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The Open Science Movement

- Improving Openness, Integrity, and Reproducibility of Scientific Research

**Identified problems**
- Reproducibility
- Access to data and code
- Bias for positive results

**Available solutions**
- Replicability projects
- Repositories (OSF, Git)
- Preregistration, Archives
The Open Science Movement

- Improving Openness, Integrity, and Reproducibility of Scientific Research

- Identified problems
  - Reproducibility
  - Access to data and code
  - Bias for positive results

- Available solutions
  - Replicability projects*
  - Repositories (OSF, Git)
  - Preregistration, Archives

Reproducibility is not for all types of science but biased toward lab, experimental sciences. Also tends to reinforce the idea of ‘sound vs soft’ sciences.

*Replication is not sufficient to “curb the natural selection of bad science” and improve the quality of publications and the probability that results are true results. Smaldino & McElreath (2016)
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- Improving Openness, Integrity, and Reproducibility of Scientific Research

Identified problems
- Reproducibility
- Access to data and code
- Bias for positive results

Available solutions
- Replicability projects
- Repositories (OSF, Git)
- Preregistration, Archives

Reproducibility is not for all types of science but biased toward lab, experimental sciences. Tends to reinforce the idea of sound vs not sound sciences.

++ Exponential growth of publications
Going back to the origins of the troubles

- How did we end up there?

What went wrong that we now need to convince researchers of the benefits of opening science?
Why do we need Open Science tools to ‘fix’ scientific practices?

We need to go to the roots of the contemporary problems that academia is facing.
Going back to the origins of the troubles

"The research culture has also changed in the last few decades. It is more **competitive**, everything is happening **fast** and putting a lot of **pressure** on everyone, [...] students are **more protective of their ideas** and in a **hurry** to put them out, by **fear** that someone else would be working on the same thing elsewhere, and in general a PhD ends up with at least **50% more papers** than what I gather it was 20 or 30 years ago."

*Yoshua Bengio (2020, Feb.)*

---

The Tyranny of the **Top Five Journals**: "Getting published in a top five economics journal is a **near-requiment for tenure**. But it’s a poor measure of research quality within a system that **punishes creativity.**"

*James Heckman and Sidharth Moktan (2018, Oct.)*

Rogue ESR survey (2500 resp., 2020 May): 50% of the respondents admit to publish episodically or regularly **unfinished works**. 14% also declare having done so "once". 68% say they do **not have the time to follow the state of research** in their field.
Going back to the origins of the troubles

more papers = more knowledge?

→ Cumulation of knowledge

What do we do with that knowledge?
Going back to the origins of the troubles

more papers = more knowledge?

Amitangshu Acharya
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How is this going to work? So many manuscripts being submitted to journals on a daily basis. Who has time to review & give each the time needed? Large volumes of low quality papers keeps getting published without thorough scrutiny. This is a serious disservice to science.
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Going back to the origins of the troubles

"The research culture has also changed in the last few decades. It is more competitive, everything is happening fast and putting a lot of pressure on everyone, the field has grown exponentially in size, students are more protective of their ideas and are in a hurry to put them out, by fear that someone else would be working on the same thing elsewhere, and in general a PhD ends up with at least 50% more papers than what I gather it was 20 or 30 years ago."

Yoshua Bengio (2020, Feb.)

The Tyranny of the Top Five Journals: "Getting published in a top five economics journal is a near-requirement for tenure. But it’s a poor measure of research quality within a system that punishes creativity."

James Heckman and Sidharth Moktan (2018, Oct.)

- Publish or perish culture ➔ competition
- Consequences of the heavy use of metrics ➔ following the publication pace has become impossible

Rogue ESR survey (2500 resp., 2020 May): 50% of the respondents admit to publish episodically or regularly unfinished works. 14% also declare having done so "once". 68% say they do not have the time to follow the state of research in their field.
Going back to the origins of the troubles

- Quest for excellence → homogenised criteria
- External reward (metrics)

→ Fast science

- Competition instead of cooperation
- Harking, p-hacking
- Cumulation of publications
- Threatened peer-reviewing system
Going back to the origins of the troubles

→ Fast science

- Quest for excellence → homogenised criteria
- External reward (metrics)
- No time to waste, especially not for “futile” questions (societal, ethical)
- Ivory tower of Science (as a monolith)

- Competition instead of cooperation
- Harking, p-hacking
- Cumulation of publications
- Threatened peer-reviewing system
- Not enough (time for) questioning
- Science as an Authority
Open Science is hardly fixing Academia

- External reward = incentives to open your research (badges, new metrics)
- Open-washing practices not necessarily addressed
- Publication-based research not challenged

“Making science better is not just about “creating better incentives”, but a collective cultural shift beyond viewing competition and individualistic success as the sole defining feature of science.”

*Lancaster et al. 2018*
Open Science is hardly fixing Academia

- External reward = incentives to open your research (badges, new metrics)
- Open-washing practices not necessarily addressed
- Publication-based research not challenged

Disclaimer: the Open science movement is useful but it doesn’t go far enough!

“Making science better is not just about “creating better incentives”, but a collective cultural shift beyond viewing competition and individualistic success as the sole defining feature of science.”

Lancaster et al. 2018
The philosophy of Slow Science

What Slow Science is not:

◦ Asking you to slow down your pace
◦ Limiting the number of publications
◦ Publishing one paper every ten years
◦ A hippie alternative
◦Disconnected from society
◦ Going back to an idealised Golden Age of Science

http://slow-science.org/
The analogy with the Slow Food movement

“a world in which all people can access and enjoy food that is good for them, for those who grow it and for the planet”

- Comprehensive approach of the strong connections between plate, planet, people, politics and culture
- Preserving the local ecosystem: traditional and regional cuisine and farming characteristics
- Focus on food quality, rather than quantity

Globalisation: a process in which small and local farmers and food producers should be simultaneously protected from and included in the global food system
The analogy with the Slow Food movement

“a world in which all people can access and enjoy science that is good for them, for those who make it and for the planet”

- Comprehensive approach of the strong connections between researchers, industries, ‘connoisseurs’, citizens, politics/funding
- Preserving the local ecosystem: traditions and specificities of different disciplines (different time scales, evaluation criteria)
- Focus on research quality, rather than quantity

→ Globalisation: a process in which small universities, less known researchers, less economically strong countries, researchers from minorities... should be simultaneously protected from and included in global academia
The philosophy of Slow Science

What Slow Science is about: Developing a **sustainable research praxis**

- What kind of research do we want? How do we see academia in a couple of years, or in a decade?
- How do we define the job of a researcher?
- How do we assess the good value of a piece of research?
- What is the relevance of my question? Of my study?
- What do I do with my knowledge?

→ **We need to reform/rethink academia, not to fix it**

"ethics lies at the very heart of scientific endeavours and much of our work revolves around ethical considerations. Researchers are used to thinking about and discussing ethical matters; we can build on that and extend this tradition to reflective action on the way we construct our communities."

Chapman et al., 2019
The philosophy of Slow Science

What Slow Science is about: Developing a **sustainable research praxis**

Slow science relies on a collective praxis, dependent on wondering, thinking, discussing and sharing in recurring cycles.

*Time and space are the essential resources for exercising professional judgement, for imagining (radical) alternatives, for critical playfulness and for ‘exposure to diversity and difference regarding ways of seeing and being in the world’.*
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What Slow Science is about: Developing a **sustainable research praxis**

Slow science relies on a collective praxis, dependent on wondering, thinking, discussing and sharing in recurring cycles.

**Time and space are the essential resources for exercising professional judgement, for imagining (radical) alternatives, for critical playfulness and for ‘exposure to diversity and difference regarding ways of seeing and being in the world’**.

**Slow science as an open, collective and public praxis**

→ One goal is to improve the **dialogue** between academia and citizens.

Patience, receptiveness, carefulness, reflection and mindfulness
What Slow Science is about: Developing a **sustainable research praxis**

“This is generous thinking: listening to one another, recognizing that we have as much to learn as we do to teach, finding ways to use our collective knowledge for the public good. From the broadest rethinking of our political and institutional landscape, to developing new ways of working in public, to sharing our ways of reading, to focusing on the most intimate practice of listening — at each level, we must be connected to, fully part of, the world around us”

*Fitzpatrick, 2019*
Where to begin?

- Organise discussions within your team/lab, start the conversation!
  - Challenge our injunctions, think about our relation to the non academic worlds*
- Be curious to other disciplines, broaden your perspectives
- If you are an Editor, use your power to challenge top tier journal publication criteria!
- Check the Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)
- Explore and imagine alternative ways of doing science
  - E.g.: Independent institutes, independent scholars, part-time researchers

* You can check this Wellcome initiative for some inspiration: https://reimagineresearchwellcome.uk.engagementhq.com/Reimagine-Research
Challenging the pipeline narrative

Fixing the pipeline:
- Adjusting flow in the pipeline
- Adapting to the pipeline
- Finding another pipeline
- Thinking outside the pipeline

By framing solutions in terms of “fixing the pipeline”, the underlying career structures for scientists remain largely unchallenged.

The traditional scientific career pipeline (Lancaster et al. 2018)
Existing initiatives and structures

- Slow science in Belgium
  https://slowscience.be/
- The Ronin Institute
  http://ronininstitute.org/
- The Research Cooperative
  https://researchcooperative.org/
- DORA
  https://sfdora.org/
- PICompS
  https://picomps.org/
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