

Master's program in  
Statistics and Data  
Mining

*Linköpings Universitet*

## Philosophy of Science

Valdi Ingthorsson | Linköpings Universitet

## What is Philosophy of Science?

- Medicine studies the body to know how it works
  - Does not study logical fallacies, how observations are dependent on theory/prejudice, or what knowledge is
  - It takes such things for granted

- Philosophers of science study science
  - Fallacies in argument
  - Sources of bias
  - What is knowledge, objectivity, truth, validity, reliability?


- They want to know how to stay healthy or to heal the sick

- They want to know the best way to conduct science



## What is Science?

*To find out what the world is really like, in a systematic and self-critical manner*



## Rival Theories of Truth

Consensus theory:  
"Truth is what we have agreed is true!"


Pragmatism:  
Ideas are true if they work (give correct predictions)

Relativism:  
*There is no truth*

Coherence Theory:  
An idea is true if it is consistent with our established world view



## Problem




## True vs. Believed to be True

- *True<sup>1</sup>* in the sense "corresponds to reality"
  - An ontological status (what kind of phenomenon it is)
- *True<sup>2</sup>* in the sense "something we know corresponds to reality"
  - Epistemic status (How do we know something is true<sup>1</sup>)
- **Truths<sup>1</sup>:** Beliefs that correspond to reality
- **Truths<sup>2</sup>:** Beliefs known/proven to be True<sup>1</sup>
  - Because they give correct predictions (they work)
  - Because they are coherent with our world view




## Theories of Knowledge



*Hypothetical-Deductive method is a method that tests theory against experience, and vice versa*



## What are we trying to figure out?



## Objective Reality?

- Physical matter + properties
- Organisms + functions
- Consciousness and their contents
- Social interactions and behaviour
- Language and concepts
- Societies
- Intelligence

Natural Sciences  
Human Sciences



## Two meanings of “objective”

- Objectively real (real existence)
  - The world as it is in itself independently of our attempts to conceive of it and measure it.  
» NOT: “the world as we objectively think of it”
- Objective knowledge/truth (ideas about reality)
  - See things as they really are
  - Unaffected by prejudice/bias  
» Only rely on measurements?



## “Objective Reality”

Basic idea ≈ the world as it is in itself

1. That which exists independently of minds
2. That which exists independently of what we believe exists

Only includes the physical objects around us

Also includes minds and their contents, therefore also social phenomena



## Views about reality

### Realism

Our ideas relate to entities that exist independently of those ideas

### Scepticism

We cannot know if there is anything independently of our ideas

### Idealism


Our ideas are the only reality there is

### Relativism

Nothing is absolutely true or certain—all views are equally valid



## The Complicated Reality




## Hidden Mechanisms

- Bacteria causing diseases
- Why different materials have different properties depending on their chemical composition
- Biological urges that govern behaviour
- Conscious processes (thinking, feeling)
- Unconscious processes (phobias, compulsions, memory)
- Social processes (conformism, hierarchies of power)



LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## Appearance and Reality



## Natural vs. Human Science

- Natural science studies non-conscious nature; it abides by laws of nature and therefore is fully predictable


The study of a single grain of salt can be generalised to all salt in the universe

- Human science studies conscious nature; it does not obviously abide by laws of nature and therefore isn't predictable

Study of a single human cannot be generalised to all humans




## Medical Science



## Choosing a Method

- Objectively measurable variables
  - Variables which the subject cannot report (lactate levels)
  - Variables which the subject can report (weight, number of visits)
- Subjectively experienced variables
  - Sensory impressions (pain)
  - Complicated cognitive wholes (sense of stigmatisation)



## Methods

*Human Science vs. Natural Science*

### Qualitative

- Participant observation
- Interviews
- Text analysis
- Discourse analysis

### Quantitative

- Field-observations
- Surveys

### Physiological Measurements

- Oxygen uptake
- Temperature
- Weighing

Measuring qualitative variables  
(which are represented numerically in quantitative studies)


You can ask about physiological variables – but only if you know the subject has made a physiological measurement

LUND  
UNIVERSITY


## Realism

Generally: Most ideas represent objectively real phenomena

But science is constantly finding out that things are not as they appear to be




## Selective realism




## Extreme anti-realism

- Reality is construed by our words and thoughts—(idealism/relativism)



## Moderate anti-realism (scepticism)

- We have no clear conception about the distinction between thought and reality, or how they relate to each other




## ”Everything is relative”!


- Relative to what? – to me (the subject)
- Relative from what – reality (or nothing?)
- Respect for the opinion of others?
  - But what about the Taliban?
    - » Terrorists?
    - » Pedophiles?
    - » Rapists?
    - » Misogynists (women haters)?
    - » Racists?




## Physicalism



## Many realities ?



## One reality-Many Views of Reality



## Hypothetico-Deductive Method

Semmelweis and the Puerperal fever epidemic in Vienna 1844

Ward 1:  
Mortality 10% ← Why the difference? → Ward 2:  
Mortality 2%

1. cosmic telluric disturbances in the atmosphere?
2. Ward 1 overcrowded?
3. Bad food?
4. Bad care?
5. Rough examinations?
6. Priest scares patients to death?
7. Wrong labour position?
8. Corpse-stuff?



LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## Elementary, dear Watson

Premise 1: logical inference

If mortality is due to poisonous air → Everyone should suffer equally that breathe same air

Premise 2: observation

We observe that everyone does not suffer equally

Conclusion

Mortality is not due to poisonous air



LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## The Logical form of the Argument

If P is true then Q

Q is not the case

Therefore P is false



LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## Hypothetico-deductive method

If mortality due to corpse-stuff → Then mortality should decrease if stuff is removed

Test: wash hands with chloride of lime

Mortality decreases

Mortality is caused by corpse-stuff



LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## Falsification vs. Verification

If P then Q

Not Q

Not P

Logically valid: Cannot deny conclusion without at the same time denying some premise too

If P then Q

Q

P

Logically invalid. Can deny conclusion without denying any premise

*Q can be caused by something else than P*



LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## Validity in Logic

1. All humans are mortal
2. Sokrates is human
3. Sokrates is mortal

**Valid:** cannot deny conclusion without denying some premise

1. When a window is hit by a brick, it breaks
2. The window is broken
3. The window has been hit by a brick

**Invalid:** can deny conclusion without denying any premise



LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## Importance of Controls

If everyone doing therapy gets well → Then the therapy is the cure

Test: evaluate the effects of therapy

60% get well

Therapy is the cure???

Not if 60% of those who didn't get therapy get well anyway!!



LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## Danger of confounders

Confounder: an unknown cause that produces the same effect as they hypothetical cause, deceiving us into believing that the hypothesis works

If everyone who eats proteins get larger muscles → Then protein causes muscle growth

Test: monitor what happens to people eating protein

80% get larger muscles

Protein causes growth???

Not if the real cause is the training; training is the confounder



LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## How Should We Conduct Science?

- Positivism
  - Knowledge by observation
- Falsificationism
  - Knowledge by excluding falsity
- Kuhn's Theory of Paradigms
  - Observations and falsifications are only judged to be valid in the context of a paradigm
- Hermeneutics
  - How to interpret meaningful contexts



LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## Positivism

### GENERALLY

- Pure reason does not give knowledge about the world
- Observation and controlled experiment can give knowledge about the world

Principle of verification: a claim is meaningless until its truth can be justified empirically



## Positivistic Science

### Naive positivism

1. Science starts with observation not guided by theory
2. General laws can be inductively inferred from a large base of data

*Problem: induction is logically invalid*

### Sophisticated positivism

- Probabilistic laws can be inferred from a large base of data – they become our hypotheses
- Hypotheses can be further tested using the hypothetico-deductive method



## Induction

Observation 1: Raven is black

Observation 2. Raven is black

Observation 3: Raven is black

...Observation 3.980.000: Raven is black

Conclusion: *All Ravens are black – Invalid*

*Valid conclusion:* All known occurrences of Ravens have been black

*But this is not a general law nor does it explain why Ravens are black*



## Two Types of Inductive Inferences

Inference from the specific to the general.

1. This raven is black
  2. This raven is black
  3. This raven is black
  4. etcetera
- *All* ravens are black

Any inference in which conclusion is plausible but not necessary

- I saw my girlfriend kiss another man
- I think she is having an affair”

“allows hypotheses to emerge from patterns found in the data”???



## Two Types ?

1. This raven is black
2. This raven is black
3. This raven is black
4. ...
  - *Nature is Uniform*
  - *When you find a consistent pattern you may have found a uniformity*
- All ravens are black

- I saw my girlfriend kiss another man
- *In our society it is a general rule that you only kiss those your are involved with*
- I think she is having an affair”

*Looks more like abduction/Inference to the best explanation*



LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## The Problem with Positivism

1. The principle of verification cannot be empirically verified: *is it meaningless?*
2. Observation without hypothesis is impossible: all observation involves interpretation
3. Neither induction or deduction guarantees truth of conclusions
4. Difficult to find anything but correlations
5. We cannot objectively observe the content of ideas; nor intersubjectively



LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## Observation: knowledge via senses

- Can we trust our senses?
- Are sensations free from interpretation/hypotheses
- Do we see what is there, or only what we expect to see?
- Can you learn to see more than you expect?

LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## Observations are Theory-dependent

*They presuppose a preunderstanding of the observed*

1. Experiences do not arise like photos in a camera
2. Experiences are like advanced computer generated images where something has been added and something removed (subconsciously).
3. How much is added and/or removed depends on our preunderstanding
4. Without preunderstanding, no meaningful experience



LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## Preunderstanding

- Understanding arises against the backdrop of certain preconditions
  - Preunderstanding—Gadamer
  - Paradigms—Kuhn
  - General backgroundstheories –Feyerabend
  - Horizon of expectations— Popper



???



## Attention test

Watch



What's up ?



## Qu'est que ce?



LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## What is going on? IV



LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## Components in our Preunderstanding

- Language and concepts
  - Allow us to perceive things as certain kinds of things, or part of a structure
  - "healthy/unhealthy", "fit/unfit", "handle"
- Beliefs, representations, theorier
  - Everything is made of matter, mental health affects body
- Personal experience
  - Practical "know-how"(how does a ruptured ligament "feel"



LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## Preunderstanding: 4 important aspects


- A mixture of **articulated** and **unarticulated** (tacit) knowledge; people reflect upon it to various degrees
- **Holistic**
- **Revisable** and in continuous revision
- Partly **context-relative**



LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## Analytic Vs. Hermeneutic Method

1. Divide the problem in as many parts as is needed to solve it  
— *Analysis*
2. Arrange the parts, simplest first and combine them into more complex wholes until they make up a coherent and clear whole — *Synthesis*



## Where do Hypotheses Come From?

- Generation of hypotheses is a source of bias
  - ...when not generated from experience (fantasy)
  - ...when generated from prejudiced observations
- Positivists suggest we declare fantasy as nonsense and rinse our observations from prejudice
- But, is this possible?
  - No, says hermeneutics, and falsificationism agrees



## Critical Rationalism/Falsificationism

1. Observation without pre-judgement is impossible
2. Science starts with problems, not observations
3. Hypotheses are not generated by observation
4. Hypotheses cannot be definitely verified—but they can be definitely falsified

*Context of Discovery*  
*Vs.*  
*Context of Justification*



## Principle of Falsification

- Hypotheses must be falsifiable (in principle)
  - Hypotheses must entail conditions which would show it to be false
- The greater number of testimplications the better
- Form as many hypotheses as you can not just one
- Do not attempt to verify the hypotheses—try to falsify them
- If we fail to falsify an hypothesis then maybe it is true



## Testimplications and Probability

Greater number of testimplications

More ways to test (falsify) hypothesis

More improbable that it will survive falsification

But for each test it survives

The probability that it is actually true increases



LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## Hypothetical-Deductive Method

HYPOTHESIS "IF A..." → TESTIMPLICATION "...THEN B"

TEST

TESTRESULT:  
"B"  
OR  
"NOT-B"

HYPOTHESIS  
VERIFIED  
"A IS TRUE"

HYPOTHESIS  
FALSIFIED  
"A IS FALSE"



LUND  
UNIVERSITY


## Kuhn about Science

- Every hypothesis has at some time or other been falsified
- Accepting/Rejecting hypotheses has not always been a completely rational process
- Hypotheses are accepted/rejected in the light of a paradigm – not merely by observations or experiments
- A paradigm consists of the total pre-understanding of a research group – including such factors as ambition, religious beliefs, social values, trust ...



LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## Paradigms



LUND  
UNIVERSITY

## Common Preunderstanding of

- What kind of objects are we dealing with?
- How should an hypothesis be formulated?
- Which equations can we use?
- How should we go about doing research (valid methods)
- What counts as a valid solution?
- Which researchers' opinion are most highly valued?
- What is useful for my career?
- How to behave as a researcher?



## Are Paradigms incommensurable?

- Different paradigms are incommensurable and therefore cannot be compared completely rationally
- Since
  - Scientific revolutions are irrational and therefore the substitution of one paradigm for another cannot be justified as scientific progress
  - Paradigms are social constructions not the result of pure scientific research.



## Equations

- Mathematical formulations of *hypotheses* about certain distinctions or categories or relationships
  - But they are often received as "definitions" that are eternally valid – and which cannot be questioned

MESS (minimum effective strain stimulation) = 3 x bodyweight  
BMI (body mass index) = mass/length<sup>2</sup>  
Overweight = BMI 25-30      Obesity = BMI >30



## Kuhn: The Development of Science

- **Prescientific period:** no established way of doing science
- **Normal science:** A group arrives at a mutual understanding about how to do science.
  - Everyone works according to the agreement
  - Only map out consequences and applications of the paradigm
  - No one questions anything and problems are pushed aside
- **Crisis:** Every consequence is mapped out and no further advances are made
  - the problems build up and can no longer be ignored
- **Scientific revolution:** A radically new way of thinking emerges
  - A period of normal science takes over...etcetera.



## Descriptive/normative?

- Kuhn's theory of paradigms is not normative
  - Does not say how science *should* be conducted.
- Describes what science is actually like
  - How our minds work
  - How science is related to society



## Relativistic?

- If paradigms are incommensurable
  - no way to justify that one paradigm is better than another
  - to change a paradigm is a leap of faith, or change of fashion



## What is a Social Construction?

- Created by human activity
- Could have remained uncreated
- Could have been made differently
- Something else could have been made

Artefacts: made by humans in a social context

Concepts: made by humans in a social context



## Types of Social Constructions

- Generic construction
  - A *product* of a conscious or subconscious social activityCourts of law, families
- Discursive construction
  - *Objects* who are what they are because of how we talk and think about themparticular individuals
- Pragmatic construction
  - Conceptual *categories* whose use is determined by social factors"feminine"  
"Cool"



## Weak vs. Strong Constructions

- *Weak social construction* – if the use of the word denoting the construction is partly determined by social factors and yet refers to some non-social fact

The Holocaust, Quarks, Charles, and Diana

- *Strong social construction* – if its use is entirely determined by social factors and does not refer to any non-social fact

"feminine", "manly", "Cool"



Meaning unit	Condensed meaning unit Description close to the text	Condensed meaning unit Interpretation of the underlying meaning	Sub-theme	Theme
She kicks about and hits the care provider when she is putting shampoo to her hair. // She tries to push the care providers away.	Using physical violence when being undressed and washed.	Fighting to defend her body zone against intrusion.		
When the care providers are in her room she closes the door from the outside so the care providers are locked up in her room and she stays outside in the corridor.	Closing the door between herself and the care providers.	Marking a boundary against others.	Fighting to protect her personal space	
She comes out to the corridor. She wears T-shirt, plastic pants and diapers and she has a face mask on. She goes to the shower. // From another resident's room and locks the door. // The care provider goes to see what she is doing and it appears that she has laid down in his bed.	Appearing undressed and "dirty" in commonly used areas and in other residents' rooms and beds.	Crossing fellow residents' physical space.		
She goes into the ward office and starts to mess about with the staff's documents. The care provider knocks on her door, waits for an answer.	Causing a mess in the ward office.	Invading the physical space of others		
The care provider permits her to rise and ramble about, she is allowed to move around while they are looking after her. // She is wandering around in the bathroom during the showering.	Permitting her to rise, ramble about, move around and wander during the morning toilet.	Asking permission and waiting for an answer before entering her room.	Paying respect to her physical space	
She sits in a chair in her room restrained by a belt so the care providers put her into a shower chair and restrain her with a belt, which is tied to the back of the chair.	Using physical restraints.			
The care provider sits on her bed and leans over her.		Coming too close.	Invading her personal space	
Care providers ask: "Shall we go to the toilet?" "Shall we take a shower?"			Treating private matters as common matters.	
The care provider is talking with others about her rash and itch.	Discussing private matters over her head.			

Figure 3 Examples of meaning units, condensed meaning units, sub-themes and themes from content analysis of observations about interaction between a woman with dementia and her care providers.

## Two Problems with Qualitative Research

Qualitative research claims to be naturalistic inductive inquiry, where themes/categories are inductively derived from data

1. naturalistic inductive inquiry is generally considered to be an indefensible position in the philosophy of science
  - It is called 'naïve inductivism'.
2. naïve inductivism and hermeneutics are generally considered to be contrary and incompatible views.

Is qualitative research simultaneously theory-free and theory-dependent inquiry? — it cannot be both.



## 'Transferability' vs Generalisability?

- Is it reasonable to think that what was found in this study could also hold for other corresponding situations/individuals?
  - Yes if we accurately capture the type of individual/group we were investigating
  - Could this interpretation of what is going on be inspiring, or revealing, or enlightening for others?
    - It gives a richer pre-understanding of what might be going on elsewhere
  - Yes, but if the interview study is big, we can generalise in the standard way




## Validity-Reliability

- **Validity:** concerns the truth of the conclusions (given the evidence) – how reasonable is it to assume that they are true (less reasonable by the number of alternative explanations)
- **Reliability:** concerns the risk for the data failing to justly representing the views of the informant at the time of the interview – is it reasonable to believe that the data is biased? (lower reliability if risk for bias is high)



## Theories of Knowledge



## Validity and Reliability II

- **Internal validity:** concerns the ability of the study design to answer its aims ≈ relevance of the method
- **External validity:** generalizability of the conclusions beyond the sample population
- **Validating data:** controlling for the reliability of the data
- **Validating a method:** checking the reliability and/or validity of a study design/method by triangulation



## Appearance and Reality

- Appearance: The world as it appears to be in experience
  - Reality: How the world really is
- "Everything is only an Appearance!" (the mind makes it real?)
    - Our senses deceive us?
    - Our prejudices deceive us?
      - » "Deceive" implies a deviation from something – from what?
  - We can speculate about the reality that gives rise to the appearance
    - Then we must be able to form ideas about things we do **not** perceive
- The logo of Lund University, featuring a circular emblem with Latin text and a figure, with the words "LUND UNIVERSITY" below it.
- 19