory for analyzing and improving environmental management in the mining industry. *Resour. Policy* **2020**, *69*, 101860. [CrossRef]

200. Nocca, F. The Role of Cultural Heritage in Sustainable Development: Multidimensional Indicators as Decision-Making Tool. *Sustainability* **2017**, *9*, 1882. [CrossRef]

201. Wang, X.; Yang, Y.; Zhuang, J. Pricing Decisions with Social Interactions: A Game-Theoretic Model. *Decis. Anal.* **2022**, *20*, 40–54. [CrossRef]

202. Hafezalkotob, A.; Alavi, A.; Makui, A. Government financial intervention in green and regular supply chains: Multi-level game theory approach. *Int. J. Manag. Sci. Eng. Manag.* **2015**, *11*, 167–177. [CrossRef]

203. Jiang, K.; You, D.; Merrill, R.; Li, Z. Implementation of a multi-agent environmental regulation strategy under Chinese fiscal decentralization: An evolutionary game theoretical approach. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2019**, *214*, 902–915. [CrossRef]

204. Yang, X.; Zhang, J.; Shen, G.Q.; Yan, Y. Incentives for green retrofits: An evolutionary game analysis on Public-Private-Partnership reconstruction of buildings. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2019**, *232*, 1076–1092. [CrossRef]

205. Chen, W.; Hu, Z.-H. Using evolutionary game theory to study governments and manufacturers' behavioral strategies under various carbon taxes and subsidies. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2018**, *201*, 123–141. [CrossRef]

206. Ercolano, S.; Gaeta, G.L.; Parenti, B. Pompeii dilemma: A motivation-based analysis of tourists' preference for "superstar" archaeological attractors or less renowned archaeological sites in the Vesuvius area. *Int. J. Tour. Res.* **2018**, *20*, 345–354. [CrossRef]

207. Ciardiello, F.; Genovese, A.; Luo, S.; Sgalambro, A. A game-theoretic multi-stakeholder model for cost allocation in urban consolidation centres. *Ann. Oper. Res.* **2021**, *324*, 663–686. [CrossRef]

208. Rahmati, Y.; Talebpour, A.; Mittal, A.; Fishelson, J. Game Theory-Based Framework for Modeling Human–Vehicle Interactions on the Road. *Transp. Res. Rec.* **2020**, *2674*, 701–713. [CrossRef]

209. Kim, S. A Game-Theoretic Analysis of Inter-Korean Transboundary Rivers. 13. 2018. Available online: https://archives.kdischool.ac.kr/handle/11125/34573 (accessed on 25 April 2024).

210. Almalki, S. Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Data in Mixed Methods Research—Challenges and Benefits. *J. Educ. Learn.* **2016**, *5*, 288–296. [CrossRef]

211. Peleckis, K. The Use of Game Theory for Making Rational Decisions in Business Negations: A Conceptual Model. *Entrep. Bus. Econ. Rev.* **2015**, *3*, 105–121. [CrossRef]

212. Chivers, C. *Keeping It Real: Experimental Game Theory and Social Ontology*; University of Sydney: Camperdown, Australia, 2015. Available online: https://ses.library.usyd.edu.au/bitstream/handle/2123/14442/CHIVERS_keeping_it_real.pdf?sequence=1 (accessed on 25 April 2024).

213. Piñero, I.; San-José, J.T.; Rodríguez, P.; Losáñez, M.M. Multi-criteria decision-making for grading the rehabilitation of heritage sites. Application in the historic center of La Habana. *J. Cult. Herit.* **2017**, *26*, 144–152. [CrossRef]

214. Miah, S.J.; Vu, H.Q.; Gammack, J.; McGrath, M. A Big Data Analytics Method for Tourist Behaviour Analysis. *Inf. Manag.* **2017**, *54*, 771–785. [CrossRef]

215. Zhu, G.-Y.; Zhang, W.-B. Optimal foraging algorithm for global optimization. *Appl. Soft Comput.* **2017**, *51*, 294–313. [CrossRef]

216. DeLong, J.P. *Optimal Foraging*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2021; pp. 79–88. [CrossRef]

217. Bettinger, R.L.; Grote, M.N. Marginal value theorem, patch choice, and human foraging response in varying environments. *J. Anthropol. Archaeol.* **2016**, *42*, 79–87. [CrossRef]

218. Svizzero, S. Foraging Wild Resources: Evolving Goals of an Ubiquitous Human Behavior. *Anthropology* **2016**, *4*, 2–7. [CrossRef]

219. Dorfman, A.; Hills, T.T.; Scharf, I. A guide to area-restricted search: A foundational foraging behaviour. *Biol. Rev.* **2022**, *97*, 2076–2089. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

220. Addicott, M.A.; Pearson, J.M.; Sweitzer, M.M.; Barack, D.L.; Platt, M.L. A Primer on Foraging and the Explore/Exploit Trade-Off for Psychiatry Research. *Neuropsychopharmacology* **2017**, *42*, 1931–1939. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

221. Pyke, G.H.; Starr, C.K. Optimal Foraging Theory. In *Encyclopedia of Social Insects*; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2021; pp. 677–685. [CrossRef]

222. Davis, G.H.; Crofoot, M.C.; Farine, D.R. Using optimal foraging theory to infer how groups make collective decisions. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **2022**, *37*, 942–952. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

223. Outram, A.K.; Bogaard, A. *Subsistence and Society in Prehistory: New Directions in Economic Archaeology*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 2019.

224. Clem, T.; Serge, S. Optimization theories of the transition from foraging to agriculture: A critical assessment and proposed alternatives. *Soc. Evol. Hist.* **2017**, *16*, 3–30.

225. Tisdell, C.; Svizzero, S. Different Behavioral Explanations of the Neolithic Transition from Foraging to Agriculture: A Review. 2016. Available online: https://hal.univ-reunion.fr/hal-02147758/document (accessed on 25 April 2024).

226. Morgan, C. Is it Intensification Yet? Current Archaeological Perspectives on the Evolution of Hunter-Gatherer Economies. *J. Archaeol. Res.* **2015**, *23*, 163–213. [CrossRef]

227. Macrae, N. *John von Neumann: The Scientific Genius Who Pioneered the Modern Computer, Game Theory, Nuclear Deterrence, and Much More*; Plunkett Lake Press: Lexington, MA, USA, 2019. Available online: https://books.google.com/books?hl=enandlr=andid=iF2mDwAAQBAJandoi=fndandpg=PT5anddq=game+theory+developed+in+the+Westandots=AqpwPux3Onandsig=_n8RQIyCaMylFL0ghqjmNB4MjWI (accessed on 10 May 2024).

228. Lügger, K.; Geiger, I.; Neun, H.; Backhaus, K. When East meets West at the bargaining table: Adaptation, behavior and outcomes in intra- and intercultural German–Chinese business negotiations. *J. Bus. Econ.* **2015**, *85*, 15–43. [CrossRef]

229. Aghion, P.; Guriev, S.; Jo, K. Chaebols and firm dynamics in Korea. *Econ. Policy* **2021**, *36*, 593–626. [CrossRef]

230. Tomeczek, A.F. The evolution of Japanese keiretsu networks: A review and text network analysis of their perceptions in economics. *Jpn. World Econ.* **2022**, *62*, 101132. [CrossRef]

231. Moro Visconti, R. Combining network theory with corporate governance: Converging models for connected stakeholders. *Corp. Ownersh. Control* **2019**, *17*, 125–139. Available online: http://hdl.handle.net/10807/143675 (accessed on 25 April 2024). [CrossRef]

232. World Economic Forum. The Global Risks Report 2022. 2022. Available online: https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_The_Global_Risks_Report_2022.pdf (accessed on 25 April 2024).

233. Block, R.J.; Friedman, S.; Kaminski, M.R.; Levin, A. *Justice on the Job: Perspectives on the Erosion of Collective Bargaining in the United States*; Upjohn Institute for Employment Research: Kalamazoo, MI, USA, 2006. [CrossRef]

234. Yanochik, M.A.; King, J.T. The Classical Bargaining Model for Organized Labor. *Atl. Econ. J.* **2015**, *43*, 375–382. [CrossRef]

235. Du, S.; Ma, F.; Fu, Z.; Zhu, L.; Zhang, J. Game-theoretic analysis for an emission-dependent supply chain in a "cap-and-trade" system. *Ann. Oper. Res.* **2015**, *228*, 135–149. [CrossRef]
236. Wood, A. The Politics of Policy Circulation: Unpacking the Relationship Between South African and South American Cities in the Adoption of Bus Rapid Transit. *Antipode* **2015**, *47*, 1062–1079. [CrossRef]
237. Restifo, A. The History and Future of Peru's Fast Growing Economy. *Perceptions* **2018**, *4*, 2–6. [CrossRef]
238. Sahakyan, D. EU Trade Policy Responses to the Proliferation of Preferential Trade Agreements in Latin America and East and Southeast Asia. *Politics Policy* **2016**, *44*, 74–96. [CrossRef]
239. Nouri, E.; Georgila, K.; Traum, D. Culture-specific models of negotiation for virtual characters: Multi-attribute decision-making based on culture-specific values. *AI Soc.* **2017**, *32*, 51–63. [CrossRef]
240. Debs, A.; Monteiro, N.P. Conflict and Cooperation on Nuclear Nonproliferation. *Annu. Rev. Political Sci.* **2017**, *20*, 331–349. [CrossRef]
241. James, C. Nuclear Arsenal Games: Coping with Proliferation in a World of Changing Rivalries. *Can. J. Political Sci.* **2000**, *33*, 723–746.
242. Carrozzo Magli, A.; Della Posta, P.; Manfredi, P. The Tragedy of the Commons as a Prisoner's Dilemma. Its Relevance for Sustainability Games. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 8125. [CrossRef]
243. Hsu, S.-L. A Game-Theoretic Model of International Climate Change Negotiations. *NYU Environ. Law J.* **2011**, *19*, 14. [CrossRef]
244. Endres, A. Game theory and global environmental policy. *Poiesis Prax.* **2004**, *3*, 123–139. [CrossRef]
245. Dong, L. Towards Resilient Agriculture Value Chains: Challenges and Opportunities. *Prod. Oper. Manag.* **2020**, *30*, 666–675. [CrossRef]
246. Ahrendsen, B.L. Agricultural Trade Policy: "America First"? *Appl. Stud. Agribus. Commer.* **2017**, *11*, 89–93. [CrossRef]
247. Namany, S.; Govindan, R.; Al-Ansari, T. Operationalising transboundary cooperation through game theory: An energy water food nexus approach for the Middle East and North Africa. *Futures* **2023**, *152*, 103198. [CrossRef]
248. Lacher, W. *Libya's Fragmentation: Structure and Process in Violent Conflict*; Bloomsbury Publishing: London, UK, 2020. Available online: https://books.google.com/books?hl=enandlr=andid=557GDwAAQBAJandoi=fndandpg=PR3anddq=joint+ventures+petroleum+industry+game-theoretic+models+loyalties+between+family+and+tribeandots=zMrFjoRaSGandsig=XH0Krh0bcWyUBe94QrfcJ1E23h8 (accessed on 25 April 2024).
249. Nagurney, A.; Flores, E.A.; Soylu, C. A Generalized Nash Equilibrium network model for post-disaster humanitarian relief. *Transp. Res. Part E Logist. Transp. Rev.* **2016**, *95*, 1–18. [CrossRef]
250. Tierney, M.J. Rising Powers and the Regime for Development Finance. *Int. Stud. Rev.* **2014**, *16*, 452–455. [CrossRef]
251. Heywood, A. Key Concepts in Politics and International Relations. Macmillan Education: London UK, 2015. [CrossRef]
252. Syed, D.; Shah, S.S. Strategy for Optimizing Human Capital Export from Pakistan: A Game-Theoretic Approach with a Focus on Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. *Soc. Sci. Res. Netw.* **2024**, 3–8. [CrossRef]
253. Kim, H.; Whitten-Woodring, J.; James, P. The Role of Media in the Repression–Protest Nexus. *J. Confl. Resolut.* **2015**, *59*, 1017–1042. [CrossRef]
254. Przepiorka, W.; Rutten, C.; Buskens, V.; Szekely, A. How dominance hierarchies emerge from conflict: A game theoretic model and experimental evidence. *Soc. Sci. Res.* **2020**, *86*, 102393. [CrossRef]
255. Merrick, K.; Hardhienata, M.; Shafi, K.; Hu, J. A Survey of Game Theoretic Approaches to Modelling Decision-Making in Information Warfare Scenarios. *Future Internet* **2016**, *8*, 34. [CrossRef]
256. Burnett, H. Signalling games, sociolinguistic variation and the construction of style. *Linguist. Philos.* **2019**, *42*, 419–450. [CrossRef]
257. Fujiwara-Greve, T. *Non-Cooperative Game Theory*; Springer: Tokyo, Japan, 2016; Volume 1.
258. Lo Prete, C.; Hobbs, B.F. A cooperative game theoretic analysis of incentives for microgrids in regulated electricity markets. *Appl. Energy* **2016**, *169*, 524–541. [CrossRef]
259. Dhamo, S.; Perna, V.; Bregasi, L. Non-Cooperative and Repetitive Games for Urban Conflicts in Tirana: A Playful Collaborative System to Lower Social Tension. In *IRIS Research Product Catalog*; Sapienza University of Rome: Rome, Italy, 2019; Volume 4. [CrossRef]
260. Sparks, A.; Burleigh, T.; Barclay, P. We can see inside: Accurate prediction of Prisoner's Dilemma decisions in announced games following a face-to-face interaction. *Evol. Hum. Behav.* **2016**, *37*, 210–216. [CrossRef]
261. Adlakha, S.; Johari, R.; Weintraub, G. Equilibria of dynamic games with many players: Existence, approximation, and market structure. *J. Econ. Theory* **2015**, *156*, 269–316. [CrossRef]
262. Zhu, Q.; Basar, T. Game-Theoretic Methods for Robustness, Security, and Resilience of Cyberphysical Control Systems: Games-in-Games Principle for Optimal Cross-Layer Resilient Control Systems. *IEEE Control Syst.* **2015**, *35*, 46–65. [CrossRef]
263. Zhang, Y.; Liu, F.; Wang, Z.; Chen, Y.; Feng, S.; Wu, Q.; Hou, Y. On Nash–Stackelberg–Nash games under decision-dependent uncertainties: Model and equilibrium. *Automatica* **2022**, *142*, 110401. [CrossRef]
264. Kong, X.; Xu, Q.; Zhu, T. Dynamic Evolution of Knowledge Sharing Behavior among Enterprises in the Cluster Innovation Network Based on Evolutionary Game Theory. *Sustainability* **2019**, *12*, 75. [CrossRef]
265. Toni, B. Nash Limit Cycles: A Game-Theoretical Analysis of Cultural Integration in America. In *STEAM-H: Science, Technology, Engineering, Agriculture, Mathematics and Health*; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2017; pp. 321–356. [CrossRef]
266. He, W.; Sun, Y. Dynamic games with (almost) perfect information. *Theor. Econ.* **2020**, *15*, 811–859. [CrossRef]

267. Karagözoğlu, E.; Keskin, K.; Sağlam, Ç. Race meets bargaining in product development. *MDE Manag. Decis. Econ.* **2020**, *42*, 702–709. [CrossRef]
268. Lindensjö, K. A regular equilibrium solves the extended HJB system. *Oper. Res. Lett.* **2019**, *47*, 427–432. [CrossRef]
269. Grimell, J. Aborted Transition between Two Dichotomous Cultures as Seen through Dialogical Self Theory. *J. Constr. Psychol.* **2020**, *33*, 188–206. [CrossRef]
270. Henrich, J. Culture and social behavior. *Curr. Opin. Behav. Sci.* **2015**, *3*, 84–89. [CrossRef]
271. Meyer, R. Intrinsic Unrealism: The Ineffectiveness of Neoclassical Economic Models. *Gettysbg. Econ. Rev.* **2023**, *12*, 103–113.
272. Hansson, S.O. Can Uncertainty Be Quantified? *Perspect. Sci.* **2022**, *30*, 210–236. [CrossRef]
273. Edelmann, A.; Wolff, T.; Montagne, D.; Bail, C.A. Computational Social Science and Sociology. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* **2020**, *46*, 61–81. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
274. Wilson, R.C.; Collins, A.G. Ten simple rules for the computational modeling of behavioral data. *eLife* **2019**, *8*, e49547. [CrossRef]
275. Kriegeskorte, N.; Douglas, P.K. Cognitive computational neuroscience. *Nat. Neurosci.* **2018**, *21*, 1148–1160. [CrossRef]
276. Lena, J.C.; Lizardo, O.; McDonnell, T.E.; Mische, A.; Tavory, I.; Wherry, F.F.; Bail, C.A.; Frye, M. *Measuring Culture*; Columbia University Press: New York, NY, USA, 2019. [CrossRef]
277. Gould, R.K.; Klain, S.C.; Ardoin, N.M.; Satterfield, T.; Woodside, U.; Hannahs, N.; Daily, G.C.; Chan, K.M. A protocol for eliciting nonmaterial values through a cultural ecosystem services frame. *Conserv. Biol.* **2015**, *29*, 575–586. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
278. Maheshwari, P.; Albert, R. Network model and analysis of the spread of COVID-19 with social distancing. *Appl. Netw. Sci.* **2020**, *5*, 100. [CrossRef]
279. Yousefi Nooraie, R.; EM Sale, J.; Marin, A.; Ross, L.E. Social network analysis: An example of fusion between quantitative and qualitative methods. *J. Mix. Methods Res.* **2018**, *14*, 110–124. [CrossRef]
280. Blazquez, D.; Domenech, J. Big Data sources and methods for social and economic analyses. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Chang.* **2018**, *130*, 99–113. [CrossRef]
281. Barrett, L.F.; Adolphs, R.; Marsella, S.; Martinez, A.M.; Pollak, S.D. Emotional Expressions Reconsidered: Challenges to Inferring Emotion From Human Facial Movements. *Psychol. Sci. Public Interest* **2019**, *20*, 1–68. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
282. Mollahosseini, A.; Hasani, B.; Mahoor, M.H. AffectNet: A Database for Facial Expression, Valence, and Arousal Computing in the Wild. *IEEE Trans. Affect. Comput.* **2019**, *10*, 18–31. [CrossRef]
283. Thorhauge, M.; Cherchi, E.; Walker, J.L.; Rich, J. The role of intention as mediator between latent effects and behavior: Application of a hybrid choice model to study departure time choices. *Transportation* **2019**, *46*, 1421–1445. [CrossRef]