

Cooperation Databank (CoDa) — Search for studies and study inclusion criteria

Content extracted from: Spadaro, Tididi, Columbus, Jin, ten Teije, & Balliet (2020)

Last update: October 15th 2020

Search for studies to be included in CoDa

We conducted systematic searches for English written documents in 2015 and 2018 using PsychInfo, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. Chinese documents were searched in November and December 2017 using CNKI, Wangfang Data, and CQVIP. The search for Japanese documents was conducted from July to December 2018 using Cinii.

The search log included the following key terms: Public goods dilemma*, Public good*, Public good* game*, Prisoner's dilemma*, Voluntar* contribut* experiment*, Voluntary contribution mechanism, Social dilemma, Mixed-motive game, Mixed-motive game*, Cooperation game (up to 2015), Resource dilemma*, Conditional cooperation (up to 2015), Interpersonal bargaining AND Experimental games (up to 2015), Matrix games, Cooperation AND Experiment. For documents published between 2016 and 2017, we additionally used the following terms: Common pool game, Give-some dilemma, Take-some dilemma, Give-some game, Take-some game. Equivalent terms were used for Japanese and Chinese searches. In order to limit the search output to only studies involving human samples, some searching strategies included the following specification: NOT Publication Name: "Theoretical Biology" NOT Publication Name: "Europhysics Letters" NOT Publication Name: "Physical Review" NOT Publication Name: "Computational".

Additionally, we performed a backward search of the social dilemma literature by reviewing articles cited by published reviews (Chaudhuri, 2011; Dawes, 1980; Pruitt & Kimmel,

1977; Wrightsman et al., 1972), meta-analyses (Balliet, 2010; Balliet et al., 2009, 2011, 2014; Balliet & van Lange, 2013; Balliet & Van Lange, 2013; Fiala & Suetens, 2017; Mengel, 2018; Pletzer et al., 2018; Rand, 2016; Sally, 1995), and books (Biel et al., 2008; Foddy, 2013; Henrich et al., 2005; Komorita, S. S., Parks, 1995; Liebrand, W. B. G., Messick, 1996; Rapoport et al., 1965; Suleiman et al., 2004). In addition, some documents were retrieved as they were cited in papers found using the above-mentioned search strategies. Finally, we sent announcements requesting published data to the Economic Science Association (ESA), European Association of Social Psychology (EASP), Judgement and Decision Making (JDM), European Association for Decision Making (EADM) listservs and on Twitter.

Study Inclusion Criteria

Decisions about eligibility for inclusion in CoDa are done at the study level. This means that for documents that report multiple studies (e.g., multi-study papers), only the eligible studies are included in the databank. Several standards were used to determine whether a study was eligible for inclusion.

- (a) *Human participants*. The study was required to have a sample of human participants. Thus, studies exclusively employing agent-based models or studies with other animals were excluded from CoDa.
- (b) *Game type*. Cooperative behavior was assessed in a prisoner's dilemma, public goods game, or resource dilemma. Studies that involved variations of these game paradigms (e.g., asymmetrical and non-linear payoff functions, intergroup settings; Bornstein, 2003) were also eligible.
- (c) *Reported cooperation*. The study reported the overall average amount of cooperative behavior or provided enough other quantitative information to calculate effect sizes in

this sample. This could be calculated across all trials of the game or only for specific trials of the game.

A flow diagram detailing our search for studies is reported in the supplemental materials. Domain experts were instructed to annotate studies that met the above-mentioned standards. However, during the annotation of studies, it was discovered that some studies did not report the overall average cooperation or enough information to compute effect sizes. Even though these studies cannot be included in meta-analyses, these studies are included in the platform. This is because these studies can still be reported to users as having measured cooperation or other specific variables of interest, and this can be included as output during a search for studies.

References

- Balliet, D. (2010). Communication and cooperation in social dilemmas: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 54*(1), 39–57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002709352443>
- Balliet, D., Li, N. P., Macfarlan, S. J., & Van Vugt, M. (2011). Sex differences in cooperation: A meta-analytic review of social dilemmas. *Psychological Bulletin, 137*(6), 881–909. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025354>
- Balliet, D., Parks, C., & Joireman, J. (2009). Social value orientation and cooperation in social dilemmas: A meta-analysis. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 12*(4), 533–547. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430209105040>
- Balliet, D., & van Lange, P. A. M. (2013). Trust, punishment, and cooperation across 18 societies: A meta-analysis. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 8*(4), 363–379. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691613488533>
- Balliet, D., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2013). Trust, conflict, and cooperation: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 139*(5), 1090–1112. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030939>
- Balliet, D., Wu, J., & De Dreu, C. K. W. (2014). Ingroup favoritism in cooperation: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 140*(6), 1556–1581. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037737>
- Biel, A., Eek, D., Gärling, T., & Gustafsson, M. (2008). *New issues and paradigms in research on social dilemmas*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-72596-3>
- Bornstein, G. (2003). Intergroup conflict: individual, group, and collective interests. *Personality and Social Psychology Review : An Official Journal of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc, 7*(2), 129–145. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0702_129-145
- Chaudhuri, A. (2011). Sustaining cooperation in laboratory public goods experiments: A

- selective survey of the literature. *Experimental Economics*, 14(1), 47–83.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10683-010-9257-1>
- Dawes, R. M. (1980). Social dilemmas. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 31(1), 169–193.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.31.020180.001125>
- Fiala, L., & Suetens, S. (2017). Transparency and cooperation in repeated dilemma games: a meta study. *Experimental Economics*, 20(4), 755–771. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10683-017-9517-4>
- Foddy, M. (2013). *Resolving social dilemmas*. Psychology Press.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203776001>
- Henrich, J., Boyd, R., Bowles, S., Camerer, C. F., Fehr, E., & Gintis, H. (2005). *Foundations of human sociality: Economic experiments and ethnographic evidence from fifteen small-scale societies*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/0199262055.001.0001>
- Komorita, S. S., Parks, C. D. (1995). *Social dilemmas*. Brown & Benchmark.
- Liebrand, W. B. G., Messick, D. M. (1996). Frontiers in social dilemmas research. In *Frontiers in Social Dilemmas Research*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-85261-9>
- Mengel, F. (2018). Risk and temptation: A meta-study on prisoner's dilemma games. *The Economic Journal*, 128(616), 3182–3209. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eoj.12548>
- Pletzer, J. L., Balliet, D., Joireman, J., Kuhlman, D. M., Voelpel, S. C., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2018). Social value orientation, expectations, and cooperation in social dilemmas: A meta-analysis. *European Journal of Personality*, 32(1), 62–83. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2139>
- Pruitt, D. G., & Kimmel, M. J. (1977). Twenty years of experimental gaming: Critique, synthesis, and suggestions for the future. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 28(1), 363–392.

<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.28.020177.002051>

Rand, D. G. (2016). Cooperation, fast and slow: Meta-analytic evidence for a theory of social heuristics and self-interested deliberation. *Psychological Science*, 27(9), 1192–1206.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797616654455>

Rapoport, A., Chammah, A. M., & Orwant, C. J. (1965). *Prisoner's dilemma: A study in conflict and cooperation* (Vol. 165). University of Michigan press.

Sally, D. (1995). Conversation and cooperation in social dilemmas: A meta-analysis of experiments from 1958 to 1992. *Rationality and Society*, 7, 58–92.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1043463195007001004>

Suleiman, R., Budescu, D. V, Fischer, I., & Messick, D. M. (2004). *Contemporary psychological research on social dilemmas*. Cambridge University Press.

Wrightsmann, L. S., O'Connor, J., & Baker, N. J. (1972). *Cooperation and competition: Readings on mixed-motive games*. BrooksCole Pub. Co.