

Peer-reviewed academic journal
Innovative Issues and Approaches in
Social Sciences

IIASS – VOL. 11, NO. 2, MAY 2018

Innovative Issues and Approaches in Social Sciences

IIASS is a double blind peer review academic journal published 3 times yearly (January, May, September) covering different social sciences: political science, sociology, economy, public administration, law, management, communication science, psychology and education.

| 2

IIASS has started as a Sldip – Slovenian Association for Innovative Political Science journal and is now being published in the name of CEOs d.o.o. by Zalozba Vega (publishing house).

Typeset

This journal was typeset in 11 pt. Arial, Italic, Bold, and Bold Italic; the headlines were typeset in 14 pt. Arial, Bold

Abstracting and Indexing services

COBISS, International Political Science Abstracts, CSA Worldwide Political Science Abstracts, CSA Sociological Abstracts, PAIS International, DOAJ.

Publication Data:

CEOs d.o.o.

Innovative issues and approaches in social sciences

ISSN 1855-0541

Additional information: www.iiass.com

CITIZEN SCIENCE PILOT EXPERIMENT IN HIGH SCHOOLS

Frane Adam¹

| 51

Abstract

The paper contains three parts. The first part presents the theoretical backgrounds of the relationship between science and civil society, and the concept as well as concrete examples of the Citizen Science. The second part reports the results of a pilot study of young students from five (Slovenian) High Schools. In the third part, so-called group-feedback analysis with the participation of students is considered, regarded as a contribution to the concept of the Citizen Science Experiment.

Keywords: citizen science, high schools, ecology, sustainable development, curriculum, civil society, biology, sociology

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12959/issn.1855-0541.IIASS-2018-no2-art3>

Frane Adam, Dr. Prof., Director of the Institute for Developmental and Strategic Analyses (Ljubljana). E-mail: frane.adam@guest.arnes.si

Introduction

The period we are currently living in is marked by scientific discoveries and technological innovations in all fields, on all levels. The natural and technical sciences in particular are included in this. It is very important that part of the humanities and social sciences is given the opportunity to become an ideal platform for reflecting on and monitoring the effects of technical/scientific applications on society and the environment. We have recently encountered two processes. The first is called the scientification of society and the everyday life of the individual. The second may be denoted the socialisation of science. We can talk about the socialisation of science when science becomes the subject of wider reflections. Important foundations for it are interdisciplinarity and ensuring the inclusion of all interested and well-informed citizens in scientific research and technological applications.

But what is the true meaning of such inclusiveness? It cannot be related to the politicisation of science but, on the contrary, to greater respect for people, namely those who are directly affected by scientific discoveries and technological applications. Inclusiveness in this respect assumes organised civil society and active citizens; active not only in a social but also in a cognitive sense and in the sense of long-term strategic policymaking. What needs to be emphasised here is the popularisation of science and technology through the media and spreading the network of non-governmental organisations dealing with this type of popularisation and knowledge transfer.

The main concern and orientation of our paper that emerges from two research projects is how to make young people familiar with the scientific way of thinking and problem-solving.² We decided to focus on ecology, environmental aspects and the challenges of sustainable development. These topics form part of both the social and natural/technical sciences. Moreover, they also serve as an inspiration for personal growth and social engagement (Shirk et al., 2012).

² This paper is mainly based on research in a project called STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics) for Youth within the Horizon scheme funded by the EU Commission, where IRSA is one of the partners (see www.institute-irsa.si). In addition, the small project “Pioneers: Citizen Science Experiment in High Schools” has to be mentioned. It was funded by the American Embassy in the framework of calls for projects for NGOs. In this connection, the collaborators Nick Vovk, Barbara Tomšič, Francesca Lori and the late Toni Pustovrh who contributed to these two projects should be acknowledged.

This paper has three parts. The first presents the theoretical backgrounds of the relationship between science and civil society, and the concept of the Citizen Science Experiment (CSE), which has proven to be a successful instrument for the socialisation of science and participation of non-scientists from civil society. The second part reports the results of a pilot study of young students from five high schools (grammar schools), which also involves other activities such as discussions with young students and teachers. In the third part, so-called group feedback analysis is applied, regarded as a contribution to the concept of the Citizen Science Experiment. At the end, we provide a short summary and a conclusion.

Civil society and the socialisation of science

The proliferation of civil society organisations (CSOs) as bearers and generators of knowledge and expertise should also be viewed in connection with the emerging knowledge-based society, or the learning society and learning organisation. Only in such an environment is there a possibility of deliberative democracy, which brings about new actions and a new understanding of the role of civil society. There is no doubt that, within this frame of reference, a certain type of 'elitism' cannot be avoided. It is quite clear the deliberative democracy model itself presupposes meritocratic characteristics, such as articulated knowledge, the ability to enter into public dialogue, and well-informed actors.

CSOs can play an important role as a mediator between politics, business and science and the rest of society and thereby help to establish a new developmental discourse and in the making of more carefully considered political decisions. Conversely, new approaches to the sociology of science underline the distinction between 'reliable science' (scientification) and 'socially robust science', (socialisation) meaning a new social contract between science and society with an emphasis on wider stakeholder inclusion and policy deliberation on the long-term implications for implementing scientific and technological innovations (Nowotny et al., 2003).

CSOs can also play a vital role as a mediator and 'translator' between scientific expertise and the broader public. It must be taken into account that: "Since expertise now has to bring together knowledge that is itself distributed, contextualised and heterogeneous, it cannot arise at one specific site, or out of the views of one scientific discipline or group of highly respected researchers. Rather it must emerge from bringing together the many different 'knowledge dimensions' involved. Its authority depends on the way in which such a collective group is linked, often in a self-organized way" (Gibbons, 1999: 6). In this connection, the

paradigm of the Mode 2 production of knowledge highlights socially distributed, application-oriented and trans-disciplinary knowledge which is subject to multiple accountabilities (Nowotny et al., 2003). The participation of citizens and stakeholders is an essential part of the research process and reflexivity.

In the last decade, the growing distrust of the general public in developed countries in the objectivity and reliability of scientific expertise, especially concerning the societal benefits, risks and unintended consequences of new developments in science and technology, has led to the forming of tentative mechanisms to enable the inclusion of a broader range of knowledge and opinions from various stakeholders in the scientific and technological research, development and deployment process, ideally creating a two-way channel between scientists and the various publics. This has become especially salient given the extensive implications of existing technologies, such as nuclear technology and biotechnology, and the new and emerging technologies like nanotechnology (Roco et al., 2011), synthetic biology (Schmidt et al., 2009) and human enhancement technologies (Savulescu et al., 2011).

The report of the Expert group on the Global Governance of Science, for example, proposes several new exchange mechanisms on the interfaces between the “society of science” and general society that could maximise the societal good and minimise the risks and negative consequences of scientific and technological processes and products, possibly even allowing some degree of societal control over what kinds of innovations and resulting social changes will be introduced (Mitcham and Stilgoe, 2009). This approach has also been further elaborated under the concept of “responsible research and innovation”, which seeks to foster the ‘right’ impacts of science and technology, that is, socially desirable innovation in a broad sense, by enabling the establishment of deliberative mechanisms that on one hand inform experts such as scientists and policymakers about public opinions, preferences and debates and, on the other, inform other stakeholders and the public about proposed scientific and technological funding, research and development directions (von Schomberg, 2011).

These approaches strive to take account of both the serendipitous nature of scientific discovery and the need to steer scientific and technological development into socially desirable and beneficial applications, as well as towards society’s pressing problems. In the scope of ‘socially responsible innovation’, approaches that include deliberations with a wide range of stakeholders and especially various

segments of the public as key elements, CSOs could perform important functions, especially as mediating agents between the society of science and policymakers on one side, and the civil society and other stakeholders on the other.

Attempts to identify and address potential ethical, legal and societal implications (Sanderson, 2009), including the risks and benefits, of new scientific and technological development in the “upstream”, namely the early phase of funding and setting of research trajectories, all require the broad collaboration of the actors directly engaged in research and other affected stakeholders, including citizens. As the mediation of individual citizens’ preferences and opinions to the key actors represents one of the great challenges in modern knowledge societies, CSOs are best suited to organising and aggregating such atomised knowledge, even though specific aspects and minority voices are often lost in this process. Such collaborations would ideally result in the exchange of knowledge and expertise, and in better general acceptance of innovations that address specific, widely recognised societal needs.³

As is evident, all these requirements regarding knowledge production systems in modern knowledge societies point to a strong need to develop “hybrid forums” (Callon et al., 2009) where experts, policymakers and citizens discuss and create new approaches for the social regulation of science and technology. Currently best placed among the institutions that could feature mechanisms and channels for stakeholder and citizen inclusion in science and technology deliberations are National Ethics Committees (NECs), expert bodies that provide policy advice on ethically and socially contentious technologies at the level of individual nations. However, a recent overview of NECs in 32 European countries (Mali et al., 2011) shows that less than half of these feature distinct mechanisms for public involvement.

Further, a majority feature passive mechanisms, meaning one-way channels of knowledge flow from experts to the public for the purpose of

³ It is worth mentioning once again that practically all CSOs have their own interests and agendas. Two illustrative examples in the discourse on the desirability of radical new technologies are the international transhumanist umbrella organisation Humanity Plus (Humanity+, 2011) which promotes the wide development and use of advanced technology to drastically improve the human condition, with goals ranging from radically extended life-spans to greatly enhanced cognitive abilities. On the other side, the international cultural and ecological conservation Action Group on Erosion, Technology and Concentration (ETC Group, 2011) rejects such technologies due to their negative impacts outweighing any benefits they might introduce. Such ideologies are diametrically opposed, but the new models of deliberation and participation would ideally enable CSOs with converging or diverging agendas to influence each other, eventually arriving at a mutually desirable direction for society’s development that would be communicated to policymakers and influence science and technology policy decisions.

informing and educating, and only a minority feature active mechanisms, meaning two-way channels that enable the exchange of knowledge, preferences and opinions between experts on one side and stakeholders and the general public on the other. Among the latter NECs are those of Germany, with its open meetings for a public exchange of views, the Netherlands, with its enlarged special thematic committees, Portugal, with its Citizenship Forum, and the United Kingdom, with its consultation papers and deliberative workshops. In the USA and some EU countries, different forms of Citizen Science or Citizen Science Experiment (Projects) can be noticed.

A closer look at Citizen Science

The term Citizen Science refers to a broad concept which includes many different aspects ranging from the observation of natural events to the democratisation of science. Nonetheless, many attempts have been made to define Citizen Science. One of the first definitions appeared 14 years ago (Lewenstein, 2004), with three parts:

1. the participation of non-scientists in the process of gathering data according to specific scientific protocols and in the process of using and interpreting that data;
2. the engagement of non-scientists in true decision-making on policy issues that have technical or scientific components; and
3. the engagement of research scientists in democratic and policy processes.

It can be noted that in Lewenstein's definition (also see Lewenstein, 2016), the broadness characterising the concept of Citizen Science persists, as each part refers to a distinct scientific branch (i.e. scientific research, scientific policy-making and science advocacy). Another definition is offered by the Green Paper on Citizen Science where Citizen Science refers to the general public's engagement in scientific research activities when citizens actively contribute to science either with their intellectual effort or surrounding knowledge or with their tools and resources (Shirk et al., 2012). Other authors use citizen science to describe a situation in which people employ scientific techniques to investigate a phenomenon of interest without any institutional cooperation (Heiss and Matthes, 2017). However, we find the cooperative aspect to be crucial in Citizen Science. This is well emphasised in the Oxford Dictionary where the term is referred to as scientific work undertaken by members of the general public, often in collaboration with or under the direction of professional scientists and scientific institutions.

The abovementioned collaboration enables professional researchers to gather large-scale or hidden data they could not access otherwise. In this sense, although Citizen Science projects have primarily concerned and flourished in the natural sciences⁴, nonetheless recently Citizen Science projects have also been initiated within the social sciences. As Heiss and Matthes explain, the rise of certain favourable conditions is responsible for that. They not only include more attractive funding programmes for citizen engagement, but also the increasing willingness of societal actors to actively contribute to scientific research. Further, public engagement has been favoured by new technologies. One example is the Austrian Citizen Science project Young Adults' Political Experience Sampling. In this project, school students are asked to send comments and pictures from their smart phones, and this engagement enables researchers to collect hard-to-access data on young people's political participation.

Nonetheless, Citizen Science goes beyond the mere collection of data. It also has an educational value, insofar as it can be responsible for increasing knowledge and scientific interest among its participants. This is witnessed by a project underway at Michigan State University to address the issue of students' attraction to STEM sectors. Ultimately, these Citizen Science experiments are found to lead to more positive attitudes and aspirations, as well as a more active interest, concerning science. Moreover, the experiments contribute to the certain STEM-related skills being acquired (i.e. responsibility, critical-thinking and problem-solving).

Experiences with Citizen Science pilot experiments

As part of the European project STEM4YOUTH, the University of Barcelona is carrying out three Citizen Science experiments. They involve a total of 96 high school students from three schools in the Barcelona metropolitan area. The schools were chosen for their different socio-economic backgrounds, whereas the students taking part in the project are in the same age range⁵. The students are gathered in small-

⁴ In this sense, the American colonialists who recorded changes in the weather may be considered the first citizen scientists. We owe credit to Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin for the birth of a network of weather observers that provided, and still does, the National Weather Service with data. Other examples of Citizen Science pioneering experiences include fields such as ornithology and astronomy.

⁵ Institut Enric Borràs is in the La Salut neighbourhood of Badalona (220,000 inhabitants). Its population is characterised by low income and high cultural diversity. The Col·legi Sant Gabriel lies in Viladecans, a smaller area of 65,000 inhabitants. The area faces deep changes regarding the use of public space as well as a rapid

scale working groups and each working group includes the following profiles: two early-stage researchers, one post-doctoral researcher, one final-year undergraduate student, one senior researcher, one researcher and up to 3 teachers involved in the pilot experiment, making a total of seven teachers for the three schools. The working groups are in charge of the design and implementation of research projects which aim to study behavioural traits in a given community.

The originality and value of these Citizen Science experiments consist in the degree of student engagement in the projects. In fact, students and members of the research team collaborate in every single stage, giving birth to a 'co-created' project. This implies an active partnership with the research team in defining the research questions, developing the hypotheses and discussing the results. For this purpose, the University of Barcelona collaborates with the Digital Commons (DIMMONS) group of the Internet Interdisciplinary Institute (IN3) from the Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (UOC).

From January to March 2017, three different Citizen Science experiments were co-created within a span of 8 hours. To do that, a set of complementary educational tools (i.e. learning via experiments/gamification, hands-on activities, inquiry-based learning) were designed and adopted to make the students familiar with the process. The co-creation phase was accomplished as a collective problem was identified, the research questions were formulated, the scientific experiment was represented through a diagram and tasks were planned. An analysis of the co-creation phase showed that students from different schools prioritise different social problems (i.e. inequality, common good, respect, community problems at Institut Borràs; self-esteem, sustainability, public space and common good at Col·legi Sant Gabriel; common good, inclusion, mobility, tourism at Jesuïtes de Casp). This phase was followed by a 3-hour informal workshop to work on minor details. The workshop proved highly relevant for increasing the students' engagement before the experiment took place.

There were some important outcomes of the experiments. The research team detected an increase in the sense of motivation and engagement of the students. These feelings emerged when the students and research team worked together to build the experiment's structure and

demographic increase. The third school, Jesuïtes de Casp, is in the centre of Barcelona where issues like inequality and the over-exploitation of resources due to tourism converge. In the first two centres, the students involved were attending the final year of secondary school and were on average 15/16 years old. In the third one, the students were attending the first year of the Baccalaureate and were on average 16/17 years old.

invited passers-by to take part in the experiments. Also, the innovative way of addressing scientific notions fostered the motivation and participation of female students. The perceptions of the scientific team were further verified by way of an anonymous online questionnaire for which 81.4% of the students answered all the questions. The answers generally showed high levels of motivation, commitment and satisfaction. Further, 45% of the participants considered their contribution as essential for the co-creation process, this measure pointing to a high degree of empowerment. It is worth noting that the high degree of perceived engagement (82%) appears to relate to the extent the students consider the co-creation environment as trustworthy. As far as the environmental context is concerned, some aspects appear to influence the students' levels of participation and inventiveness. In particular, the extent to which students share daily experiences and concerns proves to be more important than their education level.

The second positive outcome concerns the volunteers participating in the experiments. The volunteers affirm they had changed their mind about STEM learning, their conception of scientific research and the relative possibility to contribute to it. It must be noted that 30% to 45% of the volunteers were less than 24 years old. Finally, the project is responsible for launching collaboration with local institutions and associations, which may support further discussion of the findings emerging from the experiments and deploying them when designing new policies. Below, the field work at five high schools in Slovenia is outlined with special attention to one class of students who commented on the findings of the survey and other activities conducted at their own and other schools.

Survey on the meaning of ecology in Slovenian high schools

The project was run at five high (grammar) schools, four in Ljubljana and one in a rural area outside of Ljubljana. We note we had certain difficulties making contacts with these schools. We spent more time establishing contacts and agreeing on our presence and activities than was estimated at the start of the project. While the grammar high schools were responsive (except for one), it later emerged that the young students have little interest in ecological themes. Therefore, in these three high schools we only conducted short surveys (sondage). In the given time frame, only in the case of one high school – thanks to the natural sciences teacher – could we also engage in a more profound discussion with the young students involved in the survey.

In the period 19 September 2017 to 23 March 2018, we performed several project activities. At two high schools (simply named Grammar School 1 and Grammar School 2), we held lectures on social aspects of

ecology and sustainable development for a group of young students who had chosen sociology as their optional exam subject. We also conducted a group discussion with these young students, but – at least during these activities – none of them decided to become acquainted with the mentioned topics in greater detail and further develop it into a research or project agenda as part of the final examination (matura) or in another aspect. In order to explain this situation, we conducted an open-ended survey (sondage) in four high schools. In total, 215 young students were respondents, mainly from Grades 3 and 4. In this period, the communication with teachers and meetings with them were intense. We also gathered information from the high schools' webpages.⁶

The research in this project is exploratory in nature. This means the hypothesis was not defined at the beginning but formulated during the research process. We also used elements of action research and a quasi-experiment.

The questionnaire involved ten open questions addressing three thematic parts. The first part was cognitive/informative. Here we wanted to establish the high school students' level of knowledge of ecology, where this knowledge stems from, and how they estimate it (self-estimation). We found the young students acquire the greatest knowledge and information about ecology from the subject of Biology, followed by Geography and Environmental Studies (the last being an optional subject not implemented in all high schools). To a small extent, Sociology and Chemistry are also mentioned here. In the framework of Biology as a subject, there is a textbook entitled *Ecology for High Schools* (Gaberščik et al., 2013), although we could not determine the actual degree of its use in the classes. More than half the young students who responded discuss these topics at home, a little less so with their peers. More than half follows media reports and websites on these topics. Most (around 60%) believe their level of knowledge of ecology is very good and consider their level of knowledge is sufficient for them to form and express their own opinion.

The second part relates to the significance and the meaning the young students assign to ecological topics. We asked them about this meaning in an intellectual and personal sense. Their answers show the topic is relevant for almost two-thirds of the young students. Answers are divided in response to the question of whether their attitude to this topic is likely to change.

⁶ All of these activities and data are presented at <https://www.dropbox.com/sh/n860aq2701mkj3/AADVikB9cbzHjiDboFI12mNua?dl=0>

The third part relates to an active approach and a concrete interest in dealing (research/analytically) in depth with ecological topics. This thematic part also included the interest of young students in personal and social engagement. The question of whether they would choose an ecological topic in the framework of an optional (research) seminar for an examination-based degree (matura) was met with a modest response. About ten young students (5% of all respondents) answered that they are thinking about this option. We have already mentioned that in Grammar School 1 and Grammar School 2 we discussed this with young students who had chosen sociology as a final exam subject or course, but none of them had decided to focus on an ecological or environmental topic in this context. One young student from Grade 3 referred to a plan to research the topic of media reporting on preservation of the environment, but we could not determine if he/she is willing to pursue this. We note the curriculum of sociology contains ecological subjects which are also found on the list of optional seminar topics for the final examination.

Almost half the young students responded positively to the following question: Are you willing to collaborate with a research project led by a team from scientific institutions?

In relation to involvement with groups, interest circles and NGOs, about 20 young students are active (less than 10%). We should mention that at one of the high schools (Grammar School 3) the optional eco-school subject/activity is organised as well.

Estimation of the data collected

The survey results may be summarised as follows:

- the young students acquire most information from Biology and Geography;
- knowledge and acquaintance with ecological problems is estimated to be at a high level;
- ecological and the related issue of future development is estimated to be high in importance; and
- activities in both a cognitive and social-engagement sense are low; engagement that extends beyond school subjects is weakly expressed.

If we enrich the above conclusions from the short questionnaire (sondage) with other data (conversations with pupils at High Schools 1 and 2 as well their teachers, especially the study of sustainable

development and ecology in high school programmes (Kos and Pavlin, 2017), the following picture emerges:

- young students obtain a lot of information at school but their synthetic and interdisciplinary level of knowledge is quite poor;
- a passive and partly declarative attitude to ecology prevails;
- the social sciences in this context are mostly inactive and do not play the expected knowledge transfer role;
- there are huge differences among high schools regarding knowledge transfer, optional subjects and study programmes (curriculum); and
- young students with a natural sciences orientation are more likely to deal with ecological topics.

It is quite obvious there was a gap between the self-estimated and declarative levels of knowledge (and its importance) and the readiness to devote more time and use ecological topics as a seminar or research task subject. In order to explain this gap, we sought an opportunity to have a discussion with students from one high school. It was believed that discussion would contribute considerably by adding to the final interpretation of the findings. At the same time, it would make it possible to include the students in some variant of the Citizen Science arrangement.

Group feedback analysis as part of the Citizen Science Experiment – A case study

In March 2018, a teacher enabled us to meet with young students from Grade 4 who had taken part in the survey (at High School -4). Our purpose was to present the survey results and other collected data and to receive their feedback. We presented the young students with the whole research process and the results based on the acquired data. We then asked for their comments. We divided the class into small groups of five and instructed them to discuss the results, especially the question: How to explain the gap between the high levels of self-estimated knowledge of ecology and its importance on one side and the low level of readiness to adopt an active approach to this topic on the other? We also instructed one member of each team to write down the answers and form a final opinion on whether the group had achieved a total consensus or the answers were divergent.

The groups started the discussions and after 20 minutes delivered their records. The group member who wrote the answers down had reported on the discussion process before that. From their reports and records, we can establish the young students are highly concentrated on their school work and dealing with ecological topics is connected with their school obligations. This means the young students are quite well

informed about these topics but have no time or desire to deepen this type of knowledge. They act pragmatically concerning their choice of topics for examination or research topics at the end of Grade 4. We may assume that, in this sense, ecological topics are marginal and it is more likely they will choose topics or subjects where they are assured of meeting their obligations without additional complications. Some expressed the view that »you can't change anything in our country" and active engagement therefore makes no sense or does not lead to any results.

One group expressed the view that their knowledge of ecology is more school-based and theoretical. »... All this theory comes from school and is 'forced' while no one is willing to deal with this outside from school". The other group stated: »... we don't internalise our knowledge«. In relation to social engagement, it holds no meaning: »... people are aware of problems in general but do not deal with them unless they are directly affected«.

We may conclude from these comments that the young students are »school-centric« and pragmatic in relation to their engagement with ecological issues. What we know from conversations at other high schools (namely Grammar Schools 1 and 2) is that even those young students oriented towards the social sciences show little interest in global and (macro) social problems. Of the topics in sociology suggested for the final exam (matura), they have mostly chosen (micro-level) topics related to youth subcultures, lifestyle and family relations. These topics are not problematic, although the students should be more strongly encouraged to connect them with macro and global societal issues.

Conclusion

In the course of the field work at the five high schools we gathered different types of data. In conversations with the teachers we realised that huge differences exist among high schools in terms of their openness or closedness regarding the environment and initiatives from the outside. The same is true of their study programmes. In some schools, students acquire most information related to ecology or sustainable development from traditional subjects like Biology. In others, they have the opportunity to choose the study of the environment or eco-school as optional subjects (at High School 4).

However, despite the high level of self-estimated knowledge, the interest in dealing with these topics in any more profound way proved to be low. By using the method of group feedback analysis where the students of one class deliberated on the research results for the five high schools, it

turned out that they are acquiring 'theoretical' knowledge that is relatively disciplinary fragmented and disorganised.

On the other side, social engagement is also weakly expressed. The CSE revealed that the high (grammar) schools are in a cognitive and social sense quite closed systems, despite some teachers being willing to experiment with new methods, due to their study programmes (curricula) being determined on the basis of a mono-disciplinary approach. Such a constellation requires the full attention of pupils, leaving very little room for manoeuvre for other learning/teaching options parallel to a lack of incentives for a more creative approach to practise alternative methods of learning and doing research.

High schools should open themselves up to external cooperation with scientific institutions, (interested) teachers should have the opportunity to spend every few years at a scientific institute and participate in its research activities. In class, the curricula should be re-defined, with greater attention paid to:

combining individual performance with teamwork (an amalgamation of competition and cooperation – 'co-opetition');

organised discussion and reflection in small groups;

a problem-solving approach by employing knowledge from different disciplines;

scientific methods with a special accent on a synthetic approach (meta-analysis); and

ethical issues of research.

We believe that students will be more productive and creative in such a cognitive and social climate. Our analysis of the results of using CSE reveal this method of intervention is worth applying in high schools. We also believe we have added to understanding of scientific research and its role in broader society. In order to obtain deeper insights, it would be necessary to include more high schools and for the project to last a minimum of 1 year. In any case, we have established the basis for future use of the mentioned concept and methodological approach.

References

- Callon, M., P. Lascoumes and Y. Barthe. 2009. *Acting in an Uncertain World*. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press.
- Commission of the European Communities. 2006. *The Green paper*. Available from: http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/eti/index_en.htm#1 (visited January 21, 2018)
- Cornell Lab of Ornithology (2007): *What is this, "Citizen Science"?* Working Group Synthesis Report, Citizen Science Toolkit Conference, June 20-23, 2007, Ithaca, NY
- CosmoQuest. *History of Citizen Science*. <https://cosmoquest.org/x/about-cosmoquest/history-of-citizen-science/> (visited January 21, 2018)
- ETC Group. 2011. *Action Group on Erosion, Technology and Concentration*. Available from <http://www.etcgroup.org/> (visited June 6, 2011)
- Fazi, E. and J. Smith. 2006. *Civil dialogue: Making it work better*. Study commissioned by the Civil society contact group. Available from: <http://www.act4europe.org/code/en/default.asp> (visited July 1, 2009)
- Finke, B. 2007. *Civil society participation in EU governance*. Living Reviews. Available from: <http://www.livingreviews.org/lreg-2007-2> (visited June 1, 2009)
- Follesdal, A. and S. Hix. 2006. *Why there is a Democratic Deficit in the EU: A Response to Majone and Moravcsik*. European Governance Papers, NO-C-05-02. Available from: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=924666 (visited June 1, 2009).
- Gaberščik, Alenka. 2013. *Spoznajmo svoje domovanje: Ekologija za gimnazije*. Ljubljana: Rokus Klett.
- Gibbons, M. 1999. Science's new social contract with society. *Nature*, 2, pp. 11-18.
- Heinelt, R. 2007. Participatory governance and European democracy. In: Kohler-Koch, B. and Rittberger, B (Eds.): *Debating the democratic legitimacy of the European Union*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Heiss, Raffael and H. Matthes. 2017. *Citizen Science in the Social Sciences: A Call for More Evidence*. GAIA – Ecological Perspectives for Science and Society, Vol. 26, Issue 1, 22-26 <https://doi.org/10.14512/gaia.26.1.7> (visited March 1, 2018)
- Hirsch Hadorn, G., H. Hoffmann-Riem, S. Biber-Klemm, W. Grossenbacher-Mansuy, D. Joye, C. Pohl, U. Wiesmann, E. Zemp (Eds.). 2008. *Handbook of Transdisciplinary Research*. Springer.

- HORIZON 2020: Responsible research & Innovation
<https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/h2020-section/responsible-research-innovation> (visited January 18 2018)
- Humanity+. 2011. *Humanity Plus*. Available from <http://humanityplus.org/> (visited January 18 2018)
- Kos, D. and Pavlin. 2017. Trajnostni razvoj v izobraževalnih programih: Primer slovenskih gimnazij. *Teorija in praksa*, vol. 54, no. 5, pp. 806-830.
- Lewenstein, B. (2004), What does Citizen Science accomplish? Available from <http://hdl.handle.net/1813/37362>
- Lewenstein, B. (2016), Can we understand Citizen Science? *Journal of Science Communication*, 15 (01) E
- Mali, F., T. Pustovrh and B. Groboljsek. 2011. *Policy impacts of ethical advisory bodies on the societal regulation of biotechnology*. Proceedings of the 10th Annual IAS-STC Conference on Critical Issues in Science and Technology Studies, 2-4 May 2011, Graz, Austria.
- Mitcham, C. in J. Stilgoe (Rapp.) 2009. *Global Governance of Science – Report of the Expert Group on Global Governance of Science to the Science, Economy and Society Directorate, Directorate-General for Research, European Commission*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- MSU Extension, Children and Youth Impacts: *Building Science Literacy and Future STEM Professionals*. Science Literacy 2016, Michigan State University.
- MSU Extension, Children and Youth Impacts: *Youth learn scientific practices through citizen science projects*
http://msue.anr.msu.edu/news/youth_learn_scientific_practices_through_citizen_science_projects (visited January 18, 2018)
- Nowotny H. et al, 2003. Introduction. *Mode 2 revised: The new production of knowledge*. *Minerva*, 43: 179-194.
- Perellò, Josep and I. Bonhoure (2017): *D4.1 Report on Citizen Science Pilot Experiments*. STEM4YOUTH Deliverable Report, October 2017.
- Rek, M. 2007. *Organized civil society in the multilevel system of governance*. In: Adam, F. (Ed.) *Social capital and governance: old and new members of EU in comparison*. Lit Verlag: Munster, Hamburg, Berlin, Wien, London.
- Roco, M. C., C.A. Mirkin and M.C. Hersam (Eds.). 2011. *Nanotechnology Research Directions for Societal Needs in 2020: Retrospective and Outlook*. Springer.
- Ruzza, C. 2008. *Advocacy coalitions and the participation of organised civil society in the European Union*. In: Della Sala V. and C. Ruzza (Eds.) *Governance and civil society in the European Union: Volume 2: Exploring Policy Issues* Eds., 31-47 Manchester University Press.

- Sanderson, K. 2009. *Synthetic biology gets ethical*. Nature. Available from <http://www.nature.com/news/2009/090512/full/news.2009.464.html> (visited June 18, 2011).
- Savulescu, J., R. Meulen and G. Kahane (Eds.). 2011. *Enhancing Human Capacities*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Shirk J.L., et al., 2012. Public participation in scientific research: a framework for deliberate design. *Ecology and Society*, 17 (2).1-29
- Schmidt, M., A. Kelle, A. Ganguli-Mitra, H. de Vriend (Eds.). 2009. *Synthetic Biology: the technoscience and its societal consequences*. Springer.
- von Schomberg, René. 2011. *The quest for the "right" impacts of science and technology. An outlook towards a framework for responsible research and innovation*. In Dusseldorp, M. and R. Beecroft (Eds.). *Technikfolgen abschätzen lehren: Bildungspotenziale transdisziplinärer Methoden*. VS Verlag.