

Different images of science at Nordic science centres

Davidsson, Eva; Jakobsson, Anders

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Davidsson, E., & Jakobsson, A. (2007). Different images of science at Nordic science centres. *International Journal of Science Education*, 29(10), 1229-1244. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690600969848>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft



Different Images of Science at Nordic Science Centres

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Science Education</i>
Manuscript ID:	TSED-2006-0095.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	nature of science, science centre, public, museum, informal education
Keywords (user):	



Different images of science at Nordic science centres

Abstract

Science centres aim to present science in ways that will attract visitors and enhance public interest in, and knowledge of, science. But what images and different aspects of science are visitors confronted with at Nordic science centres? This study aims to explore the different aspects of science that are displayed and the ways in which these aspects constitute different images of science. In this study, staff members who work with the planning and creation of new exhibitions were asked to answer a web-based questionnaire, identifying the extent to which different aspects of science were displayed in their latest exhibition. They were also asked to voice their opinions on what, and to what extent, they would like to display different aspects in future exhibitions. This study shows that exhibitions today in particular choose to display the wonders of science, presenting science in a product-oriented and unproblematic way. The study also reveals a great discrepancy between what staff members display at their latest exhibitions and what they want to display in future exhibitions. They express a will to emphasise aspects of science on the basis of a societal and cultural perspective. This means that controversial

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 *issues, values in society, non-western science and scientific processes*
9
10 *constitute important components for future exhibitions.*
11
12

13 14 15 16 **Introduction**

17
18 Science centres worldwide aim to present science in ways that will attract
19 visitors as well as enhance the interest in, and knowledge of, science. A
20 number of research studies have been carried out in order to investigate
21 the outcome of these institutions. A majority of these studies are related to
22 learning outcomes and attitudes toward science (eg Heard, Divall and
23 Johnson, 2000; Nyhof-Young, 1996) or visitors' perceptions and
24 interactions with exhibitions (eg Pedretti, Macdonald and Gitari, 2001;
25 Brook and Solomon, 1998). However these studies do not discuss the
26 foundations and assumptions on which staff members at science centres
27 base new exhibitions and thereby conveying messages of what science is.
28 An important question is what images and different aspects of science do
29 a visitor actually meet at a science centre? Is science presented as a
30 dynamic, engaging, open and multi-faceted subject area or are ready-
31 made, product-focused and stereotyped images shown? These questions
32 formulate two extremes to how science can be presented and are not really
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 possible to answer in any unambiguous way. Still, they raise some
9 interesting and important questions for discussion. What images of
10 science are possible to display at science centres and what constitutes
11 these images? What aspects of science are chosen by the staff when
12 exhibitions are constructed?
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 This article focuses on the aspects of science staff members believe
21 they display in exhibitions and also the aspects they would like to display
22 in the future. The aspects that the respondents considered derive from the
23 ongoing debate about the nature of science. These aspects are presented in
24 detail in the following sections. The article is the first part of a larger
25 project that aims to explore the presumptions staff members have on
26 communicating science through exhibitions. The study is based on a
27 questionnaire of all staff members responsible for constructing
28 exhibitions at 30 Nordic science centres. There is a lack of studies dealing
29 with these issues, in the Nordic countries as well as internationally. This
30 has made it necessary to get an overview of and a starting point to further
31 studies. Future studies will be based on further triangulation of methods
32 using interviews and participatory observation at Nordic science centers.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The wonders of science

Lately, museums and science centres have been criticized and questioned when science has been presented in a too narrow-minded way (Pedretti, 2002; Menved and Oatley, 2000; Frøylund and Henriksen, 2003). Pedretti (2002) contends that many museums and science centres just show "the wonders of science", i.e. an unproblematic, product-focused way that shows the "good things" we humans have accomplished through science. She argues that there is a need for change; a need for diverting attention away from the *wonders of science* to exhibitions related to contemporary and sometimes even controversial science. Such exhibitions enhance learning through an increased attention on context - not only the context in which science operates, but also the visitors' contexts. By promoting a public debate about science, and not just presenting scientific facts, it entails understanding the nature, processes and achievements of science. It also entails critiquing the institution and practice of science (Pedretti 2002). Other scholars argue for integrating experiences from museums or science exhibitions into the visitors' every-day life, linked to different social and cultural activities. This places scientific principles in more familiar contexts and could provide a starting point for reflecting on

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 scientific issues that have an impact on decisions made in everyday
9
10 practice (Menved and Oatley, 2000; Jenkins, 2000). Frøylund and
11
12 Henriksen (2003) contend that museums can and should to a greater
13
14 extent turn towards society in order to contribute to an increased scientific
15
16 literacy. By having exhibits about controversial themes and by using new
17
18 methods to describe the themes, museums can reach a broader audience
19
20 and thereby take a more active role in society. When young people are
21
22 confronted with what is already known in science, without learning how
23
24 we have come to know it, the understanding of social, cognitive and
25
26 epistemic dynamics is eliminated.
27
28
29
30
31

32 There is also a need to focus on the constructions and evaluations of
33
34 knowledge claims, on the places where concepts and processes are shaped
35
36 and take on meaning (Duschl, 2000). This does not only involve
37
38 knowledge in science but also knowledge about science, an understanding
39
40 of the nature and status of science. Driver et al. (1996) describe this as
41
42 being the way in which the body of public knowledge called science has
43
44 been established and is added to, what our grounds are for considering it
45
46 reliable knowledge and how the agreement that characterizes much of
47
48 science is maintained. Also Rennie and Stocklmayer (2003) contend that
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 science museums, to a greater extent, must try to reach people that never
9 visit museums and suggest two aspects intended to increase public
10 engagement. They suggest that science centres need to seek and involve
11 the public's views through debate and consensus and also initiate outreach
12 activities. In another study, Rennie and Williams (2002) found that staff at
13 an Australian science centre had different understandings of what aims
14 the science centre should have. Two thirds believed that one important
15 aim was to influence the images of science the visitors had before their
16 visit. But almost half of the staff thought that the main aim was to display
17 science and science applications. Rennie and Williams found that the staff
18 was generally content with the positive exhibition impact on visitors, but
19 some also felt that there was room for improvement when it came to
20 presenting the nature of science and controversial issues.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **Images of science**

43
44 If scientific products and facts are the main aspects of science that one can
45 expect to find in a science exhibition like Pedretti (2002) argues, what is
46 then the unexpected? Ogawa (1998) stresses that science, as it exists in
47 different communities, is interpreted and constructed by its citizens on the
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 basis of the context and the culture they live in. From the citizens'
9 experiences, science is a constructed image believed to be culture-
10 independent. He contends that there are no culture-free interpretations of
11 science. Different ways of presenting science can always only be
12 interpretations of what science is actually about. What implications does
13 this argument bring to the science center movement and what aspects of
14 science risk to be underrepresented? For example Hodson (1998) talks
15 about *learning about science*, where there is focus on acquiring
16 knowledge and understanding of the processes and sub-processes of
17 scientific inquiries. This involves learning about different strategies and
18 tactics used by scientists, in order to understand different phenomena. He
19 also stresses the importance of understanding the role of evidence in
20 scientific knowledge building. Also Lemke (1997) emphasises the sub-
21 processes and the role of evidence by arguing that learning science is to
22 learn about how we re-make our views about the world. This
23 argumentation is crucial, when scientists in different research
24 communities publish and discuss results and evidence. These discussions
25 lead to a greater acceptance for explanations of a certain phenomenon and
26 eventually also consensus in the actual issue. Sutton (1998) too discusses
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 the importance of learning about how we reach consensus. He contends
9
10 that the language used for argumentation has changed gradually over time
11
12 and is now to a great extent detached from the humans behind science.
13
14 This leads to losses in educational points of view as it gives a very
15
16 misleading impression of how new knowledge has been established. To
17
18 make these issues explicit in science exhibitions one would need to
19
20 display scientific uncertainties and the humans behind science. There are
21
22 numerous examples of competitive explanations in history and here it is
23
24 also easy to see the humans behind the discoveries, e.g. the different
25
26 theories of natural selection held by Lamarck and Darwin. Likewise, it is
27
28 not hard to find uncertainties and controversies in contemporary scientific
29
30 debate that can be emphasised in exhibitions. The humans behind new
31
32 findings as well as how consensus is reached, are part of the public debate
33
34 and less seldom discerned in scientific exhibitions.
35
36
37
38
39
40

41
42 Another area for discussion is the importance of science in society and
43
44 also the view of science as an objective search for truth that is undergoing
45
46 change. Driver et al. (1996) describe *science as a social enterprise*, which
47
48 involves the understanding of science as an institution, embedded and
49
50 controlled by society. Sjøberg (1998) also emphasises science as being
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 part of society when discussing the relationship between science and for
9
10 example technology, ethics or politics. Decisions concerning scientific or
11
12 technological development are taken on the basis of particular interests in
13
14 society that are of benefit to some and perhaps at the expense of others.
15
16 One part of a scientific exhibition could display these tensions of different
17
18 political, economical or ethical interest groups in society; for example, the
19
20 tensions between the tobacco industry and health organizations or
21
22 between the car industry and different environmental groups. Another
23
24 possibility is to make explicit the decisions and positions that provide the
25
26 foundation for how research funding is dispersed.
27
28
29
30
31

32 There are also several examples in *science history* where values and
33
34 beliefs in society that have affected scientific thoughts can also be
35
36 displayed in science exhibitions. For example, religions beliefs played a
37
38 big role for the acceptance of scientific explanations when Galileo argued
39
40 in favour of the heliocentric view and was forced to withdraw his findings
41
42 and apologize to the church. Today there are many communities
43
44 worldwide that do not accept certain scientific explanations in favour of
45
46 religious ones. Also, in modern societies sub-cultures have created their
47
48 own explanations through their shared experiences, values and beliefs
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 (Aikenhead, 2000). This can be seen for example in US where different
9 religious groups do not accept the theory of evolution as the only
10 explanation or even a valid explanation to understanding the origin of
11 species. All these examples are meant to relate science to other
12 phenomena in society and make explicit that science does not only consist
13 of scientific products, but is also a part of, is affected by, and affects our
14 society.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 Different cultures have also affected and still affect the apprehensions
26 of *gender issues*. Several research reports show large gender differences
27 concerning, for example, the interests in different science areas, an
28 unequal division of men and women, where more men enter into scientific
29 and technical educations (TIMSS 2003, OECD 2003, Sjøberg, 2000).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Through language, another consideration of the gender issue and
38 science becomes clear. Hughes (2004) argues that gendered dichotomous
39 thinking, which is an inheritance from the 17th and 18th centuries, is still
40 present in associations where physics is seen as masculine, hard,
41 objective, abstract rationality, whereas social and human sciences connote
42 a feminine, more subjective and softer approach. The abstraction and
43 objectivity of pure science is then associated with masculinity while the
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 contextualized approach relates to femininity. Also Keller (1992)
9 discusses gender issues on the basis of language. She points to this
10 perspective when illustrating the way scientific constructs, related to the
11 female egg, are described with words like 'passive', 'is transported',
12 'drifts' and 'is penetrated'. Words like 'active', 'self-propelled' and
13 'penetrates' were related to the male sperm. Keller contends that by
14 investigating the symbolic aspects of masculinity in science, gendering of
15 science as a social construct rather than being biologically determined is
16 revealed. Exhibitions can create an awareness of gender as a social
17 construct. Also, hierarchies related to gender issues in science can be
18 emphasised, for example in scientific concepts related to language.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 A wider societal perspective of science can also incorporate *science*
36 *from non-western cultures*. As mentioned before, Ogawa (1998) and
37 Riess (2004) argue that there exists no single, universal, a-cultural
38 science, but instead all sorts of sciences are ethno-sciences. This is based
39 on the fact that interpretations of our world are made by scientists,
40 through senses affected by themselves as persons and their cultures. Even
41 Aikenhead (2000) promotes the view of science being affected by the
42 existing culture and argues that western science is one of many sub-
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 cultures of Euro-American society. Cobern and Loving (2004) discuss the
9 importance of indigenous knowledge, both historical and present. They
10 argue that it is of great value, since it broadens what is taught as science.
11 In science exhibitions, science from non-western cultures could illustrate
12 ways in which science is affected by the culture it operates in.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 In this study, aspects of science refer to the different foci an exhibition
21 can have. As mentioned before, an exhibition could for example focus on
22 the wonders of science, learning about science, science as a social
23 enterprise, science history, gender issues or science from non-western
24 cultures. It is of course impossible to display everything within a subject
25 area at an exhibition. Each exhibition is a result of conscious or
26 unconscious choices, made by staff members concerning different aspects
27 of science. The aspects of science will be used to analyse different and
28 possible connotations that exhibitions at science centres choose to
29 express. In this way comprehensive *images of science* can be described.
30 These images thus depend on how exhibitions are constituted.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 In this study, images of science will be used to analyse different and
9 possible connotations that exhibitions at science centres choose to
10 express. These images depend on how exhibitions are constituted. It is of
11 course impossible to display everything within a subject area at an
12 exhibition. Each exhibition is a result of conscious or unconscious
13 choices, made by staff members concerning different aspects of science.
14
15 Aspects of science here refer to the different foci an exhibition can have.
16
17 As mentioned before, an exhibition could for example focus on the
18 wonders of science, learning about science, science as a social enterprise,
19 science history, gender issues or science from non-western cultures.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **The study**

36
37 In the previous section the authors discuss how science generally can be
38 manifested by relating science to historical, social and cultural
39 perspectives. However their arguments are not usually based on empirical
40 studies, but instead elucidate the ongoing debate about these issues. A
41 problem in the science center enterprise is the lack of studies that
42 investigate how science can be manifested and displayed and thereby
43 convey messages to the visitors about what science is. This means that we
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 today have insufficient knowledge about what aspects of science that are
9 presented in exhibitions. Therefore this study aims to explore different
10 aspects of science that are displayed at Nordic science centres and how
11 these aspects constitute different images of science. That is, to study staff
12 members' own understanding of the extent to which they display and
13 would like to display, different aspects of science. The research questions
14 in this study are:
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

- 27 • What aspects of science do staff members display in their present
28 exhibitions?
29
- 30 • What aspects of science do staff members express they would like to
31 display in future exhibitions?
32
- 33 • In what ways do these aspects constitute different images of science?
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **The questionnaire and methodological considerations**

42
43 The reason for choosing a questionnaire in this study was to get a
44 general view of the different aspects of science that were displayed, but
45 also a will to attend to the lack of empirical studies in the area. The
46 questionnaire aimed at collecting data from staff members working at
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 different **science centres**, spread over a large geographical area, in the
9
10 Nordic countries, during a relatively short period of time. It also made
11
12 possible statistical analysis of the data. To be able to answer the research
13
14 questions, the questionnaire was developed in order to ascertain to what
15
16 extent the staff members apprehended that different aspects of science
17
18 were displayed in present exhibitions. They were also asked to consider to
19
20 what extent they would like to display the same aspects in a future
21
22 exhibition. The aspects in the questionnaire have their origin in the
23
24 previous discussion about what science can be. This means that aspects
25
26 like ‘science in society’, ‘values in society’ and ‘controversial issues’
27
28 derive from the discussion about *science as a social enterprise*, where
29
30 science is seen to be influenced by for example economy, ethics and
31
32 politics. The aspect ‘how modern science is generated’ derives from
33
34 *learning about science*. ‘Gender issues’, ‘science from other cultures than
35
36 our own’ and ‘science in a historical perspective’ were discussed
37
38 separately. Finally ‘scientific facts’ ‘science in a technical perspective’
39
40 and ‘experiences of everyday phenomena’ have its origin from the
41
42 critique of Pedretti (2002) arguing that science centers only displayed “the
43
44 wonders of science”.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Since the respondents only were asked to consider a limited number of
9
10 aspects there is an obvious risk that the questionnaire only enlightens a
11
12 part of the problem. The chosen aspects are of course not the only ones
13
14 that can be displayed and it is likely that other aspects of science would
15
16 enhance an image or even constitute other images of science. Even though
17
18 the result may be affected by these circumstances, the goal has above all
19
20 been to cover a broad view of the ongoing debate. This study is therefore
21
22 just the first part of a larger project that aims to explore what
23
24 presumptions staff members at science centres have when they
25
26 communicate science through exhibition displays. That is to make explicit
27
28 the presumptions which the staff members take for granted as members of
29
30 the science centre culture. In this way, this study also aims at providing
31
32 indications for further research. Thus is this survey a part of a method
33
34 triangulation where ethnographical methods such as participating
35
36 observations and interviews will be included.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 The selection of respondents includes directors of the science centres,
45
46 and staff members working at the centres with developing and creating
47
48 new exhibitions. A web-based questionnaire was sent to 88 persons and
49
50 more than 75 percent (66 persons) answered. In all, staff members from
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 30 science centres participated in the study and. This means that all
9
10 Nordic science centres, members of the NSCF (Nordic Science Center
11
12 Association) have participated in the study. The respondents were asked
13
14 to answer questions concerned with the extent to which they considered
15
16 that the latest exhibition at their science centre displayed different aspects
17
18 of science. They answered every question on a five grade scale from “to a
19
20 very low extent”, represented by figure 1, to “to a very high extent”,
21
22 represented by figure 5. The questions were focussed on the extent to
23
24 which the staff members considered the latest exhibition to display:
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

- 32 • scientific facts;
- 33
- 34 • science in society;
- 35
- 36 • experiences of everyday phenomena;
- 37
- 38 • gender issues;
- 39
- 40 • science from other cultures than our own;
- 41
- 42 • controversial issues;
- 43
- 44 • how modern science is generated;
- 45
- 46 • values in society;
- 47
- 48 • science in a historical perspective;
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

- science in a technical perspective

The staff members also considered the same aspects of science, relating these to what they preferred to display in future exhibitions. The purpose was to make the staff members' intentions explicit and analyze possible distinctions between the desires to present different aspects in future exhibitions to what was actually being displayed.

Analysis

Through the statistical analysis both the individual respondents' apprehensions and the mean values of the aspects became evident. This was however not sufficient, since it could only account for each aspect separately. The question was if these aspects, on the basis of the data, could be combined in order to constitute different images of science. In the theoretical background some aspects seemed to be more frequently occurring than others, when presenting science (e.g. scientific facts, science in a technical perspective and experiences from everyday phenomena). From the first analysis, the mean values also made explicit that some clusters of aspects had higher values than others. This pointed

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 to the fact that some items in the data were interrelated. This interrelation
9
10 can be visualized through principal component analysis, which reveals
11
12 latent relationships between items. In conducting principal component
13
14 analysis, the orthogonal rotation Varimax was chosen. This brought out
15
16 groups of items (aspects), which indicated that the exhibitions displayed
17
18 certain aspects of science in favour of others. In such a group, the aspects
19
20 constitute, what in this study are described as images of science. To
21
22 measure the reliability of the questionnaire, i.e. to find out if the aspects
23
24 were really interrelated, the value of Cronbach's alpha was calculated. A
25
26 value above 0.70 is an acceptable value, but a value just below this can
27
28 also be realistic due to the diversity of what is being measured (Field,
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2005).

Results

Images of science in present exhibitions

The first analysis showed big differences in the extent to which aspects of science are displayed. Table 1 illustrates that the considerations of what was displayed were divided mainly into two extreme groups of aspects, one with high, and one with low mean values. Only one aspect, 'science

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 in a historical perspective' (3.22), was found in-between these extremes.
9
10 The highest mean value was related to 'experiences from everyday
11 phenomena' (4.09). When analyzing how the individual respondents
12 answered, the dispersion related to this aspect was low. Other aspects
13 with high mean values, were 'scientific facts' (3.94), 'science in society'
14 (3.89) and 'science in a technical perspective' (3.69). For these aspects
15 the dispersion of answers was slightly higher.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 The low mean value group contained five aspects. The lowest mean
25 value was related to 'science from other cultures' (2.09). Nearly all the
26 respondents experienced that their exhibitions displayed this aspect to a
27 very low extent. The other aspects in this group were 'gender issues'
28 (2.77), 'values in society' (2.75), 'controversial issues' (2.60) and 'how
29 modern science is generated' (2.59). Among these aspects the dispersions
30 of answers was large, with few answers in the middle of the scale.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Place table 1

42
43 The analysis pointed to two main clusters of aspects that represent
44 latent factors. This implies that a number of hidden relationships were
45 made evident. These relationships can mediate different images of science
46 that the exhibitions convey (see Table 2).
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 The first factor, *the usefulness of science*, contains the aspects ‘science
9 in society’, ‘science in a technical perspective’, ‘how modern science is
10 generated’ and ‘scientific facts’. The aspect ‘science in society’ had the
11 highest correlation within this factor. A probable connotation, in line with
12 ‘science in a technical perspective’, is that this kind of exhibition
13 mediates the usefulness of technical achievements in our society. The
14 aspect ‘scientific facts’ emphasises science as a foundation for scientific
15 products. By describing science mainly through the explanation of
16 concepts and theories there is a risk that science is displayed according to
17 the wonders of science (Pedretti, 2002). This means that science risks to
18 be portrayed in single-dimension and authoritarian ways, i.e. all questions
19 have one correct answer.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 The aspect of how modern science is generated emphasises scientific
37 processes. But when related to the other three aspects within this factor,
38 the usefulness of scientific products is emphasised through scientific
39 processes. The aspects reinforce and increase the image of science as
40 being concerned with the usefulness of scientific products in our society.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48 On the basis of this analysis, an explicit image of science appears, *the*
49 *usefulness of science*. Mainly this image conveys the usefulness we, as
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 individuals or as a society, can gain from science. It can also convey all
9
10 the good that can be achieved through science, without discussing
11
12 problems related to these technical and scientific achievements. Three of
13
14 these aspects had high mean values and a probable interpretation is
15
16 therefore that this is a common image shown at Nordic science centres.
17
18

19
20 **Place Table 2**
21

22
23 The second factor, *science and culture*, (see Table 2), consists of the
24
25 aspects 'gender issue', 'science from other cultures' and 'science in a
26
27 historical perspective'. The aspect 'gender issues', has the highest
28
29 correlations within this factor. Gender issues can be related both to
30
31 existing norms and values in society as well as in the scientific
32
33 community. By relating to gender issues, the implication is that science
34
35 consists of more than just concepts, figures, theories and scientific
36
37 applications. In this way science can be related to the existing inequity
38
39 between men and women. It can also make explicit the women and men
40
41 behind scientific findings. Hughues (2004) argues that there is a risk in
42
43 describing science without this perspective is that science is displayed in
44
45 an inhuman way, where science seems to be unaffected by interpersonal
46
47 relationships and conflicts.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 By displaying the aspect of science from other cultures, it is possible to
9
10 convey the belief that science is of wider concern than just being aimed at
11
12 an elite group of white, western men (Aikenhead, 2000). It can also in this
13
14 way make explicit the gap between Western science that operates in rich,
15
16 developed countries and science in third world countries. Through the
17
18 historical perspective, science of today can be compared to science in a
19
20 historical context. This is also elucidated when displaying different
21
22 understandings of historical phenomena. An exhibition can for example
23
24 stress the nature of science and how scientific knowledge becomes
25
26 established through anomalies and scientific disputes (Sutton, 1998).
27
28 These three aspects together, as illustrated in Table 2, interrelate and
29
30 create the image *science and culture*. According to the mean values in
31
32 Table 1, this image is less commonly occurring in exhibitions today.
33
34 *Science and culture* connotes that science is affected by women and men
35
36 that live and have lived and thereby makes science an integral part of our
37
38 culture.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The two images *the usefulness of science* and *science and culture* (see
47
48 Table 2) describe how the aspects interrelate and constitute different
49
50 images of science. The figures represent how well correlated each aspect
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 is to the factor in the analysis; where 1 is the maximum and -1 is the
9
10 minimum (0 is absolutely no correlation whereas -1 is a directly opposed
11
12 correlation). In a reliability test *the usefulness of science* gets a
13
14 Cronbach's alpha of 0.70. *Science and culture* gets a Cronbach's alpha of
15
16 0.59 which is an acceptable value (Field, 2005).
17
18
19

20 21 *Images of science in future exhibitions*

22
23
24 The respondents were asked to reconsider the ten aspects of science,
25
26 relating these to the extent to which they would like to display them in
27
28 future exhibitions. The intention was to make explicit the respondents'
29
30 own desires to display different aspects. It also aimed at describing
31
32 possible differences between how science is displayed today, compared to
33
34 how the respondents themselves stress certain aspects. The result shows,
35
36 as illustrated in Table 3, that the mean values for each aspect is higher
37
38 when compared to the respondents' views related to the extent to which
39
40 these aspects were displayed in their latest exhibition. A probable
41
42 explanation is that there is a greater will to present different aspects than
43
44 perhaps is possible. Despite this, there are big differences between how
45
46 the respondents actually display the aspects and the extent to which they
47
48 would like to display them.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Place table 3

In Table 3 it can be seen that the aspect ‘experiences of everyday phenomena’ has the highest mean value (4.48) related to what the respondents would like to display. It also has a very low dispersion of the answers. Other aspects that have high mean values are ‘science in society’ (4.29), ‘scientific facts’ (3.98) and ‘science in a technical perspective’ (3.98). These were the same aspects the respondents believed their latest exhibitions displayed to a high degree. There is thus both a statement that these aspects are displayed in present exhibitions and a will to display them in future exhibitions. Some aspects have relatively low mean values related to the matter of what is actually presented, but have high mean values when it comes to what the respondents would like to display. In other words, these aspects represent perspectives that the respondents express are not sufficiently evident in present exhibitions. For example, ‘gender issues’ has a high mean value (3.98) in matters related to future exhibitions, compared to what is actually displayed (2.77). This is also true for how modern science is generated as well as matters having to do with ‘controversial issues’. ‘Science from other cultures’ has the lowest

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 mean (3.75) and is thereby the aspect the respondents would like to stress
9
10 least of all in future exhibitions. This aspect has the lowest mean value
11
12 related both to present and future exhibitions. 'Science in a historical
13
14 perspective' has the second lowest mean value (3.86) related to future
15
16 exhibitions. In present exhibitions, this aspect has a relatively higher
17
18 mean value compared to the other aspects, pointing to the fact that the
19
20 respondents to a higher extent prefer emphasizing other aspects of science
21
22 in future exhibitions than the historical perspective.
23
24
25

26
27 The principal component analysis was again used to distinguish hidden
28
29 relationships in the data. Here the results point to the fact that, even when
30
31 it comes to the respondents' own will to display certain aspects of science
32
33 in future exhibitions, there exists clusters of aspects. Here, three different
34
35 clusters became evident, which are illustrated in Table 4.
36
37
38

39 The first factor, *Science, technology and culture* contains a
40
41 combination of aspects that are almost the same as the previous image
42
43 *science and culture*. It consists of the aspects 'science from other cultures
44
45 than our own', 'gender issues', 'science in a historical perspective' and
46
47 'science in a technical perspective'. As mentioned earlier, the image
48
49 *science and culture* connotes that science is affected by past and present
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 men and women in our society and is thereby a part of our culture. An
9
10 interesting difference, related to what the respondents would like to
11
12 display, is the addition of 'science in a technical perspective'. In *the*
13
14 *usefulness of science*, the technical perspective is related to the use
15
16 humans have of science in our society. When it comes to the image
17
18 *science, technology and culture*, the technical perspective can take on
19
20 another meaning, since it is related to other aspects. These aspects can
21
22 emphasise humans behind science, the influences of society and the fact
23
24 that science is of wide concern in our world. In this way, the technical
25
26 perspective can connote that it is part of as well as affected by our culture.
27
28 *Science, technology and culture* implicates placing science and
29
30 technology in a human context, related to past and ongoing trends in
31
32 society, pointing towards the intention of not only displaying technology
33
34 in terms of figures, facts and the usefulness of technical devices.
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 From the analysis, two other clusters of aspects also appear and
42
43 consequently create two images of science. The second factor of concern
44
45 to what the respondents would like to display is *science debate*. As seen
46
47 in Table 4 it consists of the aspects 'controversial issues', 'values in
48
49 society' and 'how modern science is generated'. 'Controversial issues'
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 have the highest correlation within this factor. This aspect, along with
9
10 'values in society', can connote conflicting socio-scientific issues related
11
12 to contemporary science and scientific research (Driver et al, 1996). This
13
14 discussion can be further deepened through considering the aspect of
15
16 'how modern science is generated', as it accentuates scientific processes
17
18 (Hodson, 1998). In *the usefulness of science*, this aspect has a product-
19
20 oriented focus and could display how to develop new products. In *science*
21
22 *debate*, scientific processes are emphasised through socio-scientific
23
24 issues. An exhibition of this kind can connote that science is also about
25
26 debate, argumentation and the submission of evidence (Lemke, 1997).
27
28 Questions about what kind of scientific research we need and what the
29
30 consequences are for humans and our environment can convey the view
31
32 that science is affected by ongoing discussions in society.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Place table 4**

47 The third factor (see Table 4) is *informative science*. It contains the
48
49 aspects 'scientific facts' and 'science in society'. The aspect 'scientific
50
51 facts' has the highest correlation within this factor. This aspect can be
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 illustrated through figures, explaining concepts and describing
9
10 measurements, laws and theories. Scientific facts can describe knowledge
11
12 already proved and considered valid, leaving little room for discussion.
13
14 'Scientific fact' is combined in this factor with 'science in society', which
15
16 can connote the usefulness of science in our society. Here this is done
17
18 without considering a technical perspective or how modern science is
19
20 generated, as in *the usefulness of science*. An exhibition based on
21
22 scientific facts and science in society risks regarding science in a narrow-
23
24 minded way, where much within science is excluded (Pedretti, 2002;
25
26 Mened and Oatley, 2000). In a reliability test the values for Cronbach's
27
28 alpha are 0.72 for *science debate*, 0.74 for *science, technology and culture*
29
30 and 0.60 for *informative science*.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Discussion

43
44 The results of this study point to that two images are mainly presented in
45
46 exhibitions at Nordic science centres. The image *the usefulness of science*
47
48 displays science primarily in a product-oriented way through presenting
49
50 the usefulness of technical achievements in society. As such, this image
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 confirms the critique from Pedretti (2002) and Frøyland and Henriksen
9 (2003).
10

11
12 However, the results of this study point to a more complex and multi-
13 faceted image. Through statistical analysis, it becomes evident that even
14 scientific processes are made explicit in exhibitions. According to the
15 staff members, the scientific processes become explicit through displaying
16 scientific products and scientific applications in a societal perspective.
17 But Duschl (2000) contends, that if scientific processes are to be
18 understood, they also need to include the constructions and evaluations of
19 knowledge claims and how consensus is reached in the research
20 community. Seen in this perspective, scientific processes, as presented in
21 *the usefulness of science*, risk to be displayed in an insufficient way.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 The second image is *science and culture* and expresses science from a
38 gender, historical and non-western perspective. The mean values of the
39 aspects are proportionately low, which also indicate that this image does
40 not occur frequently. Many scholars (eg Hughes, 2004) argue that the
41 aspects in this image are often lost when presenting science, but are at the
42 same time important parts in the need to increase an interest for science
43 and technology. Exhibitions that contain the image *science and culture*
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 can in this way contribute to questioning this stereotyped perspective of
9
10 science (Riess, 2004; Ogawa, 1998). This image of science also
11
12 incorporates science from non-western cultures. The image *science and*
13
14 *culture* also makes explicit the humans behind science, creating
15
16 opportunities to display a more human image of science (Sutton, 1998).
17
18

19
20 An explicit result in this study is the evident differences in staff
21
22 members' assumptions of what is actually displayed and what they would
23
24 like to see presented in future exhibitions. On the whole, all aspects of
25
26 science acquire higher mean values in future exhibitions. One explanation
27
28 is the will to display as many aspects of science as possible. But at the
29
30 same time some aspects diverge and acquire a significantly higher mean
31
32 value in future exhibitions than others. Some examples of these kinds of
33
34 aspects are 'science from other cultures', 'how modern science is
35
36 generated', 'controversial issues' and 'gender issues'.
37
38
39

40
41 An important question is why staff members experience some aspects
42
43 as less explicit as they would wish. What probable explanations can there
44
45 be for this phenomenon? Are these aspects of science not accepted in the
46
47 scientific community? To what extent do sponsors affect the content of
48
49 exhibitions? Is there a fear of being accused of taking positions in
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 sensitive questions about science? Questions of this kind are outside the
9
10 frame of this study, but are at the same time crucial to understanding the
11
12 images of science that are displayed at science centres.

13
14
15 The analysis of what staff members would like to see presented in
16
17 future exhibitions reveals three main images. The first image *science,*
18
19 *technology and culture* accepts technology as an important part of science
20
21 in a human context, affected by our society and culture. A possible
22
23 interpretation of this image is the intention of emphasizing gender issues
24
25 and science from other cultures through a historical and technical
26
27 perspective. The significance of displaying this image of science is
28
29 confirmed by Driver et al (1996) and Sjøberg (1998).
30
31
32
33

34
35 The second image in future exhibitions is *science debate*. This image
36
37 elucidate the importance of displaying socio-scientific issues by stressing
38
39 the aspects 'controversial issues', 'values in society' and 'how modern
40
41 science is generated'. This is also confirmed by Rennie and Williams
42
43 (2002). Several scholars (e.g. Pedretti, 2002; Menved and Oatly, 2000)
44
45 have called attention to the importance of controversial issues in science.
46
47
48 Further, Frøyland and Henriksen (2003) contend that exhibitions about
49
50 controversial themes can reach a broader audience and thereby contribute
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 towards playing a more active role in society. There seems to be extensive
9
10 agreement concerning this issue, where staff members and researchers in
11
12 science education would like to see more socio-scientific issues related to
13
14 contemporary and controversial science. An important question is: what
15
16 prevents science centres from displaying this image of science? Even this
17
18 question can provide a base for future research in this area.
19
20
21

22 The third image, *informative science*, contained the two aspects
23
24 'scientific facts' and 'science in society'. An exhibition based only on
25
26 these aspects, risks regarding science in a narrow-minded and
27
28 unproblematic way, similar to what Pedretti (2002) described by "the
29
30 wonders of science". In this image much within science is excluded.
31
32
33

34 This study has pointed to the existence of two main images of science
35
36 when science is displayed at Nordic science centres. It is above all a
37
38 narrow-minded and product-oriented image of science that is evident,
39
40 where scientific processes in many respects are absent. The study also
41
42 reveals a discrepancy among the staff members' thoughts related to what
43
44 their latest exhibitions displayed and what they themselves would like to
45
46 see displayed in future exhibitions. The result has made explicit the
47
48 existence of different images of science. Images that appear in science
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 exhibitions depend on what aspects staff members decide to display.
9
10 However in this study the respondents considered a limited number of
11
12 aspects, which can have resulted in that some images have not been made
13
14 explicit. Nor has it been possible to analyze the underlying causes of why
15
16 these images of science are used. An increased understanding of the
17
18 implicit presumptions about science and learning about science will
19
20 require additional studies. Future studies should thus be directed towards
21
22 finding explanations for the pertinent differences that exist between what
23
24 is presented today and what staff members themselves find desirable to
25
26 display in future exhibitions.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **References**

- 35
36 Aikenhead, G. (2000). Renegotiating the culture of school science. In R. Millar , J.
37
38 Leach, and J. Osborne (Eds.), *Improving science education* (pp. 245-264). UK:
39
40 Open University Press.
41
42
43 Brook, H., & Solomon, J. (1998). From playing to investigating: Research in an
44
45 interactive science center for primary pupils. *International Journal of Science*
46
47 *Education* 20 (8), 959-971.
48
49 Cobern, W., & Loving, C. (2004). Defining 'science' in a multicultural world.
50
51 Implications for science teaching. In E. Scanlon, P. Murphy, J. Thomas & E.
52
53 Whitelegg (Eds.), *Reconsidering science learning* (pp. 195-214). London: Routledge
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Falmer.
- 9
10 Driver, R., Leach, J., Millar, R., & Scott, P. (1996). *Young people's images of science*.
- 11 Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- 12
13
14 Duschl, R. (2000). Making the nature of science explicit. In R. Millar, J. Leach, and J.
- 15 Osborne (Eds.), *Improving science education* (pp. 187-206). Buckingham, UK: Open
- 16
17 University Press.
- 18
19
20 Field, A. (2005). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS*. London, UK: Sage.
- 21
22 Frøyland, M., & Henriksen, E. K. (2003). Museer: historie og gammel lukt? Museer og
- 23 naturvitenskapelig allmenndannelse. (Museums: history and bad smell? Museums and
- 24 scientific general knowledge.) In D. Jorde (Ed.) *Naturfagsdidaktikk: Perspektiver,*
- 25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 30 345-371). Oslo, Norway: Gyllendal Akademisk.
- 31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 33 Heard, P F., & Divall, S A., & Johnson, S D. (2000). Can 'ears-on' help hands-on
- 34 science learning - for girls and boys? *International Journal of Science Education*, 22
- 35 (11), 1133-1146.
- 36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 40 Hodson, D. (1998). *Teaching and learning science, towards a personalized approach*.
- 41 Philadelphia, US: Open University Press.
- 42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 42 Hughes, G. (2004). Marginalization of socio-scientific in science-technology-society
- 43 curricula: some implications for gender inclusivity and curriculum reform. In E
- 44 Scanlon, P. Murphy, J. Thomas & E Whitelegg (Eds.), *Reconsidering science*
- 45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 51 Jenkins, E. (2000). 'Science for all': time for a paradigm shift? In R. Millar, J. Leach &
- 52 J. Osborne (Eds.), *Improving science education*. (pp. 207-226). Buckingham, UK:

Open University Press.

Keller, E F. (1992). The origin, history, and politics of 'gender and science'. In J. C. Petersen (Ed.), *Handbook of Science, Technology, and Society*. (pp. 80-94). US: Sage.

Lemke, J L. (1997). Cognition, context and learning: A social semiotic perspective. In D Kirshner (Ed.), *Situated cognition theory*. (pp. 37-56). NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale.

Menved, M., & Oatley, K. (2000). Memories and scientific literacy: Remembering exhibits from a science center. *International Journal of Science Education* 22, 1117-1132.

Nyhof-Young, J. (1996). Learning science in an alternative context: The effects on a selected group of young science educators. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 5 (1), 69-75.

OECD. (2004). *Learning for tomorrow's world – First results from PISA 2003*. OECD.

Ogawa, M. (1998). A cultural history of science education in Japan: An epic description. In W. W. Cobern (Ed.), *Socio-Cultural perspectives on science education*. (pp. 139-161). Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publisher.

Pedretti, E., Macdonald, R D., and Gitari, W. (2001). Visitor perspective in the nature and practice of science: challenging beliefs through a question of truth. *Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education*, 1(4), 399-418.

Pedretti, E. (2002). T. Kuhn meets T. Rex: Critical conversations and new directions in science centers and science museums. *Studies in Science Education*, 37, 1-42.

Riess, M. (2004). What is science? Teaching science in secondary schools. In E.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Scanlon, P. Murphy, J. Thomas & E. Whitelegg (Eds.), *Reconsidering science*
9 *learning*. (pp. 3-11). London, UK: Routledge Falmer.
- 10
11
12 Rennie, L J., & Stocklmayer, S M. (2003). The communication of science and
13 technology: past, present and future agendas. *International Journal of Science*
14 *Education*, 25 (6), 759-773.
- 15
16
17 Rennie, L. & Williams, G. (2002). Science centers and scientific literacy: Promoting a
18 relationship with science. *Science Education*, 86 (5), 706-727.
- 19
20
21 Sjøberg, S. (2000). *The SAS (science and scientists) project: development and results*.
22 1/2000, Institute for Teacher Education and School Development. Oslo, Norway:
23 Acta Didacta.
- 24
25
26 Sjøberg, S. (1998). Naturfag som allmenndannelse: en kritisk fagdidaktikk. (Science as
27 general knowledge: a critical subject didactic.) Norway: ad Notam Gyldendal.
- 28
29
30 Sutton, C. (1998). New perspectives on language in science. In B. J. Fraser & K. G.
31 Tobin (Eds.), *International handbook of science education*. (pp. 27-38).UK: Kluwer
32 Academic Publishers.
- 33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- TIMSS. (2003). *Trends in international mathematics and science study*. The
International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

TABLE 1: Mean values for the extent each aspect of science was displayed according to the respondents' assumptions about their latest exhibition.

In what extent do you think the latest exhibition displayed	Mean values, latest exhibition	Std. deviation
Experiences of everyday phenomena	4.09	0.84
Scientific facts	3.94	1.11
Science in society	3.89	0.95
Science in a technical perspective	3.69	1.10
Science in a historical perspective	3.22	1.24
Gender issues	2.77	1.30
Values in society	2.75	1.11
Controversial issues	2.60	1.25
How modern science is generated	2.59	1.15
Science from other cultures	2.09	1.06

TABLE 2: Images of science displayed in present exhibitions

The usefulness of science	Science and culture
---------------------------	---------------------

Science in society (0.81)	Gender issues (0.79)
Technical perspective (0.77)	Science from other cultures (0.77)
How modern science is generated (0.70)	Historical perspective (0.58)
Scientific facts (0.61)	

TABLE 3: Mean value for the extent to which the respondents would like to display each aspects of science in future exhibitions

In what extent would you like a future exhibition to display:	Mean values, future exhibition (latest exhibition)	Std. deviation
Experiences of everyday phenomena	4.48 (4.09)	0.61
Science in society	4.29 (3.89)	0.77
Scientific facts	3.98 (3.94)	0.93
Gender issues	3.98 (2.77)	0.89
Science in a technical perspective	3.98 (3.69)	0.82

How modern science is generated	3.97 (2.59)	0.86
Controversial issues	3.94 (2.60)	0.93
Values in society	3.91 (2.75)	0.76
Science in a historical perspective	3.86 (3.22)	0.86
Science from other cultures	3.75 (2.09)	0.91

TABLE 4: Images of science related to how the respondents would like to display science in future exhibitions

Science, technology and culture	Science debate	Informative science
Science from other cultures (0.87)	Controversial issues (0.85)	Scientific facts (0.88)
Gender issues (0.66)	Values in society (0.78)	Science in society (0.80)
Science in a historical perspective (0.63)	How modern science is generated (0.69)	
Science in a technical perspective (0.57)		

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only