Industrial and Organizational Psychology, page 1 of 5
doi:10.1017/iop.2022.70

COMMENTARY

A brighter vision of the potential of open science for benefiting practice: A ManyOrgs proposal

Christopher M. Castille[1]*, Tine Köhler[2], and Ernest H. O'Boyle[3]

[1]Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, USA, [2]University of Melbourne, Parkville, Australia and [3]Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA
*Corresponding author: Email: christopher.castille@nicholls.edu

Guzzo et al., (2022) are correct in pointing out key challenges that open science principles and practices present to us as an applied discipline. Our commentary on Guzzo et al., (2022) focuses on three points they make. First, Guzzo et al., (2022) recognize the need for greater collaboration between academics and practitioners in adapting open science practices to applied settings. Such collaboration is needed to avoid harming both our practical relevance and our scientific integrity. Second, Guzzo et al. raise meaningful concerns about incentivizing open science practices, which they frame as harming applied research. Third, they acknowledge open science discussions on the need for replication. Interestingly, in contrast to open science advocates, they urge our stakeholders to prioritize conceptual replication (new approach to testing the same idea) over direct replication (same materials and methods, new observations), providing big data research as an exemplar of conceptual replication research.

In essence, Guzzo et al. frame open science as the enemy of practice. We wonder if this framing is helpful for making our science stronger and better. Additionally, their recommendations—relying on big data, incentivizing conceptual replication, and the selective use of pre-registration—do not address the deeper issues motivating the open science movement, namely that publication and outcome reporting bias are pervasive (e.g., Banks et al., 2016) and traced to a key problem: insufficient resources. How have other sciences addressed this problem? Physicists overcame resource problems by pooling resources, giving rise to powerful tools such as the James Webb Telescope and Large Hadron Collider. Such tools could not have been created without the collaboration of many scientists and institutional bodies pooling and sharing what they can. Similarly, psychologists have pooled limited resources to overcome longtime shortcomings facing our discipline (for a review, see Uhlmann et al., 2019).

What is needed is a compelling vehicle for pooling our resources. How might leveraging open science practices promote greater collaboration between academics and practitioners? How could we incentivize the thoughtful uptake and application of open science practice among academics and practitioners? How do we incentivize replications? With our commentary, we add to Guzzo et al.'s piece by addressing these three questions. Specifically, we draw inspiration from an innovation emerging from the open science movement—crowdsourced multisite replication research (Moshontz et al., 2018; Uhlmann et al., 2019). There has been little discussion about leveraging crowdsourced multisite replication research in field settings of interest to Industrial-Organizational (IO) psychology (i.e., organizations). We hope to prompt this discussion by proposing that IO psychologists form a crowdsourced multisite replication initiative that services field settings. We outline one possible initiative (we call it "ManyOrgs") and explain how it offers a pragmatic (if challenging) solution to problems facing our field.