



Seminar Public Economics (LV-Nr. 36247)

Summer Semester 2026

Topic: Replication crisis

The seminar will take place as a block seminar (date: to be announced at the preliminary meeting)

Procedure: Procedure: Topics will be presented in the preliminary meeting, after which preferences for topics can be submitted. Topics will be assigned by taking preferences into account (in case of doubt, by drawing lots), and topics will be assigned by email. Binding registration must be completed no later than one week after topics have been assigned via CMLife.

Preliminary meeting:

April 23, 2026, 2:00 p.m., in room S55;. Attendance is mandatory.

Submission of topic preference:

April 24–30, 2026, online

Assignment of topics:

May 6, 2025, via email to Felix Zwies

REGISTRATION: May 6–13, 2026, via CMLife (binding); 10 spots for master's students (Economics, IWG, GÖ).

Supervision period:

May 13 – August 2, 2026; contact Felix Zwies within the first three weeks of the processing and supervision period.

SUBMISSION: **September 1, 2026, by 11:59 p.m.** as a PDF via email to Felix Zwies (felix.zwies@uni-bayreuth.de)

Topics
Block A: Incentive structures in the scientific system
Block B: Selective evidence and biases in research
Block C: Replications
Block D: Crowd science and coordinated replication

Topic and objectives of the seminar

The seminar focuses on the empirical examination of the replication crisis in the (economic) sciences. The central question is why key empirical results can only be reproduced to a limited extent, and which institutional, methodological, and behavioral mechanisms contribute to this. Structural incentive problems in the scientific system as well as statistical distortions and questions of empirical verifiability will be analyzed.

The seminar is divided into four thematic areas: (A) Incentive structures in the scientific system, in particular publication and career mechanisms, (B) P-hacking and publication bias as expressions of selective evidence production, (C) replication studies as an instrument of scientific quality control, and (D) crowd science and coordinated reproducibility initiatives as an institutional response to validity problems in empirical research. The studies discussed are mainly from empirical economic research and related disciplines.

The objective of the seminar is to develop an in-depth understanding of the institutional and methodological determinants of scientific evidence. Students should comprehend and critically evaluate the respective works in terms of their research questions, methodological approach, and empirical evidence base. The focus is on questions of internal and external validity, statistical testing practice, and the incentive effects of institutional frameworks.

Each student will be given a study as a basis for their seminar paper and presentation, which they will be required to understand and explain in detail using the guiding questions listed below.

Key questions for preparing the seminar paper and seminar presentation

1. **Research Question:** What research question(s) or problem(s) does the paper address? What assumptions or hypotheses underlie it?
2. **Relevance:** Why are these questions important?
3. **Contribution to Literature:** What specific added value does the study provide compared to existing research?
4. **Data, evidence, and context:** What empirical basis is used? How suitable is it for answering the research question? In the case of replications: What are the differences between the original study(s) and the replication study(s)?
5. **Methodology:** What methodological approaches does the study use, and to what extent are they suitable for answering the research question? For replications: What are the differences compared to the original study?
6. **Results:** What are the most important results of the study?
7. **Validity:** How robust and convincing are the results (both internally and in terms of generalizability, i.e., externally)? What are the possible weaknesses or limitations?
8. **Discussion in the context of the replication crisis:** How can the study be understood in the broader context of the replication crisis and the robustness of scientific evidence? What implications does this have for research practice, incentive structures, or the quality of empirical results?
9. **Implications:** What conclusions can be drawn from the study?
10. **Open questions:** Which aspects remain unanswered or raise new questions?
11. **Outlook:** What future studies or analyses could help to clarify these open questions?



Literature:

Theme block	Paper
Block A	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Heckman, J. J., & Moktan, S. (2020). Publishing and promotion in economics: The tyranny of the top five. <i>Journal of Economic Literature</i>, 58(2), 419-470. https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/jel.201915742) Angrist, J., Azoulay, P., Ellison, G., Hill, R., & Lu, S. F. (2020). Inside job or deep impact? Extramural citations and the influence of economic scholarship. <i>Journal of Economic Literature</i>, 58(1), 3-52. https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/jel.201815083) Hamermesh, D. S. (2018). Citations in economics: Measurement, uses, and impacts. <i>Journal of Economic Literature</i>, 56(1), 115-156. https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/jel.20161326
Block B	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Brodeur, A., Carrell, S., Figlio, D., & Lusher, L. (2023). Unpacking p-hacking and publication bias. <i>American economic review</i>, 113(11), 2974-3002. https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/aer.202107952) DellaVigna, S., & Linos, E. (2022). RCTs to scale: Comprehensive evidence from two nudge units. <i>Econometrica</i>, 90(1), 81-116. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.3982/ECTA187093) Chopra, F., Haaland, I., Roth, C., & Stegmann, A. (2024). The null result penalty. <i>The Economic Journal</i>, 134(657), 193-219. https://academic.oup.com/ej/article/134/657/193/7238466?login=true
Block C	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Ball, S., Katz, B., Li, F., & Smith, A. (2023). The effect of cognitive load on economic decision-making: a replication attempt. <i>Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization</i>, 210, 226-242. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S01672681230009382) Gallegos, S. (2023). Political turnover negatively affects the quality of public services: a replication. <i>Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization</i>, 212, 796-818. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167268123001993#bib0001
Block D	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Brodeur, A., Mikola, D., & Cook, N. (2024). <i>Mass reproducibility and replicability: A new hope</i> (No. 16912). IZA Discussion Papers. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/resrep58994.pdf?acceptTC=true&coverpage=false&addFooter=false2) Silberzahn, R., Uhlmann, E. L., Martin, D. P., Anselmi, P., Aust, F., Awtrey, E., ... & Nosek, B. A. (2018). Many analysts, one data set: Making transparent how variations in analytic choices affect results. <i>Advances in methods and practices in psychological science</i>, 1(3), 337-356. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/2515245917747646

Further reading:

- Balafoutas, L., Celse, J., Karakostas, A., & Umashev, N. (2025). Incentives and the replication crisis in social sciences: A critical review of open science practices. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 114, 102327. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214804324001642>
- Dreber, A., & Johannesson, M. (2025). A framework for evaluating reproducibility and replicability in economics. *Economic Inquiry*, 63(2), 338-356. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/ecin.13244>
- Fišar, M., Greiner, B., Huber, C., Katok, E., Ozkes, A. I., & Management Science Reproducibility Collaboration. (2024). Reproducibility in management science. *Management Science*, 70(3), 1343-1356. <https://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/full/10.1287/mnsc.2023.03556>
- Trueblood, J. S., Allison, D. B., Field, S. M., Fishbach, A., Gaillard, S. D., Gigerenzer, G., ... & Teodorescu, A. R. (2025). The misalignment of incentives in academic publishing and implications for journal reform. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 122(5), e2401231121. <https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.2401231121>