

Title: Towards a culture of open scholarship: The role of pedagogical communities

Flávio Azevedo¹, Meng Liu², Charlotte R. Pennington³, Madeleine Pownall⁴, Thomas Rhys Evans⁵, Sam Parsons⁶, Mahmoud Elsherif⁷, Leticia Micheli⁸, Samuel Westwood⁹, FORRT¹⁰

1. Department of Communication, Friedrich Schiller University, Germany
(flavio.azevedo@uni-jena.de)
2. University of Cambridge, UK (ml858@cam.ac.uk)
3. School of Psychology, Aston University, Birmingham, UK (c.pennington@aston.ac.uk)
4. University of Leeds, UK (M.V.Pownall@leeds.ac.uk)
5. University of Greenwich, UK (thomas.evans@greenwich.ac.uk)
6. University of Oxford, UK (sam.parsons@psy.ox.ac.uk)
7. University of Birmingham, UK (mxe587@student.bham.ac.uk)
8. Leibniz Universität Hannover, Germany (micheli@psychologie.uni-hannover.de)
9. Department of Psychology, School of Social Science, University of Westminster, London, UK (s.westwood@westminster.ac.uk)
10. FORRT (forrt@forrt.org)

[CrediT/tensing](#)

Corresponding author: flavio.azevedo@uni-jena.de

Abstract

The UK House of Commons Science and Technology Committee has called for evidence on the roles that different stakeholders play in reproducibility and research integrity. Of central priority are proposals for improving research integrity and quality, as well as guidance and support for researchers. In response to this, we argue that there is one important component of research integrity that is often absent from discussion: the pedagogical consequences of how we teach, mentor, and supervise students through *open scholarship*. We justify the need to integrate open scholarship principles into research training within higher education and argue that pedagogical communities play a key role in fostering an inclusive culture of open scholarship. We illustrate these benefits by presenting *A Framework for Open and Reproducible Research Training (FORRT)*, an international grassroots community whose goal is to provide support, resources, visibility, and advocacy for the adoption of principled, open teaching and mentoring practices, whilst generating conversations about the ethics and social impact of higher-education pedagogy. Representing a diverse group of early-career researchers and students across specialisms, we advocate for greater recognition of and support for pedagogical communities, and encourage all research stakeholders to engage with these communities to enable long-term, sustainable change.

Keywords: open scholarship; open educational resources; open science; open research; pedagogy; reproducibility; research integrity.

Introduction

The *open scholarship* movement seeks to make knowledge of all kinds openly shared, transparent, rigorously researched, and inclusive (1, 2). The movement is composed of many grassroots and top-down initiatives that have successfully accelerated adoption of open scholarship practices (e.g., study preregistration, data sharing, replication studies, and open access publishing), bringing well-needed change to research practice. However, wider adoption across disciplines and career stages remains limited, while social injustices in research culture remain a persistent and largely ignored issue (3). One main reason is that most initiatives only encourage open scholarship and higher standards for quality of evidence (4, 5), but fail to address how we teach, mentor, and supervise students through *open scholarship* in higher education. By overlooking the opportunity to reshape the future generation of researchers and consumers of science, we undermine the goal towards permanently redressing perverse academic incentives and research evaluations that undermine research quality and an inclusive research culture (6-8).

The above situation is likely to remain unchanged if initiatives that seek to incorporate open scholarly practices in teaching and mentoring continue to receive no support from stakeholders and no recognition or reward from institutional policies and procedures. In a typical University, for example, the time of faculty members and researchers is spread across teaching, research, and administration, and for those on research contracts, is focused on academic outputs, grants and external engagement. This lack of support and reward works as a disincentive to teaching through open scholarship and, therefore, to promoting best practice in research integrity and culture. As a result, even though the wave of scientific reform is influencing scientific practices

and norms globally, the current model of higher education is largely outdated with respect to open scholarship with many students finishing their degree without ever learning about the ‘credibility crisis’ or open scholarship practices (9).

We propose that pedagogical communities play a fundamental role in incorporating open scholarship in higher education with the view to improve future research practice and culture. Pedagogical communities are educationally-oriented ‘open science communities’ (10) that make open science knowledge accessible and facilitate communication between academia and policy. They also advocate for the integration of open scholarship into higher education and raise awareness of its pedagogical implications and associated challenges. Pedagogical communities equip educators with the necessary didactic tools to incorporate open scholarship into curricula and educators’ teaching, mentoring, and research practices.

In what follows, we outline the advantages of integrating open scholarship into higher education. We discuss what pedagogical communities can bring to the open scholarship movement, and exemplify their potential benefits with one such community. We call for greater collaboration between pedagogical communities and all the stakeholders of research to minimise the demands of introducing open scholarship pedagogy and to improve—and make future-proof—research integrity.

Main text

What are the benefits of integrating open scholarship into higher education?

We believe that teaching—and involving students in the discussion of—open scholarship and reproducibility has at least three unique benefits.

First, the content of most undergraduate and postgraduate courses in social and health sciences may unnecessarily disadvantage students who wish to have a career in academic scholarship or to transfer their research skills to outside academia. Specifically, open scholarship is generally not taught in higher education yet is increasingly being practiced in research, thereby creating misalignment between research practice and what is taught. This misalignment is visible by the fact that many so-called standard practices taught to students are arguably equivalent to questionable research practices (e.g., reporting post-hoc analyses as confirmatory, discouraging replication studies, focusing on novel research) that undermine research integrity, meaning that students who wish to conduct high quality research have to unlearn what they have been taught. Not only is this a waste of resources, it is also a missed opportunity to put students in a position of strength and at competitive advantage in their career ahead.

Second, from the perspective of researchers, the integration of open and reproducible practices into teaching facilitates the alignment between research belief and research practice. We argue that open research is incomplete without open educational practices. Core values such as openness, transparency, inclusivity, accessibility, and reproducibility are not exclusive to research alone and should be embedded in teaching. Training our future researchers and consumers of science through open scholarship allows open science practices to become the norm and to be passed on to the next generation, cumulatively consolidating the foundation for a sustainable future.

Third, integrating open scholarship into higher education advances social justice which, whilst being the most fundamental, is arguably one of the most overlooked tenets

of contemporary scholarship (11). Indeed, open scholarship, including open educational resources, is underpinned by the powerful idea that knowledge is a public good for all of humanity (11-13). Current academic systems help perpetuate global inequalities with prescribed dogmas, reinforced hierarchies, and hidden curricula. There are still systematic barriers to accessing scientific knowledge, where barriers exist not only between and within institutions but also between academia and the public. Integrating open educational resources into higher education can remove barriers to entry and career progression to enhance diversity and representation within science.

While there are few notable exceptions (e.g., 14-16), attempts to incorporate open scholarship in higher education requires a crowd-sourced, community-based effort. Pedagogical communities exemplify a promising pathway towards a culture of open scholarship practices in research, education and training through empowering individual members of the research community. This includes not only those who conduct research on a day-to-day basis, but also students who constitute our future.

Bridging the gap: The role of pedagogical communities

Fostering a culture of open scholarship practices through communities (e.g., FORRT, CREP, ReproducibiliTEA, R4E, OSCs, PaPOR TRaIL, ProjectTier, RIOT Science Club, OSKB, and BITSS) can bring important benefits to the academic community. Despite the different mission and scope of these initiatives, all are working towards integrating open scholarship into higher education while helping advance research integrity, transparency, reproducibility, and ethics through pedagogical reform. Pedagogical communities are key in facilitating the co-creation of open scholarship educational materials. Resources and didactics '*by educators for educators*' are crucial

in facilitating the integration of open scholarship into higher education and reducing the burden placed on scholars. Pedagogical communities also offer a much-needed environment wherein scholars share individual experiences, identify common hurdles, and iteratively enhance their pedagogy towards better addressing the unique challenges ensuing from curricular reform. Through these exchanges, pedagogical communities help create a culture of open scholarship, benefiting those within the community, and those that interact with it.

Pedagogical communities also offer a low-entry point into improved research and pedagogical practices. As pedagogical communities welcome scholars from all levels, and often particularly early career researchers, they are an accessible space for educators wishing to learn and practice open scholarship. By cutting across career stages, these communities become essential to instilling the new and improved values and norms of open scholarship.

Further, pedagogical communities play a key role in offering a sense of community to those who would otherwise be deprived of such a learning opportunity when there are fewer top-down initiatives and infrastructure to encourage change. As such, these communities are essential to address recent concerns regarding the lack of diversity in the open scholarship movement (e.g. 17-21). By breaking the boundaries of academic fields and geographical locations, such communities contribute to the advancement of social justice, making the movement more diverse and representative of the plural needs of academics.

A roadmap towards creating open pedagogies for open scholarship practices

Established in 2018, the Framework of Open and Reproducible Research Training (FORRT) is one such pedagogical community aiming to build, together with educators and students, a pathway to the stepwise adoption of principled, open teaching and mentoring practices, whilst also generating a conversation about the ethics and social impact of higher-education pedagogy. It responds to calls for a wider interpretation of open scholarship as inclusive scholarship (e.g., 21-23) by involving those at all stages of learning. In this sense, FORRT's mission seeks to empower teachers and their students, who may find it otherwise challenging, to not only develop strong competencies in this area but also incorporate open scholarship into their teaching and learning.

To achieve its aims, FORRT has accomplished 12 unique initiatives to date (11), which also illustrate the role that pedagogical communities play in co-creating materials that lower barriers to entry into open scholarship (<https://forrt.org/nexus>). One far-reaching initiative addresses the lack of open source educational resources, which is essential to facilitate engagement with, and adherence to, research integrity and transparency, replicability, reproducibility, openness, and accessibility. Thus, in a hackathon held at the 2021 Society for the Improvement of Psychological Science Annual Conference, the FORRT community drew from experts, interested parties, and stakeholders to co-create several evidence-based, publicly accessible lesson plans and >60 ready-to-run activities that are accompanied by teaching notes and can be integrated into existing taught courses (see <https://forrt.org/lesson-plans>; Pownall et al. [2]). Another important initiative aimed to deal with the overwhelming new (and

ever-evolving) nomenclature in open scholarships, which can act as a barrier to incorporating open scholarship into higher education. Here, over 100 members of the FORRT community produced a consensus-based, editable Glossary of over 250 terms and their concise definitions with supporting references (<https://forrt.org/glossary>; Parsons et al. [1]). The glossary will hopefully usher in a shared perspective and language to benefit researchers and teachers alike, whether experienced or newcomers to open scholarship, whilst also highlighting important considerations for social justice by making a wide range of accessibility and inclusivity-related terms well-represented within its language. Lastly, to reduce the burden on educators aiming to integrate open and reproducible practices into their teaching and mentoring, and aid in the learning process of any person interested in staying up-to-date with the open scholarship literature, FORRT has prepared over 200 summaries of academic articles related to varied topics on open and reproducible practices (<https://forrt.org/summaries>).

Outlook

Although there is momentum behind improving research quality, longer-term and far-reaching change both in practice and in culture is only possible with initiatives that train high quality research practices within higher education. Regrettably, to date, the responsibility for incorporating open scholarship principles into education and training has heavily relied on the initiative of early adopters of the scholarship movement. Pedagogical communities are one instrumental initiative that provide a road map and resources to help incorporate open scholarship principles into education and training more broadly, and yet recognition of and support for these communities continues to be near absent. Pedagogical open scholarship communities—whether

focusing on creating and developing new methods of education, addressing the new challenges of curricular reforms ensuing from new and improved research norms, or highlighting the importance of epistemic, cultural, and demographic diversity—are an essential component of a broad range of solutions ensuing from the credibility revolution (5). Given their importance, we advocate for greater support and recognition of pedagogical communities. Specifically, stakeholders in education and research should provide instrumental support for these communities, and we encourage that researchers, educators and teachers also engage with these initiatives so as to jointly shape a more accessible and widely-disseminated open scholarship culture. We also see an important role of governance and funding agencies in strengthening pedagogical communities. Currently, pedagogical communities depend on the voluntary effort of its members. A strategic use of funding will seed longer-term sustainable pedagogical communities by guaranteeing resources to help fund awareness-raising and training events, and facilitate the production of impactful scholarly outputs that allow others to incorporate open scholarship in educational materials. In addition, the flexibility granted by financial resources can be an important catalyst for the creation and development of new initiatives and pedagogical materials.

In conclusion, we (a) stress that it is critical to embed training in reproducibility and research integrity into higher education pedagogy to ensure long-term sustainable change; and (b) call for greater collaboration with pedagogical communities, paving the way for a much needed integration of top-down and grassroots open scholarship initiatives.

List of abbreviations

CREP: Crowdsourced Replication Project; R4E: Reproducibility for Everyone; OSCs: Open Science Communities; PaPOR TRaIL: Principles and Practices of Open Research: Teaching, Research, Impact, and Learning; ProjectTier: Teaching Integrity in Empirical Research; OSKB: Open Scholarship Knowledge Base; and BITSS: Berkeley Initiative for Transparency in the Social Sciences.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate: Not applicable.

Consent for publication: all authors give consent for publication. Availability of data and materials: all resources discussed in this article are available at forrt.org.

Competing interests: authors declare no competing interests.

Funding: *Not applicable.*

Authors' contributions: Conceptualization: F.A. Project administration: F.A. Writing - original draft: F.A., M.L., C.R.P., M.P., T.R.E., S.P., M.M.E., and L.M. Writing - review & editing: F.A., M.L., C.R.P., M.P., T.R.E., S.P., M.M.E., L.M., and S.W.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank David Moreau for his comments on an earlier draft.

References

1. Parsons S, Azevedo F, Elsherif MM, Guay S, Shahim ON, Govaart GH, et al.. Community-Sourced Glossary of Open Scholarship Terms. [Preprint] 2021.

2. Pownall M, Azevedo F, Aldoh A, Elsherif MM, Vasilev MR, Pennington CR, et al. Embedding open and reproducible science into teaching: A bank of lesson plans and resources. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*. 2021. DOI: 10.1037/stl0000307.
3. Wellcome Trust. What researchers think about the culture they work in. [Internet]. 2021 [cited 5 November 2021] Available from: <https://wellcome.org/sites/default/files/what-researchers-think-about-the-culture-they-work-in.pdf>
4. Munafò MR, Nosek BA, Bishop DV, Button KS, Chambers CD, Du Sert NP, et al. A manifesto for reproducible science. *Nature human behaviour*. 2017;1(1):1-9. Doi: 10.1038/s41562-016-0021
5. Vazire S. Implications of the credibility revolution for productivity, creativity, and progress. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. 2018;13(4):411-7. Doi: [10.1177/1745691617751884](https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617751884)
6. Nosek BA, Bar-Anan Y. Scientific utopia: I. Opening scientific communication. *Psychological Inquiry*. 2012;23(3):217-43. Doi: 10.1080/1047840X.2012.692215
7. Nosek BA, Spies JR, Motyl M. Scientific utopia: II. Restructuring incentives and practices to promote truth over publishability. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. 2012;7(6):615-31. DOI: [10.1177/1745691612459058](https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691612459058)
8. Uhlmann EL, Ebersole CR, Chartier CR, Errington TM, Kidwell MC, Lai CK, et al.. Scientific utopia III: Crowdsourcing science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. 2019;14(5):711-33. Doi: [10.1177/1745691619850561](https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691619850561)

9. Chopik WJ, Bremner RH, Defever AM, Keller VN. How (and whether) to teach undergraduates about the replication crisis in psychological science. *Teaching of Psychology*. 2018;45(2):158-63. Doi: 10.1177/0098628318762900
10. Armeni K, Brinkman L, Carlsson R, Eerland A, Fijten R, Fondberg R, et al. Towards wide-scale adoption of open science practices: The role of open science communities. *Science and Public Policy*. 2021; scab039. Doi: 10.1093/scipol/scab039
11. FORRT. Introducing a Framework for Open and Reproducible Research Training (FORRT). *PsyArXiv [Preprint]* 2019. DOI: 10.31219/osf.io/bnh7p.
12. Merton RK. *The sociology of science: Theoretical and empirical investigations*. University of Chicago press; 1973.
13. Smith MS, Casserly CM. The promise of open educational resources. *Change: The Magazine of higher learning*. 2006;38(5):8-17. Doi: 10.3200/CHNG.38.5.8-17
14. Button KS, Chambers CD, Lawrence N, Munafò MR. Grassroots training for reproducible science: A consortium-based approach to the empirical dissertation. *Psychology Learning & Teaching*. 2020;19(1):77-90. Doi: [10.1177/1475725719857659](https://doi.org/10.1177/1475725719857659)
15. Wagge JR, Brandt MJ, Lazarevic LB, Legate N, Christopherson C, Wiggins B, Grahe JE. Publishing research with undergraduate students via replication work: The collaborative replications and education project. *Frontiers in psychology*. 2019;10:247. Doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00247

16. Feldman G. Mass Replications & Extensions (CORE) [Internet]. Mgto.org. 2021 [cited 2021 Sep 24]. Available from:
<https://mgto.org/pre-registered-replications/>
17. Nathan MJ, Lewis N Jr, Hope E. Universities say they want more diverse faculties. So why is academia still so white? [Internet]. FiveThirtyEight. 2021 [cited 2021 Sep 24]. Available from:
https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/universities-say-they-want-more-diverse-faculties-so-why-is-academia-still-so-white/amp/?__twitter_impression=true
18. Onie S. Redesign open science for Asia, Africa and Latin America. *Nature*. 2020;587(7832):35–7. doi: 10.1038/d41586-020-03052-3
19. Roberts SO, Bareket-Shavit C, Dollins FA, Goldie PD, Mortenson E. Racial inequality in psychological research: Trends of the past and recommendations for the future. *Perspectives on psychological science*. 2020;15(6):1295–309. [Doi: 10.1177/1745691620927709](https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620927709)
20. Steltenpohl CN, Montilla Doble LJ, Basnight-Brown D, Dutra NB, Belaus A, Kung C-C, et al. Society for the Improvement of Psychological Science Global Engagement Task Force Report. *PsyArXiv [Preprint]* 2021. DOI: 10.31234/osf.io/4upqd
21. Whitaker K, Guest O. # bropenscience is broken science. *The Psychologist*. 2020;33:34-7.
22. Albornoz D, Chan L. Power and inequality in Open Science discourses. *IRIS -Revista de Informação, Memória e Tecnologia*. 2018;4(1):70-9.
23. Bahlai C, Bartlett LJ, Burgio KR, Fournier AM, Keiser CN, Poisot T, et al. Open science isn't always open to all scientists. *American Scientist*. 2019;107(2):78-82.

