Community and Interculturality in Dialogue. 2023; 3:72
doi: 10.56294/cid202372

ORIGINAL

The dynamic nature of scientific knowledge: an epistemological look at the research activity of human hand anthropometry

La naturaleza dinámica del conocimiento científico: una mirada epistemológica de la actividad investigativa de la antropometría de la mano humana

Misael Ron[1], Evelin Escalona[1]

[1]Universidad de Carabobo, Venezuela.

Cite as: Ron M, Escalona E. The dynamic nature of scientific knowledge: an epistemological look at the research activity of human hand anthropometry La naturaleza dinámica d. Community and Interculturality in Dialogue 2023;3:72. https://doi.org/10.56294/cid202372.

Submitted: 20-06-2023 **Revised:** 31-08-2023 **Accepted:** 27-10-2023 **Published:** 28-10-2023

Editor: Prof. Dr. Javier González Argote

ABSTRACT

This research focuses on analyzing the dynamic nature of scientific knowledge from an epistemological perspective, focusing specifically on anthropometric research of the human hand. The main objective of this study is to examine how knowledge is generated and evolves in this field, in the light of epistemological theories such as Lakatos'. Key concepts of epistemology and philosophy of science are addressed, including the theories of Lakatos, Popper, Kuhn and Feyerabend. Subsequently, Lakatos' theory of Scientific Investigation Programs (SIPs) is applied to the field of hand anthropometry, identifying its fundamental core (which refers to the belief in the relevance of hand measurements) and its protective belt (comprising auxiliary theories and methods). It discusses how both heuristics and empirical evidence drive the evolution of knowledge in this field, also emphasizing the importance of creative inquiry, scientific debate, and methodological rigor. Ultimately, it is concluded that anthropometric research eloquently exemplifies the inherent dynamic nature of scientific knowledge.

Keywords: Epistemology; Scientific Knowledge; Hand Anthropometry.

RESUMEN

Esta investigación se enfoca en analizar la naturaleza dinámica del conocimiento científico desde una perspectiva epistemológica, centrándose de manera específica en la investigación antropométrica de la mano humana. El objetivo principal de este estudio consiste en examinar cómo se genera y evoluciona el conocimiento en este campo, a la luz de teorías epistemológicas como la de Lakatos. Se abordan conceptos clave de la epistemología y la filosofía de la ciencia, incluyendo las teorías de Lakatos, Popper, Kuhn y Feyerabend. Posteriormente, se aplica la teoría de los Programas de Investigación Científica (PIC) de Lakatos al ámbito de la antropometría de la mano, identificando su núcleo fundamental (que se refiere a la creencia en la relevancia de las mediciones de la mano) y su cinturón protector (que comprende las teorías y métodos auxiliares). Se analiza cómo tanto la heurística como las pruebas empíricas impulsan la evolución del conocimiento en este campo, enfatizando también la importancia de la indagación creativa, el debate científico y la rigurosidad metodológica. En última instancia, se concluye que la investigación antropométrica ejemplifica de manera elocuente la naturaleza dinámica inherente al conocimiento científico.

Palabras clave: Epistemología; Conocimiento Científico; Antropometría De La Mano.

INTRODUCTION

Epistemology, as a sub-discipline of philosophy, is a specialized field of study that focuses on knowledge's nature, origins, and validity. Epistemological questions often involve the deployment of abstract concepts and sophisticated analytical methods to investigate complex issues such as the demarcation between knowledge and belief, the determination of necessary and sufficient conditions for knowledge, and the identification of the constraints and limitations inherent in our cognitive capacity. With a repertoire of philosophical orientations that includes, but is not limited to, empiricism, rationalism, constructivism, and pragmatism, epistemology shapes the ontological and methodological principles that guide acquiring and validating knowledge in scientific research.(1)

In this research, the central objective is to examine, from an epistemological perspective, the dynamic nature of scientific knowledge and its continuous evolution. In particular, research in the field of anthropometry of the human hand will be taken as a case study, analyzing how knowledge is generated in this field and what processes drive its development and transformation.(2) To this end, we will reflect on fundamental theories of science developed by thinkers such as Lakatos, Popper, Kuhn, and Feyerabend.(3,4,5,6) The analysis will focus on Lakatos' theory of Scientific Research Programs and its application to hand anthropometry. In this way, we seek to understand in depth the complex dynamics by which scientific knowledge evolves in anthropometric research of the human hand.

DEVELOPMENT

The nature of scientific knowledge

Scientific knowledge is considered one of the highest levels of understanding humans can attain. It is characterized by several distinctive attributes that differentiate it from other types of knowledge: objectivity, systematicity, the ability to be examined, tested, and refuted,(7) and the constant search for universal laws and principles to explain and understand our natural and social world. Science relies on empirical and rational methods to test its theories and hypotheses, which distinguishes it from other modes of understanding that rely on intuition, authority, or belief.(8)

Within the philosophy of science, several thinkers have proposed frameworks for understanding how scientific knowledge develops and evolves. A mainstay in this field is the work of Imre Lakatos (1922 - 1974) and his theory of Scientific Investigation Programs (SIPs). Lakatos argues that science advances through these programs, each consisting of a "hard core" of theories and assumptions that remain fixed and unquestioned. Surrounding this hard core is a "protective belt" of auxiliary hypotheses and theories that adapt and evolve in response to new empirical evidence and challenges. This framework provides a model for understanding how scientific knowledge can be simultaneously stable in terms of its hardcore and dynamic in terms of its protective belt.(9)

However, Lakatos' view differs from other philosophers of science, such as Karl Popper (1902 - 1994), who advocated a model of falsificationism.(10,11,12,13) According to Popper, scientific theories cannot be verified; they can only be refuted or falsified. For a theory to be considered scientific, Popper argued, it must be able to make predictions that can be tested and that, if false, would disprove the theory. In this sense, Popper sees the advance of science not as a gradual accumulation of knowledge but as a process of constantly eliminating erroneous theories through falsification.(10)

Another influential thinker in this field is Thomas Kuhn (1992-1996), who introduced the concept of scientific paradigm. For Kuhn, science does not advance linearly and cumulatively but through periodic revolutions in which a new one replaces a dominant paradigm. In this sense, a paradigm is a network of theories, methods, and assumptions that scientists accept as valid at a given time. The transition from one paradigm to another, a process Kuhn calls "paradigm shift," is often messy and contentious, as new paradigms may challenge previously accepted fundamental assumptions and theories.(11)

Similarly, Paul Feyerabend (1924-1994) offered a radical critique of the rules and methods of science. Against any absolute methodological prescription, Feyerabend advocated a "methodological anarchy" in which scientists are free to use any method or approach they deem helpful. According to Feyerabend, science is an inherently creative and messy process that cannot, and should not, be constrained by a rigid set of rules or procedures.(12)

Together, these different perspectives provide a multifaceted view of the nature of scientific knowledge and the concept of science. Far from being a monolithic and immutable entity, science emerges as a dynamic and complex field, constantly changing and evolving. Despite their differences, the theories of Lakatos, Popper, Kuhn, and Feyerabend show the importance of maintaining a spirit of inquiry and criticism at the heart of scientific activity and leverage that scientific knowledge is as much a product of human creativity as of rigor and precision, and that its progress depends on the capacity of human beings to question, experiment and explore the unknown.

Lakatos' theory of Scientific Research Programs (SRP) and its application to anthropometric research on the human hand

Within the theories for obtaining scientific knowledge mentioned above, the theory of Scientific Research

https://doi.org/10.56294/cid202372

Programs (SRP) developed by Imre Lakatos provides a valuable conceptual framework for analyzing research activity in the anthropometry of the human hand. This theory offers an epistemological perspective that emphasizes the evolution and development of scientific knowledge through the interplay between the hardcore and the protective belt of a research program.[13] By applying this theory to the research process in hand anthropometry, one can examine how fundamental concepts and underlying assumptions combine with auxiliary theories and hypotheses to drive progress in this field of study.[14]

First, it is essential to understand the hard core of the research activity in human hand anthropometry. This hardcore could be identified with the belief that hand measurements are meaningful indicators of human variability and can provide helpful information in various practical applications.[15] This hardcore establishes the foundations and main objectives of research in hand anthropometry and remains constant throughout the development of this field.[16]

In correspondence with Lakatos' approaches, in the case of hand anthropometry, the protective belt, which encompasses auxiliary theories and hypotheses that are used to extend and adapt knowledge, may include specific methods of measurement,[15] assumptions about the relationship between hand measurements and other variables, and the interpretation of the results obtained. In the research process, these auxiliary theories, when subjected to empirical tests, can be modified as new data are obtained, and new measurement techniques are developed. Under this epistemic logic, we are faced with a research dynamic capable of generating a powerful source of knowledge and progress in research on hand anthropometry.

In this sense, in hand anthropometry, CIP theory allows us to unveil how auxiliary theories and assumptions adapt and evolve in response to new evidence and challenges. For example, as measurement technology advances, researchers can incorporate more precise and sophisticated techniques to obtain more detailed hand measurements. This involves modifying and developing new ancillary theories to interpret and analyze the data obtained more accurately.

In addition, the theory of CIPs also allows one to examine how hypotheses and auxiliary theories are subjected to rigorous testing to verify their validity.[15] Hence, in human hand anthropometry research, this may involve conducting comparative studies in different populations to establish correlations between hand measurements and other variables, such as age, gender, or predisposition to certain diseases. These rigorous tests help to determine the reliability and usefulness of the auxiliary theories used in this type of research.

Another element to be analyzed is heuristics in the context of CIP theory, as it refers to the strategies and methods used to guide the generation of new theories and the modification of existing theories within a scientific research program. Heuristics foster creativity, exploration, and adaptability in science, allowing the generation of new hypotheses and theories and the adaptation of existing ones in response to new evidence and challenges.[17]

In the case of scientific knowledge generation in human anthropometry, innovative and creative heuristics stand out. For example, researchers may use different measurement approaches and methods to explore and discover new dimensions and characteristics of the hand, which may be relevant to account for human variability and practical applications of the knowledge that emerges from the inquiry. This implies an open and creative attitude to discover new anthropometric indicators and explore their relationship with other factors, such as age, gender, or health.

Furthermore, in hand anthropometry, heuristics can also manifest in adapting and refining existing auxiliary theories in the area. As new data accumulate and new measurement techniques are developed, existing theories may be modified to incorporate and explain the new findings. For example, researchers may adjust relationships between hand measurements and other variables to reflect better relationships discovered in the data.

The need for an inquiry into hand anthropometry favors heuristics aimed at exploring new areas of investigation and generating new hypotheses to provide accurate answers regarding as-yet uninvestigated aspects of hand anthropometry. Researchers can look for correlations between hand measurements and other phenomena, such as physical ability, motor dexterity, or cognitive skills. This creative exploration can open up new research directions and generate new theories that expand our knowledge of the hand and its relationship to human variability.

Importantly, heuristics captures the application of ordered approaches in scientific research. It highlights rigorous methods and strategies to generate and evaluate hypotheses.[17] Researchers must follow sound scientific principles, such as collecting empirical data, applying statistical analysis methods, and replicating results to ensure the validity and reliability of findings.[18]

Lakatos' theory of CIPs is not static and linear. The evolution and development of scientific knowledge often involve challenges and controversies. In the case of hand anthropometry research, debates may arise about the validity of the measurement techniques, the interpretation of the data, or the applicability of the proposed theories. These debates and controversies are an integral part of the scientific process. They can further the evolution of the protective belt, promoting the improvement and refinement of the theories and assumptions

https://doi.org/10.56294/cid202372

used.

Methodological Rigor in Hand Anthropometry Research

Scientific knowledge in the field of anthropometry is based on the rigorous use of the scientific method and the application of specialized techniques and tools to measure and analyze the dimensions and characteristics of the human body. This discipline seeks to obtain precise and objective information to understand its variability in different populations and establish correlations with other relevant variables.[19]

Researchers use standardized measurement methods and specific protocols to obtain reliable and reproducible data in this field. These protocols are based on scientific principles, such as replicability and validity of the results obtained.[20] In addition, advanced techniques, such as 3D imaging systems and digital measurement devices, are used to accurately and in detail capture the dimensions of the hand and its three-dimensional structure.[21]

Research in hand anthropometry also involves:

- the formulation of scientific hypotheses,
- the design of studies and experiments to test these hypotheses, and
- the statistical analysis of the data collected.

Researchers apply specialized statistical methods to analyze the variability of hand dimensions in different populations and establish significant relationships with variables such as age, gender, or genetic characteristics. In addition, specific approaches, such as multivariate analysis, are used to understand better the complex relationships between hand dimensions and other relevant variables. These analyses make it possible to identify patterns and trends in the data, which contributes to a deeper understanding of the variability and associations present.[22]

In this field, research also benefits from technological advances, which have enabled the development of new measurement tools and techniques. For example, motion capture systems and biomechanical analysis platforms provide detailed information on the functionality and performance of the hand in different activities. Research in hand anthropometry also has practical applications in various fields, such as ergonomic product design, medical rehabilitation, and occupational ergonomics. The results of anthropometric studies can be used to develop products and devices that are optimally adapted to the dimensions of the human hand, thus improving comfort and efficiency in use. Furthermore, in the medical field, anthropometric studies of the hand can contribute to personalizing treatments and therapies for patients with injuries or disabilities in this area.

In the field of public health, research related to the anthropometry of the human hand is of great relevance, as it provides objective and accurate information on the dimensions and characteristics of the human hand, which allows addressing different aspects related to the health and well-being of people. Anthropometric data collected in research can provide a solid basis for implementing health programs and public prevention policies. These data allow the identification of risk groups and the design of specific intervention strategies to address hand-related health problems such as occupational injuries, diseases, and disabilities related to hand function.

FINAL REMARKS

It can be said that Lakatos' theory provides a valuable framework for analyzing research in the anthropometry of the hand, highlighting the importance of inquiry, criticism, and creativity in scientific activity. Taking into account Lakatos' epistemological approaches, research in anthropometry of the human hand can be approached from different perspectives, based on a heuristic based on the search for scientific knowledge, capable of providing valuable answers to the aspects of anthropometry of the hand that still require inquiry.

REFERENCES

1. Nesher D. On Kant doing philosophy and the Peircean alternative. Semiotica 2023;2023:1–38. https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2022-0022.

2. Ascanio VT, Ron M, Hernández-Runque E, Sánchez-Tovar L, Hernández J, Jiménez M. Trabajadores con discapacidad y significación del proceso Salud-Trabajo. Visibilizando claves para la prevención. Salud, Ciencia y Tecnología 2022;2:224–224. https://doi.org/10.56294/saludcyt2022224.

3. Ron M, Pérez A, Hernández-Runque E. Nivel de riesgo para la salud y predicción del dolor musculo-esqueletico en trabajadores en condiciones de teletrabajo: Un enfoque matricial. Interdisciplinary Rehabilitation / Rehabilitacion Interdisciplinaria 2023;3:40–40. https://doi.org/10.56294/ri202340.

4. Agassi J. Popper and His Popular Critics: Thomas Kuhn, Paul Feyerabend and Imre Lakatos. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2014. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-06587-8.

5. Johansson L-G. Theories About the Development of Science. In: Johansson L-G, editor. Philosophy of Science for Scientists, Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2016, p. 103–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-26551-3_6.

6. Lakatos I. History of Science and Its Rational Reconstructions. PSA: Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association 1970;1970:91–136. https://doi.org/10.1086/psaprocbienmeetp.1970.495757.

7. Ramírez ME, Ron M, Mago G, Hernandez-Runque E, Martínez MDC, Escalona E. Proposal for an epidemiological surveillance program for the prevention of occupational accidents and diseases in workers exposed to carbon dioxide (CO2) at a Venezuelan brewing company. Data and Metadata 2023;2:55–55. https://doi.org/10.56294/dm202355.

8. Orensanz M, Denegri G. Helminthology according to the philosophy of science of Imre Lakatos. Salud Colect 2017;13:139–48. https://doi.org/10.18294/sc.2017.1134.

9. Mitra S. An Analysis of the Falsification Criterion of Karl Popper: A Critical Review. Tattva Journal of Philosophy 2020;12:1–18. https://doi.org/10.12726/tjp.23.1.

10. Anand G, Larson EC, Mahoney JT. Thomas Kuhn on Paradigms. Production and Operations Management 2020;29:1650–7. https://doi.org/10.1111/poms.13188.

11. Shaw J. Was Feyerabend an anarchist? The structure(s) of 'anything goes.' Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A 2017;64:11–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsa.2017.06.002.

12. Guna ASF, Ramadhani F. Metodologi Program Riset Imre Lakatos. JURNAL PENDIDIKAN ISLAM AL-ILMI 2021;4. https://doi.org/10.32529/al-ilmi.v4i1.934.

13. Assya'bani R. Methodology of Scientific Reseacrh Programmes Imre Lakatos: Implikasi Terhadap Studi dan Pendidikan Islam. AT-TURAS: Jurnal Studi Keislaman 2020;7:218–31. https://doi.org/10.33650/at-turas.v7i2.1053.

14. Cardoza W, Rodriguez C, Pérez-Galavís A, Ron M. Work psychosocial factors and stress in medical staff in the epidemiology area of a public institution. Interdisciplinary Rehabilitation / Rehabilitacion Interdisciplinaria 2023;3:52–52. https://doi.org/10.56294/ri202352.

15. Coello XP, Garrido RS. Imre Lakatos: Los programas de investigación científica. Revista Honoris Causa 2021;13:109–16.

16. Quispe IZ, Ron M, Hernandéz-Runque E, Escalona E, Trovat-Ascanio V. Evaluación ergonómica del puesto de trabajo colgador de pollo en empresa beneficiadora de aves. Salud, Ciencia y Tecnología 2022;2:217–217. https://doi.org/10.56294/saludcyt2022217.

17. Sürücü L, Maslakçi A. Validity and reliability in quantitative research. Business & Management Studies: An International Journal 2020;8:2694–726. https://doi.org/10.15295/bmij.v8i3.1540.

18. Nadadur G, Parkinson MB. Extrapolation of Anthropometric Measures to New Populations. SAE Int J Passeng Cars – Electron Electr Syst 2008;1:567–73. https://doi.org/10.4271/2008-01-1858.

19. De Stefani A, Barone M, Hatami Alamdari S, Barjami A, Baciliero U, Apolloni F, et al. Validation of Vectra 3D Imaging Systems: A Review. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 2022;19:8820. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19148820.

20. Ron M, Pérez A, Hernández-Runque E. Prevalencia del dolor músculo esquelético auto-percibido y su asociación con el género en teletrabajadores/as del tren gerencial de una empresa manufacturera de alimentos venezolana. Interdisciplinary Rehabilitation / Rehabilitacion Interdisciplinaria 2023;3:51–51. https://doi.org/10.56294/ri202351.

21. Ron M, Escalona E. Revisión sistemática sobre metodologías en estudios de antropometría y fuerza de mano en trabajadores. Salud de los Trabajadores 2021;29:128–45.

22. Boon M, Van Baalen S. Epistemology for interdisciplinary research – shifting philosophical paradigms of science. Euro Jnl Phil Sci 2018;9:16. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13194-018-0242-4.

FINANCING

There is no funding for this work.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

AUTHORSHIP CONTRIBUTION

Conceptualization: Misael Ron, Evelin Escalona.
Research: Misael Ron, Evelin Escalona.
Methodology: Misael Ron, Evelin Escalona.
Original writing-drafting: Misael Ron, Evelin Escalona.
Writing-revision and editing: Misael Ron, Evelin Escalona.