

Student's Name

Professor's Name

Course

Date

Is what is considered as good evidence the same in different areas of knowledge?

Over time, the principle of proof, particularly concerning epistemology, has become an important aspect in the creation of information. Experts in diverse fields of expertise depend on facts to obtain insight to the truth regarding various facets of our lives. Therefore, based on this claim, they ought to focus on good data that is not skewed by aspects such as bias to provide accurate information. In this situation, information mediates by facilitating the attempts of the knowers to offer a valid interpretation or precise image of the universe. Well-supported proof fundamentally attempts to determine what is valid and what is not. In this case, the prescribed title requires one to analyze the degree to which good evidence is equal within the numerous areas of expertise. In this case, proof refers to facts or statistics used to validate or contradict a particular hypothesis. Proof is considered the basis on which experts rationally differentiate between two full representations of truth in the process of knowledge production. In relation to this statement, it is indispensable to consider what constitutes good facts and what does not to comprehend the correct operation of knowledge. For epistemology, according to Joyce (298), strong proof is key as it reflects justified conviction, which is an integral and central feature of the development of truth. The argument that proof is inseparable from justification preferably posits that in diverse fields of science, the notion of strong evidence is normative. Alternatively, the essence of experience in various fields is likely to impair the interpretation of successful proof by the experts. Is strong

proof in the various fields of science a universal notion? This article seeks to affirm and prove that what constitutes as good proof is equivalent within the numerous fields of education by analyzing the sciences of human and history as well.

Human Sciences

Sufficient evidence in human research, as with other fields of knowledge, is what constitutes to the creation of the facts and truth production. Such evidence, therefore, is a term that transcends the borders of vast AOKs. In human research, by testing assumptions that are backed by substantial evidence, experts aim to create the foundation of knowledge. Because of the dependence of this AOK on the empirical methods, the ability of evidence to back the conviction of an authority is highly dependent on its capacity to provide logical conclusions. The degree to which the essence of the current facts may be determined through science is its relation to the reality. Credible evidence in human sciences thus establishes a minimum level through which specialists support or dismiss particular statements or findings of expertise. Similar to a court of law, the facts provided in this AOK must point out the truth of a particular theory or argument above reasonable doubt. The dependence of human research on scientific experimentation suggests that proof needs to create understanding that approximates the facts. Among other fields of science, the case is the same, where proof has to correlate with the facts ideally. Over time, knowledge gathered by cumulative experiences has established a more substantive context for the interpretation of evidence. Thus, sense interpretation becomes an integral WOK when it comes to the quantification of facts. Scientists decide easily what information is considered good and how it fits with the science creation process by making hypotheses. This factor can also be discovered when researching the field of human perception in the field of psychology. Elizabeth F. Loftus designed a hypothesis few decades ago in the process of researching the facet of memory alteration to form

the foundation the False Memory Research (Patihis, Frennda and LePort). She, initially, scrutinized how a person's environment can taint their memory and perception orientations. Still, her peers disapproved her hypothesis, arguing that the notion of distorted memories was basically thought-provoking the universally and commonly accepted ways of recuperating from memory repressions. Consequently, various experiment were conducted to disapprove Loftus critics as well as affirm her hypothesis that indeed, a person's memory could be altered (Koriat, Pansky and Goldsmith). Deese-Roediger-McDermott is an ideal example. In the study, the resulted complemented lotus's research though substantive evidence. The research affirmed that, because human sciences' access to truth by experts, it is equivalent to other vast areas of knowledge.

As an alternative, it can be argued that there is lack of compatibility between the evidence provided by human sciences and other knowledge areas. The assertion can be justified and backed by the evidence from various studies which indicate that AOK produce subjective evidence which is open for different human interpretations. Furthermore, other areas of knowledge focus on specific parts of reality and ignore the rest. Disciplines, such as economy, utilize highly the mathematical models which can only illustrate specific and reduced facets of reality. In the approximation of truth, the production of evidence is never sufficient. As a result, there is a difference that cannot be ignored between what is deemed as good proof in the human sciences and substantial evidence in other areas of knowledge. For example, the evidence presented by a Harvard report indicated that the dependence of evidence generated by models by experts prior to the 2008 financial crisis was not enough to provide sufficient evidence that could mitigate the situation. The neoclassical model among other approaches used by experts, facilitated a critical prediction that house market values were to remain stable despite the economic catastrophe. Thus, the scenario was an evidence to prove that human sciences sometimes have shortcomings that limits the experts' access to truth.

In such AOK, good evidence proved to not always be credible in knowledge production. The shortcomings can also be assumed in other areas of knowledge.

History

The nature of historical research make history as an AOK to have credible proof that complements similar assertions and concepts provided by other AOKs. The assumption is consistent with the principles that dictates the production of knowledge in history. Since historians do not possess the ability to make evaluation in secondary and primary sources pertaining a specific event in history, they must turn to evidence for factual significance. They analyze the evidence to determine whether it is good and credible before using it to make assumptions. Eventually, historians find themselves dependent on inductive, deductive, and casual reasons to determine how a historical event or narrative can explained using the evidence. This approach is analogous to other approaches or processes employed in other fields of expertise. In addition, recent growths in technology aim to protect historical records. The technology allows a bettered access to facts for experts and therefore shapes their experience of historical events. As long as this proof encourages historians to construct new views that pursue a reasoned development, then it is recognized as fine. The proof provided by history experts using the carbon dating of rocks discovered in the Karoo Basin, South Africa, in 2009, is a perfect recent example. Through the evidence, it was discovered that a rare species identified as Dicynodon, a very crucial component of the Permian –Triassic Extinction has disappeared more than one million years before the historic discovery (Hurley). Since the evidence improved the historian's understanding and was discovered through a credible process, it was considered important and useful. Such a cases and occurrence confirm that indeed, the notion of good proof or evidence universal across different AOKs.

In contrast, in various fields of knowledge, historical evidence is not a satisfactory proof. Since no ultimate truth resides in history, experts often use various methods to generate knowledge. The advancement of competitive historical accounts essentially results from this aspect, which then makes the resulting knowledge questionable. Among other major epistemological weakness for this AOK, experts remain more reliant on other sources of evidence to select and interpret evidence presented to them (Dickie). The evidence, hence, becomes subjective in that what founds a good evidence for one expert could be considered insufficient by another expert. A specific historical occurrence could therefore have different explanation derived from a common evidence. The varying discernments by different experts facilitate the process of determining which evidence should be deemed as good evidence. Despite the well of evidence that many experts could possess, this explanation show that a valid interpretation of evidence is not guaranteed. Historians are not limited to their AOK, especially when the evidence available cannot sufficiently explain past events. For example, they opt for other areas of knowledge such as imagination that can sufficiently feel the gaps. The challenges encountered by members of the history community in evaluating the readability of evidence support he assumption that good knowledge in history deviates from the insight that can be seen in other AOKs.

Conclusion

The exploration of both history and human science in this analysis confirms that what counts as good evidence in one field of knowledge is consistent on other areas of knowledge too. The findings are based in the fact that here is a similarity between the ideologies which are responsible for guiding the process of producing knowledge which consequently make affirm that good evidence is universal. Moreover, the interrelation between the truth and evidence guarantees that good evidence should be able to transcend area of knowledge boundaries. After all, epistemology

has a primary goal of generating truth. Regardless, the analysis also uncovered the inconsistencies between good evidence in other area of knowledge and history and human sciences. This assumption is founded in the fact that many experts tend to apply differing methods to produce knowledge and determine what should be deemed as good or evidence.

About

Our aim is to provide the best assessment help

GET 25% OFF
ON 1ST ORDER

ORDER
NOW