

PRESENTATION

Description: This is a study about the prevalence of and opinions towards **pre-registration** and **pre-analysis plans** in experimental economics. The study is conducted by the **ESA Data and Replicability Committee**, and it should take approximately **15 minutes**. Your participation in this study will improve our understanding of current practices and attitudes towards pre-registration and pre-analysis plans in our profession. There are no known risks associated with this study that would go beyond those of everyday life.

Confidentiality: No personal data will be collected in this survey. Your anonymous data will be used in a presentation at the **ESA World Meeting in Lyon** (26-29 June) and the results will be written up in a **report to be shared with the members of the ESA**. The anonymized data will also be used in a methodological research paper on the use of pre-registration and pre-analysis plans in experimental economics. All the anonymized data produced in this survey may be used in future research, shared with other researchers, or made available on a public repository. In no circumstances will your identity or personal involvement in this survey be disclosed.

Your rights as a participant: Participation is entirely voluntary. You may leave the survey at any time without any penalty or prejudice. You can also skip questions in the survey.

Ethics approval: This study has been reviewed and approved by the ethics committee of Koc University (2023.142.IRB3.062), where the PI is listed as Seda Ertac (chair of the ESA Data and Replicability Committee). Should you have any questions, difficulties, or complaints, please contact the researchers at sertac@ku.edu.tr or chr@ku.edu.tr.

[Q.0.1] I have read the above and agree to participate in this survey:

- Yes [1]
- No [0]

[Q.0.2] What type(s) of **empirical methods** do you **primarily** use in your research? Please select all that apply.

- Lab experiment [1]
- Field experiment [2]
- Online experiment [3]
- RCT / impact evaluation [4]
- Unincentivized survey (no experiment) [5]
- Observational data [6]
- Other (please indicate in the box below): [Text box] [7]
- I do not do any empirical research [8]

Definition

The definitions and practical implementations of pre-registration and pre-analysis plans may vary widely (Banerjee et al., 2020; Christensen and Miguel, 2018; Miguel, 2021).

For the purpose of this survey, we do not make a strict distinction between pre-registration and pre-analysis plans, and use these terms in the following way:

👉 By pre-registration and a pre-analysis plan, we mean:

1. writing down a subset of the study design, outcome variables of interest, hypotheses or planned statistical analyses **in advance** of analyzing the outcome data; AND
2. posting the document on a **public registry** where it will be **time-stamped**.

⚠ For our purposes, this may also include writing down hypotheses or planned statistical analyses for a previously collected experimental or observational dataset in advance of examining the data.

[Q.1.1] Have you **heard** of the practice of pre-registering hypotheses or analysis plans in advance of a research project?

- Yes [1]
- No [0]

[Q.1.2] What is your **general opinion** on pre-registering hypotheses or analysis plans in advance of a research project?

- Very unfavorable [1]
- Somewhat unfavorable [2]
- Neither unfavorable nor favorable [3]
- Somewhat favorable [4]
- Very favorable [5]
- Not sure [6]

Your experience with pre-registration

[Q.2.1] Have you pre-registered one or several of your research projects?

- Yes (personally or together with my collaborators on our joint projects) [1]
- No [0]

[Q.2.2] [If Q.2.1=No] Why haven't you pre-registered any of your research projects up to now? Please select all that apply. [Order randomized (except for the last option)]

- Pre-registration is time-consuming. [1]
- The research projects I conduct are too complex to write a meaningful plan. [2]
- The research projects I conduct are exploratory. [3]
- I need to learn from the data how to analyze it. [4]
- Pre-registration is not possible because I use existing datasets. [5]
- I do not see what would be useful to pre-register. [6]
- I do not want to be penalized for deviating from a pre-registration. [7]
- It won't help me to do better research. [8]
- My collaborators are not favorable to the idea of pre-registration. [9]
- Other reasons (please describe in the box below): [Text box] [10]

[Q.2.3] [If Q.2.1=Yes] What type(s) of research was it for? Please select all that apply.

- Lab experiment [1]
- Field experiment [2]
- Online experiment [3]
- RCT / impact evaluation [4]
- Unincentivized survey (no experiment) [5]
- Observational data [6]
- Other (please indicate in the box below): [Text box] [7]

[Q.2.4] [If Q.2.1=Yes] What were the main reasons that brought you (or your collaborators) to pre-register your research projects? Please select all that apply. [Order randomized (except for the last option)]

- Because it is required or recommended at top journals. [1]
- To make sure the research design and analysis contain all key elements. [2]
- Because it leads to more reliable results. [3]
- To avoid making biased choices during the data analysis. [4]
- To facilitate the work with collaborators or research assistants. [5]
- To contribute personally to transparent research. [6]
- To signal research credibility. [7]
- Other reasons (please describe in the box below): [Text box] [8]

[Q.2.5] [If Q.2.1=Yes] In what year did you or your collaborator(s) first pre-register a research project? [Dropdown with numbers: 2023, 2022, ..., 2011, 2010 or earlier]

[Q.2.6] [If Q.2.1=Yes] How many of your research projects were pre-registered by you or your collaborator(s) since then?

- All of them [1]
- Most of them [2]
- Some of them [3]
- None [4]

[Q.2.7] [If Q.2.6≠All of them] What were the reasons that brought you to not pre-register some of your research projects? Please select all that apply. [Order randomized (except for the last option)]

- Pre-registration is time-consuming. [1]
- Some research projects I conducted were too complex to write a meaningful plan. [2]
- Some research projects I conducted were exploratory. [3]
- I needed to learn from the data how to analyze it. [4]
- Pre-registration was not possible because I used existing datasets. [5]
- I did not see what would be useful to pre-register. [6]
- I did not want to be penalized for deviating from a pre-registration. [7]
- I did not think it would help me to do better research. [8]
- My collaborators were not favorable to the idea of pre-registration. [9]
- Other reasons (please describe in the box below): [Text box] [10]

Existing registration platforms

[Q.3.1] Which of the following registration platforms have you heard of? Please select all that apply.

- AEA RCT Registry ([link](#)) [1]
- AsPredicted ([link](#)) [2]
- ClinicalTrials.gov ([link](#)) [3]
- Experiments in Government and Politics (EGAP) Registry ([link](#)) [4]
- Open Science Framework (OSF) ([link](#)) [5]
- Registry for International Development Impact Evaluations (RIDIE) ([link](#)) [6]
- Other (please indicate in the box below): [Text box] [7]

[Q.3.2] [If Q.2.1=Yes] Which of the following registration platforms have you **used** so far? Please select all that apply.

- AEA RCT Registry [1]
- AsPredicted [2]
- ClinicalTrials.gov [3]
- Experiments in Government and Politics (EGAP) Registry [4]
- Open Science Framework (OSF) [5]
- Registry for International Development Impact Evaluations (RIDIE) [6]
- Other (please indicate in the box below): [Text box] [7]

[Q.3.3] [Only one selected in Q.3.2] Why do you use this registration platform for your work? Please explain below: [Text box]

[Q.3.4] [More than one selected in Q.3.2] Which registration platform do you prefer to use for your work and why? Please explain below: [Text box]

[Q.3.5] The various registration platforms differ in the extent to which pre-registrations are made **publicly available** and **searchable**.

Which of the following **disclosure policies** are you most favorable to?

- Make all pre-registrations automatically public once the data collection is concluded. [1]
- Allow researchers to decide before the data collection whether to make their pre-registration public or not. [2]
- Allow researchers to decide at any point in time whether to make their pre-registration public or not. [3]

[Q.3.6] The platforms also differ in terms of the pre-registration format. Some impose **word/page limits** and require researchers to use a **template**, while others follow a less structured but more flexible format.

Which of the following **formats** are you most favorable to?

- Standardized pre-registration format with word/page limit and specific fields. [1]
- Free-form pre-registration format with no word/page limit but some suggested fields. [2]

[Q.3.7] Are there **any other features** (whether currently available or not) that you think registration platforms should have? Please indicate below: [Text box]

Breadth of application, implementation and reporting

In this section, we would like to ask you for your opinion on:

- 👉 the **breadth of application** of pre-registration practices;
- 👉 the **implementation** and **reporting** of pre-registered (vs. non-pre-registered) analyses.

Breadth of application

[Q.4.1] Which **type(s)** of studies should be pre-registered in your view? Please select all that apply.

- Lab experiment [1]
- Field experiment [2]
- Online experiment [3]
- RCT / impact evaluation [4]
- Unincentivized survey (no experiment) [5]
- Observational data [6]
- Pilot studies [7]
- Other (please indicate in the box below): [Text box] [8]

[Q.4.2] What **elements** do you think a pre-registration should contain? Please select all that apply.

- Clear hypotheses [1]
- Sample size justification [2]
- Detailed power calculations [3]
- Whether any prior (pilot) data was collected [4]
- Criteria for excluding observations (e.g., treatment of outliers) [5]
- All regression specifications and tests [6]
- The significance threshold used in tests [7]
- Corrections for multiple hypothesis testing [8]
- A hierarchy of tests (primary, secondary, exploratory) [9]
- The theoretical model if one will be included in the paper [10]
- Other (please indicate in the box below): [Text box] [11]

Implementation and reporting

[Q.4.3] How much should one **follow** a pre-registration? Please select the statement you most agree with.

- The author(s) should execute the pre-analysis plan word for word. [1]
- The author(s) can deviate parsimoniously from the pre-analysis plan as long as it is clear where and why. [2]
- The author(s) can deviate as much as they want as long as it is clear where and why. [3]
- The author(s) can use the pre-analysis plan for guidance but there is no need to follow it. [4]

[Q.4.4] Which information should the authors **disclose** in the paper? Please select all that apply.

- Clear statement of which studies / treatments were pre-registered. [1]
- Link to pre-registration document(s) on the front page of the paper. [2]
- Distinct labeling of exploratory and pre-registered analyses in the main text. [3]
- Clear comparison in the appendix of the pre-registration vs. analysis presented in the paper. [4]
- Other (please indicate in the box below): [Text box] [5]

Interpretation and peer review

[Q.5.1] Imagine you are reading a paper with a pre-registration.

On a scale of 0 (not at all) to 10 (extremely), how would you rate the **credibility of a statistically significant finding** ($p < 0.05$) based on a:

- Pre-registered hypothesis test
- Non-pre-registered hypothesis test

[Q.5.2] Have you ever **reviewed** a paper with a pre-registration for a journal?

- Yes [1]
- No [2]

[Q.5.3] [If Q.5.2=Yes] As a reviewer, did you **check the pre-registration documents**?

- Yes, for all papers with pre-registration I reviewed. [1]
- Yes, for some of the papers with pre-registration I reviewed. [2]
- No, I never checked the pre-registration documents. [3]

[Q.5.4] [If Q.5.2=Yes AND Q.5.3≠No] How did checking the pre-registration documents **affect your evaluation of the paper under review**?

Generally speaking:

- It made my evaluation more positive. [1]
- It did not affect my evaluation. [2]
- It made my evaluation more negative. [3]
- Other (please indicate in the box below): [Text box] [4]

[Q.5.5] In general, **how often** do you think reviewers check pre-registration documents?
[Slider 0%-100%]

[Q.5.6] Who do you think should check the pre-registration documents that accompany a submission?

- The editor in charge of the paper [1]
- One specific reviewer [2]
- All reviewers [3]
- Another journal member (e.g., the data editor) [4]
- Someone specifically appointed for this job [5]
- Nobody (the authors are solely responsible) [6]
- Other (please indicate in the box below): [Text box] [7]

Beliefs about current practices and views

[Q.6.1] Consider all experimental papers published **between 2017 and 2022** in the journals listed below.

What **percentage** of these papers do you think were pre-registered? [Slider 0%-100%]

- Papers published in “Top 5” journals in economics
- Papers published in *Experimental Economics*

[Q.6.2] Consider all participants in this survey. What **percentage** do you think **answered “Yes”** to the question “Have you heard of the practice of pre-registering hypotheses or analysis plans in advance of a research project?” [Slider 0%-100%]

[Q.6.3] Consider all participants in this survey. What **percentage** do you think **answered “Somewhat favorable” or “Very favorable”** to the question “What is your general opinion on pre-registering hypotheses or analysis plans in advance of a research project?” [Slider 0%-100%]

[Q.6.4] Below is a list of statements about the **potential impact of pre-registration on a range of outcomes**.

Given what the current practices are, what do you guess is the likely impact of pre-registration on these outcomes? [1=Strongly decrease; 2; 3; 4; 5=Strongly increase]

- Disclosure of null results
- Transparency of design and/or analytical choices
- Amount of *p*-hacking
- Amount of HARKing (hypothesizing after seeing the results)
- Replicability of research
- Clarity and coherence of presentation
- Level of research creativity
- Amount of risky/speculative research
- Volume of research produced

Other practices

This part asks you about **Registered Reports** and **Results-blind review**, two alternative publication mechanisms, which follow a two-stage peer-review system as follows:

- 👍 Authors submit a manuscript that contains **only** their research questions, hypotheses, detailed study designs, and analysis plans, but **absent any description of findings**.
- 👍 Submitted manuscripts meeting standards of methodological rigor receive an “**in-principle acceptance**”, which commits the journal to publish the final paper as long as the procedures described in the initial submission were followed.
- 👍 The authors submit a final manuscript that includes the approved protocol, the results, and the discussion. The second-stage review focuses on compliance with the protocol and whether the conclusions are justified by the evidence.

Importantly:

- In **Registered Reports**, no data collection occurs before the first-stage review process.
- In **Results-blind review**, the data collection and analysis may be ongoing or already completed before submission.

[Q.7.1] Have you **heard** of Registered Reports?

- Yes [1]
- No [0]

[Q.7.2] Have you **heard** of Results-blind review?

- Yes [1]
- No [0]

[Q.7.3] What is your **general opinion** on the following practices? [1=Very unfavorable; 2; 3; 4; 5=Very favorable; 6=Not sure]

- Open data and protocol
- Replication studies
- Registered Reports
- Results-blind review

Role of the ESA

We would like to hear your thoughts on the role that you think the ESA should play in light of recent trends in “Open Science.”

[Q.8.1] What should be the ESA’s role in the use of pre-registration? (EXEC: *Experimental Economics*; JESA: *Journal of the Economic Science Association*) [1=Strongly disagree; 2; 3; 4; 5=Strongly agree]

In my view, the ESA should:

- ... **strongly encourage pre-registration** for all studies submitted to EXEC and JESA.
- ... **mandate pre-registration** for all studies submitted to EXEC and JESA.
- ... provide **guidelines to authors** on how to write a pre-registration.
- ... provide **guidelines to reviewers** on how to evaluate manuscripts with pre-registrations.

[Q.8.2] What **other initiatives** should the ESA consider to promote research transparency and open science?

- Promote open data [1]
- Commit to publishing high-quality replication studies [2]
- Commit to publishing high-quality papers with clear “null” results [3]
- Consider results-blind review (i.e., assessment of paper merits without seeing results) [4]
- Consider pre-data collection review (e.g. Registered Reports) [5]
- Other (please indicate in the box below): [Text box] [6]

[Q.8.3] We will hold a **panel session on pre-registration and pre-analysis plans** at the ESA World Meeting in Lyon (26-29 June).

Please indicate below if there are **any topics** or **discussion points** you would like to be covered by the panel: [Text box]

[Q.8.4] Do you have any other comments or suggestions for the ESA? [Text box]

A little bit more about you

This is the final part of the survey.

[Q.9.1] Are you a member of the Economic Science Association?

- Yes [1]
- No [0]

[Q.9.2] Will you be attending the ESA World Meeting in Lyon (26-29 June)?

- Yes, as a presenter [1]
- Yes, as an attendee [2]
- No [3]

[Q.9.3] What is your gender?

- Male [1]
- Female [2]
- Non-binary / third gender [3]
- Prefer not to say [4]

[Q.9.4] What is your career stage?

- Graduate student [1]
- Post-doctoral scholar [2]
- Assistant Professor (without tenure) [3]
- Assistant Professor (with tenure) [4]
- Associate Professor (without tenure) [5]
- Associate Professor (with tenure) [6]
- Full Professor [7]
- Research Scientist in a non-academic position [8]
- Other (please indicate in the box below): [Text box] [9]

[Q.9.5] Where is your current position **located**, based on the ESA's regional groupings? If you hold several positions, please indicate the location of your **main** position.

- Asia-Pacific [1]
- Europe [2]
- North America [3]
- Other (please indicate in the box below): [Text box] [4]

[Q.9.6] In what **year** did you complete or do you expect to complete your Ph.D.? [Dropdown with numbers: 2028 or later, 2027, ..., 1981, 1980 or earlier]

[Q.9.7] Is economics your primary discipline?


- Yes [1]
- No [0]

[Q.9.8] [If Q.9.6=No] What is your primary discipline? [Text box]

[Q.9.9] [If Q.9.6=Yes] What topics do your main research agenda(s) focus on? Please select all that apply.

- Applied Economics (charitable giving, economic development, labor market, etc.) [1]
- Applied Economics (other) [2]
- Decision Theory (risk, ambiguity, beliefs, time, bounded rationality, learning, etc.) [3]
- Field Experiments [4]
- Games (bargaining, contests, coordination, information, networks, repeated games, etc.) [5]
- Markets (auctions, finance, IO, macroeconomics, market design and matching, etc.) [6]
- Psychology and Biology (cognition, emotions, gender and individual differences, neuroeconomics, etc.) [7]
- Public Choice (public goods and common pool resources, voting and rent-seeking, etc.) [8]
- RCTs / impact evaluation [9]
- Social Behavior (communication, group behavior, lying and cheating, norms and morals, other-regarding preferences, etc.) [10]
- Other (please indicate in the box below): [Text box] [11]

Thank you so much for having taken the time to participate in this survey!

 What's next?

1. We will analyze the data and read all your responses.
2. We will hold a special panel session at the ESA World Meeting in Lyon (26-29 June) where we will mention preliminary results.
3. We will produce a report with the full results and provide some recommendations.
4. We will engage in discussions with the ESA journal editors.

[Q.9.10] In the meantime, please let us know about **any concerns or suggestions** you would like to bring to the ESA, either in the box below or by directly emailing Seda Ertac (sertac@ku.edu.tr), the chair of the ESA Data and Replicability Committee. [Text box]