

The purpose of this presentation is to present a glossary to accompany LCTTA.

# A Glossary of Precise Scientific Terms -- Joe Heafner, M.S.

Catawba Valley Community College  
Catawba Valley Astronomy Club  
Lucile Miller Observatory  
Contributing Editor, *Sky & Telescope*

Version 20100122

1

This presentation is freely available  
from [www.sticksandshadows.com](http://www.sticksandshadows.com).  
Contact the author at  
[heafnerj@sticksandshadows.com](mailto:heafnerj@sticksandshadows.com).

2

This presentation was created in  
conjunction with the LCTTA  
textbook project.

3

Saturday, January 23, 2010

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 Unported License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 171 Second Street, Suite 300, San Francisco, California, 94105, USA.

4

## Abstract

A glossary is presented within the context of a new astronomy textbook designed around critical thinking. Though intended for astronomy, the glossary should be applicable to any introductory science textbook.

5

I include an abstract.

## Purpose?

- to emphasize awareness of the importance of terminology
- not to write a treatise on the philosophy of science

6

I'm not trying to rewrite philosophy or psychology here. I'm not qualified to do either! I'm trying to emphasize that scientists' refusal to use terms consistently both within and outside of the scientific community causes avoidable problems for students and laypersons. These problems aid the public in undermining science.

## critical thinking

- the set of skills necessary to evaluate the validity of evidence and the resulting conclusions based on that evidence
- no universal definition (AFAIK)

7

I've not found a universally accepted definition of critical thinking, so I attempted to formulate my own.

## claim

- a statement or judgement

8

It's that simple. A claim almost always asserts that something is or is not the case. Claims are evaluated on whether they are valid (testable and falsifiable) or not valid (not testable or not falsifiable, either one is sufficient). This has absolutely nothing to do with whether the claim is true or false, and the distinction is very difficult for most students to understand.

## claim

- Einstein got general relativity wrong.
- Protons may someday travel at superluminal speeds.

9

In science, a claim isn't necessarily evaluated on whether it is true or false. Notice that there is no logic included in a claim since there is no conclusion to be drawn. A claim may not be simultaneously true and false. However, it may be neither! For example, consider the claim, "The king of America is from Georgia." This statement is neither true nor false because America has no king. This claim also happens to be invalid because it can't be tested. How can a nonexistent king be from Georgia?

## argument

- one or more premises followed by a conclusion

This is very simplistic and not intended to overrule more precise definitions from formal logic. I want to emphasize the difference between a “claim,” which contains no logic, and an “argument,” which does include logic. Both may be proposed as an explanation.

10

## argument

- premise indicators: because, given that, since, assuming that, as indicated by, inasmuch as, in view of the fact that
- conclusion indicators: therefore, thus, consequently, as a result, it follows that, we can conclude that, so, hence

There are many indicators that signal a premise or a conclusion. This list is by no means exhaustive. Indicators are not required and are frequently omitted.

11

## argument

- Most scientists are atheists. Therefore, Joe is an atheist.
- I do not understand quantum physics. Therefore, it must be wrong.

Notice that there is a premise and a conclusion. The idea is to ascertain whether or not the conclusion follows logically from the conclusion. This structure and flow define an argument’s validity. A scientific argument must also be testable and falsifiable.

12

## hypothesis

- a claim or argument put forth in a form that makes it testable and falsifiable

13

Testability and falsifiability form the cornerstone of scientific validity. Both criteria must be met.

## hypothesis

- Humans will never set foot on Moon. (Hewitt)
- There may be laws that scientists can't discover. (Hewitt)
- Carl Sagan was an atheist. Therefore, his scientific work is invalid.

14

Examples of valid and invalid claims and an argument. Note that the first claim cannot be proven true.

## testable

- having some experiment(s) that can be performed or observation(s) that can be made in an attempt to verify an argument, with at least two possible outcomes

15

I am not entirely comfortable with this definition, but it is the best I could come up with.

## testable

- ⦿ A shadow's behavior is influenced by Sun's position in the sky.
- ⦿ Aliens first brought life to Earth.

16

Examples of testable and untestable claims.

## falsifiable

- ⦿ having one possible outcome of experiment or observation that conclusively shows an argument to be false
- ⦿ a argument that can only be shown to be true is a **tautology**

17

This definition is straightforward. Note that falsification has nothing to do with whether the claim or argument is correct or incorrect (I deliberately do not use “true” and “false” here to avoid associating “falsifiable” with “false”).

## falsifiable

- ⦿ A pen falls in agreement with Newtonian physics.
- ⦿ Physical laws may be different in different parts of the Universe.

18

Examples of falsifiable and unfalsifiable claims.

## natural phenomenon

- an event, occurrence, or process that can be explained with testable and falsifiable arguments

19

This was difficult to define! I welcome suggestions for improvement.

## natural phenomenon

- Moon's changing visual appearance
- variation in a tree's shadow

20

Here are two examples of simple natural phenomena.

## supernatural phenomenon

- an event, occurrence, or process that can only be explained with untestable and unfalsifiable arguments

21

This too was difficult to define! I welcome suggestions for improvement.

## supernatural phenomenon

- ◉ miraculous medical recoveries
- ◉ eclipses caused by dragons eating Sun

22

Here are two examples of supernatural phenomena.

## model

- ◉ a collection of one or more internally consistent hypotheses that constitutes an explanation for some observed natural phenomenon and that generates testable predictions about that phenomenon
- ◉ models may have limited scope and may be replaced by better models over time
- ◉ "better" is subjective

23

Models may also provide a description (as opposed to an explanation) for a natural phenomenon. The qualifier "better" could mean "more efficient", "more expedient", or "more accurate" or even something else.

## model

- ◉ Ptolemaic model of solar system
- ◉ Copernican model of solar system

24

Here are two examples of scientific models.

## Occam's Razor

- Given two or more models that explain a natural phenomenon equally well, Nature prefers the simplest model.
- "equally well" means all current evidence must be accounted for

25

The "equally well" part is frequently overlooked. Understand that it is a necessary part of the definition. "Simplest" means "containing the fewest ad hoc assumptions."

## Occam's Razor

- Global climate change is a conspiracy among left-wing scientists to control the world. All scientists are in on it.
- Global climate change is real.

26

Of these two explanations, the former requires more ad hoc assumptions than the latter. Thus, Occam's razor would have us choose the latter explanation.

## theory

- a model that has survived repeated testing to the extent that it is generally accepted as correct even though it is always subject to further testing

27

This is one of the most misused words in all of science. Scientists caused this problem and scientists should fix it!

## theory

- theory of relativity
- theory of evolution

Here are two examples of correct usage of “theory.” I advocate replacing “theory” with “accepted body of knowledge” in introductory science textbooks.

28

## science

- the process of describing or explaining a natural phenomenon by applying successively better models
- “better” is subjective
- all natural phenomena have scientific explanations

I think my definition of science is equivalent to that of the AAPT. I am concerned about the possibly circular definition of “natural phenomena” here.

29

## framework

- rules defined both explicitly and implicitly by a set of scientifically valid hypotheses, models, and theories
- defines what questions can and cannot be asked, and therefore, answered

Students have difficulty understanding this term. I’ve begun using chess analogies, remembering that all analogies are imperfect. Each chess piece can move on the board according to certain rules. These rules form a framework that allows us to ask questions like, “Can the knight capture the pawn two squares up and one square to the right?”. This same framework disallows questions like, “Can the knight capture the pawn three squares up?” The second question is disallowed because the framework formed by the various pieces’ movement rules do not permit it. Therefore, all questions about moving a knight three squares in a row are disallowed by the framework.

30

## open-mindedness

- willingness to accept any **scientifically valid** model and to stay within **established frameworks**
- when taken beyond scientific validity, open-mindedness becomes **gullibility**

31

The difference between open-mindedness and gullibility must be emphasized. It's also important to understand that the restrictions of open-mindedness do not inhibit creativity! Quite to the contrary, scientists are among the most creative people on Earth.

## evidence

- information that either supports or contradicts a claim or argument
- evidence can sometimes support an invalid or faulty claim or argument

32

This was difficult to define. I welcome suggestions for improvement. The second point is intended to flag situations such as a "meteor shower umbrella." You can show statistically that an umbrella will protect you from meteorite strikes, but the probability of being struck by a meteorite is small to begin with.

## fact

- evidence that is repeatable and reliable to the extent that it is taken as general knowledge

33

This was especially difficult to define. I am not convinced I got it correct. I welcome suggestions for improvement.

## indoctrination

- education without supporting evidence

Education without supporting evidence is indoctrination at best, and propaganda at worst.

34

## opinion

- a **personally** held judgement that is not necessarily supported by evidence, but is formed by the **individual**
- opinions are neither valid nor invalid, merely a statement of **personal** judgement formed by the **individual**
- opinions may be relevant or irrelevant; Nature doesn't care about our opinions

I spent a lot of time thinking about this word and incorporated the OED's definition into mine, with the emphasis of the personal nature of an opinion. Are all opinions equal? Is everyone really entitled to an opinion? Is everyone entitled to express that opinion? Should some opinions carry more weight than others? Which opinions should be ignored? Which opinions should be heeded?

35

## belief

- similar to an opinion, but not necessarily formed by the individual; possibly created by **another person or group of persons**

Again I used the OED for help here, with the emphasis on creation by other people. This is especially true of religious beliefs.

36

## religion

- ⦿ the belief in and worship of a superhuman controlling power, especially a personal *God* or gods
- ⦿ this is from the OED

37

I thought long and hard about this word, but the OED seems correct.

## philosophy

- ⦿ opinion
- ⦿ ~~theory~~ or attitude held by a person or organization that acts as a guiding principle for behavior
- ⦿ this is from the OED

38

I distinguish between “religion” and “philosophy” since I think they can be, but are not often, detached from one another.

## misconception

- ⦿ conclusion(s) based on incorrect reasoning or faulty evidence

39

This word gets bandied about in educational circles but I have yet to see it properly defined.

Here are examples of misconceptions that any introductory astronomy course should eliminate.

## misconception

- ☉ Moon's visual appearance caused by Earth's shadow
- ☉ seasons caused by variations in Earth-Sun distance

40

## accept

- ☉ to treat a claim or argument as true based on supporting evidence; synonym of know
- ☉ compare with believe

41

I have advocated a distinction between “believing” and “accepting.” The latter is based on evidence and the former is not.

## believe

- ☉ to treat a claim or argument as true without any supporting or contradictory evidence
- ☉ compare with accept

42

I have advocated a distinction between “believing” and “accepting.” The latter is based on evidence and the former is not.

## fallacy

- ◉ an error in reasoning or an error in logic that may or may not lead to an incorrect conclusion

43

Defining this word is not a problem. The problem is that very few if any introductory science students ever get exposure fallacies and how they are used to subvert science.

## fallacy

- ◉ Dr. Smith is a bad scientist because he's not a Christian.
- ◉ I saw a meteor just before moonrise. Therefore, the meteor caused moonrise.
- ◉ too many to list!

44

Here are examples of common fallacies. There are many, many more.

## doubt

- ◉ refusal to accept for fear of being wrong
- ◉ refusal to accept with the intent to discredit

45

To be precise, doubt must not be confused with, or equated to, uncertainty. The former is frequently used as a tactic to discredit science. The latter is present in all scientific endeavors, and is not inherently a reason to discredit science. The phrase "exact science" must be avoided because there is no such thing.

## uncertainty

- ◉ inherent inexactness present in all scientific endeavors

To be precise, doubt must not be confused with, or equated to, uncertainty. The former is frequently used as a tactic to discredit science. The latter is present in all scientific endeavors, and is not inherently a reason to discredit science.

46

## laws of nature

- ◉ the collection of internally consistent models, supported by observational and experimental evidence, forming a conceptual framework that allows us to describe everything we currently understand about a subset of naturally occurring phenomena and allows us to make testable predictions about the remaining naturally occurring phenomena we do not yet understand, but are likely to eventually understand

This definition is designed to address the issue of which questions are allowed and which are not. I thought long and hard about this definition.

47

## laws of nature

- ◉ By this definition, the laws of nature are mutable and ever better approximated as models are improved.
- ◉ Scientists don't know the ultimate laws of nature. We only find better and better approximations to them based on our understanding.
- ◉ The framework defines which questions are acceptable and which are not.

Here are some important qualifications to the previous definition. Note that Quinn asserts that the laws of nature are immutable and everlasting. I think what she calls the “laws of nature” are what I refer to as the “ultimate laws of nature.”

48

I have learned two things. Defining terms precisely is difficult. Defining terms precisely is necessary, especially in introductory science. It is a neglected issue long overdue for correction.

DIFFICULT!  
NECESSARY!

49


## References

- < Arons, Arnold B. *Teaching Introductory Physics* (Wiley, New York, 1997)
- < Quinn, Helen. *Physics Today*, Vol. 60, No. 2, p. 8, 2007.
- < Shermer, Michael and Pat Linse. *The Baloney Detection Kit* (The Skeptics Society, <http://www.skeptic.com>)

50

Thank you!

51



52