

2. Давидченко І. Д. Формування лінгвокультурологічної компетентності майбутніх вихователів дошкільних навчальних закладів : дис. ... канд. пед. наук : 13.00.04 / ДВНЗ “Донбаський державний педагогічний ун-т”. Слов’янськ, 2018. 359 с.
3. Українська лінгвокультурологія: навч. посіб. для студ. зі спец. “Українська мова і література” / кол. авт.: О. І. Потапенко, Я. О. Потапенко, Л. П. Кожуховська та ін.; за заг. ред. проф. О. І. Потапенка. Корсунь-Шевченківський: ФОП Гаврищенко В. М., 2014. 350 с.

**YU. MIELKOV**

---

*Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Senior Researcher,  
Institute of Higher Education of the National Academy of Educational Sciences  
of Ukraine,  
Interregional Academy of Personnel Management*

## **OPENNESS AND DEMOCRATIZATION OF SCIENCE AS A WAY TO ITS SOCIAL RE-INSTITUTIONALIZATION**

---

The idea of Open Science gradually finds its recognition in broader circles of academics and administrators, including those in Ukraine. However, in most of the cases the measures related to Open Science in fact turn out to be relevant just to the promotion of Open Access [6]. The problem is that Open Science is actually a complex multi-layered phenomenon that combines behavior and procedures (including Open Access) with the development of the academic infrastructure and international and interdisciplinary cooperation of scientists – and with even more fundamental level of goals and values that constitute the axiological basis for the research activity and academic integrity [4]. “Openness” of science is a way to adopt and to enforce the values of democracy, academic freedom and scientific rationality that serve as a ground of the European culture – in order for both the Ukrainian science to become fully integrated into the European Research Area and for the country to re-build its economy after the on-going war would finally end. Open Science is actually aimed at achieving not only open access to academic publications, but social re-institutionalization of science as well: it is impossible to implement its principles while negating that goal.

I would argue that the aspect of Open Science related to the values is no less relevant for the successful implementation of its guidelines than procedures of open access and its infrastructure. On the one hand, it is such values that form the motivation for the academics to carry out their research activities: no legislative act is capable of forcing either a student or a professional scientist to conduct research, either in “closed” or “open” form. If a person does not have internal values that could become a driving force for carrying out a certain activity, then any existing infrastructure or clearly prescribed procedures for such an activity will

remain but declarations. On the other hand, the value aspect can enable the noted re-institutionalization of science in the contemporary society: that also meets the needs of science itself — particularly, acting as a potential solution to the problem of insufficient funding of academic activities and insufficient social prestige of researchers, which in turn are the reasons for the insufficient motivation for the academics to carry out their research on the desirable level of quality.

The current crisis of science, its controversial status as a social institution could be related to the unprecedentedly high authority that science had enjoyed in the previous historical age. On the one hand, in the course the development of human civilization, science has been transformed from the hobby of a relatively small number of enthusiasts (back in the 17<sup>th</sup>–19<sup>th</sup> centuries) into a professional business of millions of “research fellows”. On the other hand, global problems created by technologies as a consequence of scientific discoveries, as well as the inherent inability of science to provide quick and unambiguous answers to many vital questions have led to the formation of “alternative” forms of scientific knowledge, from “folk science” up to frank pseudoscience, as well as to the public disillusionment with academic science, to the rejection of science as a whole, with all its knowledge and methods. As stated by Christian Fuchs, in the age of “post-truth politics” and fake news spreading globally through social media, people no longer trust facts and experts — they do not rationally examine “what is real and what is fiction, but assume something is true if it suits their state of mind and ideology” [2, 283].

I think that the crisis in question is still the crisis of science as a social institution, and not as a sphere of activity aimed at search for the truth. It is not that we do not have any ways to “trust facts” — it is that traditional institutional criteria are insufficient. As argued by Jüri Eintalu, “...it may turn out that the scientific institutions are not producing science, while the “non-scientists” are doing real science” [1, 116], — the reason is that the tendency inherent to elite universities to regard all research activities performed outside of them as non-scientific, could lead to heavy corruption. I would say that such a position is in fact an excellent representation of a “closed” science — a paradigm totally opposed to Open Science! That is, as it has already been noted, Open Science is not just a set of procedures for providing open access to the publication of *professional* academics, it is the very idea of *democratization* of science by institutionalization a kind of citizen’s science, as opposed to both closed professional science — and to “folk-science” that has little to do with the ideals and methodology of rational inquiries, but is in fact a direct and legal offspring of the “closed” science.

The problem is not that the “professional” science is necessarily corrupted — the problem is that in today’s society it faces challenges it can’t overcome just by itself. In different countries of the world it becomes increasingly difficult to pursue academic career [3]. In order to deal with the ever growing quantities of knowledge produced by academics, different grading criteria are being applied — and they are not always adequate. I mean abstract scientometric approaches applied to various disciplines and even to humanities: as shown by Sandersan Onie, even in such large countries as China, Brazil or India, the pursuit of formal quan-

titative indicators of academic activity in accordance with the requirements set up by government bodies leads but to the loss of quality: publications in “predatory” journals, falsification of reviews, etc. [5, 35]. That is what can be called “a *pokazuha-science*”, as coined by Jüri Eintalu [1, 117].

I think that in order to find a way out of this mess we have to reconsider our understanding of science and try to see its democratization as a way to ensure re-institutionalization of science in contemporary society as a kind of citizen’s science. Science in this aspect is first of all a *democratic culture of thinking*. Today, it is in need not only and not as much as a craft of professional academics engaged in research within the limits of their highly specialized discipline, but as a methodology of cognition. Science is a culture of critical rational thinking that could be useful to every single person – in order to live and work in any area of human activity in the contemporary world of uncertainty, not just for academic research per se. It is science that serves to affirm the values of openness, democracy, and even tolerance, which can lay out the foundation for the very existence of all the humankind. It is academic culture that can teach human persons how to think independently and how to create new knowledge on their own, including the process of acquisition and interpretation of huge amounts of information available due to computer technologies. Since the times of Ancient Greece, the key characteristic of the European culture was and remains the disinterested pursuit of the true knowledge basing on free rational discourse and the freedom of academic research. And openness as a promising trend for today’s science and for the society as a whole appears as a historical chance for Ukraine to become a true European country.

## References

---

1. *Eintalu J.* Institutional Degeneration of Science. *Philosophy Study*. 2021. Vol. 11. № 2. P. 116–123. DOI: 10.17265/2159-5313/2021.02.005. URL: [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=3801335](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3801335)
2. *Fuchs Ch.* Digital Democracy and the Digital Public Sphere. L.; N.Y.: Routledge, 2023.
3. Is Science Only for the Rich? *Nature*. 2016. Iss. 537. P. 466–470. DOI: 10.1038/537466a. URL: <https://www.nature.com/articles/537466a>
4. *Mielkov Yu.* The Notion of ‘Open Science’: its Values and Meaning for the Higher Education System. *Philosophy of Education*. 2021. Iss. 27 (2). P. 8–23. DOI: 10.31874/2309-1606-2021-27-2-1. URL: <https://philosopheducation.com/index.php/philed/article/view/680/607>
5. *Onie S.* Redesign Open Science for Asia, Africa and Latin America. *Nature*. 2020. Iss. 587. P. 35–37. DOI: 10.1038/d41586-020-03052-3. URL: <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-020-03052-3>
6. Ukraine has joined the EU countries that have an approved plan for implementing the Open Science principles. *Government Portal*. 2022, 8<sup>th</sup> October. URL: <https://www.kmu.gov.ua/en/news/ukraina-pryiednalas-do-krain-ies-shcho-maiut-zatverdzhnyi-plan-realizatsii-pryntsypiv-vidkrytoi-nauky>