



Call for Regular Articles & Registered Reports

Special Issue on “Behavioral Ethics Under Review: Replications and Theoretical Foundations”

Guest editors:

Prof. Dr. Philipp Schreck, Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg, Germany

Prof. Dr. Bernd Irlenbusch, University of Cologne, Germany

Prof. Dr. Sabrina Jeworrek, Otto-von-Guericke-University Magdeburg, Germany

Prof. Dr. Gari Walkowitz, Technische Universität Bergakademie, Germany

Aim of This Special Issue

Reproducibility is increasingly recognized as fundamental to credible science in both economics and psychology (Anderson/ Kichkha, 2017). However, large-scale replication projects in psychology have exposed a crisis of replicability: for example, the Open Science Collaboration (2015) found that only about one-third of published effects replicated significantly. Experimental economists have similarly begun to confront these issues (Camerer et al., 2016). Despite growing awareness, direct replications remain rare across these disciplines, and scholars have called for more systematic and critical replications to ensure the reliability of evidence in economics, psychology, and management (Ankel-Peters et al., 2023; Block et al., 2023; Mueller-Langer et al., 2019).

As an interdisciplinary field drawing on economics, psychology, and related disciplines, behavioral ethics research is equally in need of robust replication. Behavioral ethics plays a key role in shaping policies, training programs, and organizational practices, particularly in business contexts. When findings are not replicable, interventions based on them risk being ineffective—or even harmful. Replication is also essential for distinguishing robust psychological effects from those shaped by context, methodology, or bias—an especially critical task in a field that grapples with complex human behavior and moral judgment. However, few systematic replication efforts have been conducted, despite the real-world importance of behavioral ethics findings. Notable exceptions include replications by Bartling et al. (2023), Verschuere et al. (2018), and Kristal et al. (2020), which highlight both the value and the feasibility of rigorous reproducibility studies in this domain.

For this special issue, we welcome three types of replication-related contributions in the field of behavioral ethics: 1) Registered Reports designed to replicate existing research findings, where data collection has not yet begun; 2) Regular Articles reporting completed replication studies that also include a meaningful extension of a key finding; 3) Conceptual Articles that reflect on the need for and design of replication projects in behavioral ethics from a philosophy of science perspective.

By emphasizing reproducibility and methodological rigor, we aim to strengthen the credibility of behavioral ethics research and ensure that empirical findings and regularities are robust and reliable (Ankel-Peters et al., 2023).

Relevant Topics Include, But Are Not Limited To:

- Normative foundations for the replication of behavioral ethics findings
- Moral behavior in markets
- Moral behavior in firms and organizations
- Social, descriptive, and moral norms (following, enforcement, supporting institutions, etc.)
- Bounded ethicality
- Dual process decision making
- Heuristics and biases
- Cheating, deception and lying
- Compliance and integrity
- Corporate social responsibility
- Corporate or CEO political activism
- Ethical leadership
- Lobbying
- Corruption
- Sustainable consumption
- Gender and cultural effects

While we welcome contributions from various disciplines, all submissions should clearly articulate their relevance to business contexts and implications for business scholars and/or practitioners.

Evaluation Criteria

Which Types of Replication Studies Do We Consider?

- Scientific replications with extensions: A scientific replication repeats the original study by maintaining the same (or a closely similar) model, but tests it on a different sample or population (Hamermesh, 2007). We also expect an extension element: the replication should vary at least one critical aspect of the original research. For example, this could involve adding a manipulation / treatment that amplifies or attenuates the original effect, or incorporating (alternative) process measures that were not included in the initial study. The effectiveness of measures to improve ethical behavior can just as well be tested based on the initial design of an existing study.
- Conceptual replications: A conceptual replication examines the same constructs and relationships as the original study but uses different operationalizations of the independent and dependent variables (Crandall/ Sherman, 2016; Lynch et al., 2015). This category includes, for example, replications of lab experiments conducted in real-world field settings.

Please note that we do not consider mere reproductions (i.e., aiming to reproduce an article's findings using the same data and analytical strategy) but require the collection of new data.

Open Science Practices

All replication studies must be preregistered using commonly accepted platforms (e.g., OSF, aspredicted.org).

All empirical contributions must adhere to the principles of open science and include full resources to reproduce the data collection and data analysis (cf. [Open Economics Guide](#)). These include study materials (e.g., experimental instructions, questionnaires, stimuli), data (raw data and analyses data), and code (e.g., STATA or R scripts). Resources should be shared anonymously at a repository such as the Open Science Framework (www.osf.io).

We also expect all authors who present original data to obtain a vote from an ethics committee at their research institution confirming that the research project is ethically unobjectionable before starting to collect data.

Timeline and Submission Process

Articles can be submitted as **regular articles** or as **registered reports**.

Before submitting a regular article or registered report, all interested contributors should first submit **an extended abstract** outlining their (proposed) project **by October 31, 2025**, via philipp.schreck@wiwi.uni-halle.de. Based on the abstract, we will provide early feedback on whether the project is a good fit for the Special Issue and, if necessary, suggest revisions prior to full submission. From there on, the timeline depends on the submission format.

Authors of selected abstracts for **regular articles** will be invited to submit full papers **by June 30, 2026**. Earlier submissions will be accepted and evaluated on a rolling basis.

Authors of selected abstracts for **registered reports** will be invited to submit “stage 1 manuscripts” **by Feb. 28, 2026**. Earlier submissions will be accepted and evaluated on a rolling basis. A Stage 1 manuscript describes a detailed study plan that must include introduction, theory & hypotheses, and methods sections as well as a description of planned data analyses. However, a Stage 1 manuscript does not include specific results as the data has not been collected yet. The Stage 1 manuscript will undergo peer review and, following favorable reviews, authors will receive an in-principle acceptance (IPA). An IPA guarantees the article’s (Stage 2) final acceptance irrespective of the results, given that the research is conducted as planned. Changes to the contents of the Stage 1 manuscript are no longer possible after having received an IPA. For more information on registered reports, please see Chambers/ Tzavella (2022) and Henderson/ Chambers (2022) as well as <https://www.cos.io/initiatives/registered-reports>.

Registered Reports and final manuscripts need to be submitted via the journal’s website: <http://www.springer.com/1573> (klick "Submit Online" there and make sure to indicate that the submission belongs to this special issue).

Submission of a manuscript implies that the work described has not been published before; that it is not under consideration for publication anywhere else; that its publication has been approved by all co-authors, if any, as well as by the responsible authorities – tacitly or explicitly – at the institute where the work has been carried out.

Submitted papers should adhere to the format requirements of the Journal of Business Economics. Please consult the Journal’s submission guidelines available at <https://link.springer.com/journal/11573/submission-guidelines>.

References

- Anderson, Richard G/ Kichkha, Areerat (2017): Replication, meta-analysis, and research synthesis in economics. In: *American Economic Review*, 107 (2017), S. 56-59.
- Ankel-Peters, Jörg/ Fiala, Nathan/ Neubauer, Florian (2023): Do economists replicate? In: *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 212 (2023), S. 219-232.
- Bartling, Björn/ Fehr, Ernst/ Özdemir, Yagiz (2023): Does market interaction erode moral values? In: *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 105 (2023), S. 226-235.
- Block, Jörn H/ Fisch, Christian/ Kanwal, Narmeen/ Lorenzen, Solvej/ Schulze, Anna (2023): Replication studies in top management journals: An empirical investigation of prevalence, types, outcomes, and impact. In: *Management Review Quarterly*, 73 (2023), S. 1109-1134.
- Camerer, Colin F/ Dreber, Anna/ Forsell, Eskil/ Ho, Teck-Hua/ Huber, Jürgen/ Johannesson, Magnus/ Kirchler, Michael/ Almenberg, Johan/ Altmejd, Adam/ Chan, Taizan (2016): Evaluating replicability of laboratory experiments in economics. In: *Science*, 351 (2016), S. 1433-1436.
- Chambers, Christopher D/ Tzavella, Loukia (2022): The past, present and future of Registered Reports. In: *Nature human behaviour*, 6 (2022), S. 29-42.
- Crandall, Christian S/ Sherman, Jeffrey W (2016): On the scientific superiority of conceptual replications for scientific progress. In: *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 66 (2016), S. 93-99.
- Hamermesh, Daniel S (2007): Replication in economics. In: *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économie*, 40 (2007), S. 715-733.
- Kristal, Ariella S/ Whillans, Ashley V/ Bazerman, Max H/ Gino, Francesca/ Shu, Lisa L/ Mazar, Nina/ Ariely, Dan (2020): Signing at the beginning versus at the end does not decrease dishonesty. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117 (2020), S. 7103-7107.
- Lynch, John G/ Bradlow, Eric T/ Huber, Joel C/ Lehmann, Donald R (2015): Reflections on the replication corner: In praise of conceptual replications. In: *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 32 (2015), S. 333-342.
- Mueller-Langer, Frank/ Fecher, Benedikt/ Harhoff, Dietmar/ Wagner, Gert G (2019): Replication studies in economics—How many and which papers are chosen for replication, and why? In: *Research Policy*, 48 (2019), S. 62-83.
- Open Science Collaboration (2015): Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. In: *Science*, 349 (2015), S. aac4716.
- Verschuere, Bruno/ Meijer, Ewout H/ Jim, Ariane/ Hoogesteyn, Katherine/ Orthey, Robin/ McCarthy, Randy J/ Skowronski, John J/ Acar, Oguz A/ Aczel, Balazs/ Bakos, Bence E (2018): Registered replication report on Mazar, Amir, and Ariely (2008). In: *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 1 (2018), S. 299-317.