

The results of a big replication project in psychology published three years ago caused significant uneasiness in the social science community. The results of that project indicate that fewer than half of the replication studies delivered results similar to the ones reported in the original studies. The research on replicability and reproducibility of scientific findings is becoming one of the fastest developing area of research in many disciplines, usually delivering similarly troubling results. The issue of reproducibility of findings constitutes a significant challenge also in the management science. It has been shown, that low level of reproducibility is caused not only by variation of human and organizational behavior but also results from engagement in questionable research practices such as stretching of statistical significance (*p-hacking*) and hypothesizing after results are known (*HARKing*).

Thus far the research on the replication issue focuses on causes of replication failures and factors leading to few replication studies being published on the pages of management journals. At the same time, a silent assumption is made, that publication of failure to replicate affects the trust towards the research that could not be replicated. The first goal of the proposed project is to check if this assumption is true. Does publication of a replication study affect the perception of the original study? Does failure to replicate lowers scholars' trust toward the study, that could not be replicated?

The second goal amounts to exploring which features of a replication study affect its success, understood both as an ability to replicate earlier findings, and as the resonance the replication study achieves in the community of management scholars.

The third goal is to discover if and how the editorial policies of management journals address the issue of replication crisis. Have such journals recently introduced changes, intended to increase both replicability and reproducibility of scholarly findings? Has the management science community responded to the replication crisis similarly as the community of psychologists? Has it introduced requirements regarding data and code availability similar to the requirements which are becoming standard in economics?