International Journal of Humanities and Social Development Research
Volume 10, № 1, 2026, 83-104
https://doi.org/10.30546/2523-4331.2026.10.1.83

EPISTEMOLOGY AND METHODOLOGY OF SCIENCE: FOUNDATIONS, CONTROVERSIES, AND CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES

Bakiri Mohammed AMINE
Djilali Bounaama University of Khemis Miliana, Algeria

0009-0002-6367-4956

© The Author(s) 2026

ABSTRACT

This article offers a critical and comprehensive examination of the epistemological foundations and methodological frameworks that constitute the philosophy and practice of science. It investigates the nature of scientific knowledge — what it is, how it is justified, and what its limits are — through an engagement with the central debates in the field: the demarcation problem, the logic of induction and its Humean critique, the Popperian turn to falsificationism, the Kuhnian account of scientific revolutions, Lakatos's methodology of scientific research programmes, and the challenges posed by feminist epistemology, social constructivism, and postcolonial science studies. The article argues that no single epistemological framework is sufficient to account for the full complexity of scientific practice, and that a pluralist, critically reflexive approach to the epistemology of science is both theoretically necessary and practically productive. It further contends that the exclusion of non-Western epistemological traditions from mainstream philosophy of science represents a significant intellectual impoverishment that contemporary scholarship is only beginning to address. Drawing on primary texts and secondary commentary from Bacon (1620/2000) through Popper (1959), Kuhn (1962), Feyerabend (1975), Longino (1990), and Harding (1991) to more recent work in social epistemology and the sociology of scientific knowledge, the article provides a rigorous and wide-ranging critical assessment of the epistemological status of scientific knowledge claims.

©2026.All rights reserved.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 29/09/2025
Accepted: 26/12/2025
Published online: 25/04/2026

KEYWORDS

Epistemology of science, scientific methodology, falsificationism, paradigm shifts, social constructivism, feminist epistemology, postcolonial science studies

1. Introduction

The question of what science is and what makes scientific knowledge distinctive has occupied philosophers, scientists, and social theorists for centuries. It is a question that refuses easy resolution, not because thinkers have been insufficiently ingenious in proposing answers, but because the phenomenon itself — the practice of science, the accumulation of scientific knowledge, the success of scientific prediction and technological application, and the recurring crises and revolutions that restructure scientific understanding — is irreducibly complex. Epistemology, the branch of philosophy concerned with the nature, sources, justification, and limits of knowledge, is therefore not a luxury for scientists but a constitutive dimension of scientific self-understanding.

The relationship between epistemology and the methodology of science is intimate and bidirectional. Epistemological commitments shape methodological choices: a scientist who accepts that knowledge is grounded in sensory experience will approach research differently from one who holds that theoretical structures underdetermine empirical evidence. Conversely, the actual practice of science — the way experiments are designed, data is interpreted, theories are defended and abandoned — provides the raw material for epistemological reflection. Philosophy of science without attention to actual scientific practice is sterile; scientific practice without epistemological self-consciousness is, at best, unreflective and, at worst, methodologically arbitrary.

This article proceeds as follows. Section two examines the classical empiricist foundations of scientific epistemology, from Bacon's critique of the idols of the mind through Hume's sceptical challenge and the Vienna Circle's logical empiricism. Section three analyses the Popperian revolution and its proposal of falsificationism as the criterion of scientific demarcation and the engine of scientific progress. Section four engages the historicist turn in philosophy of science, examining Kuhn's account of normal science and scientific revolutions, Lakatos's sophisticated response, and Feyerabend's anarchist epistemology. Section five critically assesses the challenge of scientific realism and its principal alternatives — instrumentalism, constructive empiricism, and structural realism.

Section six examines the social dimensions of scientific knowledge, including the sociology of scientific knowledge (SSK), feminist standpoint epistemology, and the challenges posed by postcolonial and indigenous science studies. Section seven reflects on the implications of this landscape for scientific methodology, arguing for a critically reflexive pluralism. Section eight provides a conclusion.

The article adopts a critical academic stance throughout: it does not merely summarise existing positions but interrogates their assumptions, examines their internal tensions, and evaluates their relative strengths and weaknesses in the light of both philosophical argument and attention to the history and sociology of science.

2. Empiricist Foundations of Scientific Epistemology

2.1 Bacon and the Reform of Natural Philosophy

The modern self-understanding of science as an empirical enterprise grounded in systematic observation and inductive reasoning owes much to Francis Bacon's early seventeenth-century programme for the reform of natural philosophy. In his Novum Organum (1620/2000), Bacon argued that the received intellectual tradition — dominated by Aristotelian syllogistic reasoning and scholastic commentary on ancient texts — was constitutively incapable of generating genuine knowledge of nature. The problem, for Bacon, was not merely technical but psychological and social: the human mind is subject to systematic distortions — what Bacon called the 'idols' (idola) — that prevent clear and unbiased observation of nature. The Idol of the Tribe reflects the distortions inherent in human nature as such; the Idol of the Cave reflects individual biases and preconceptions; the Idol of the Marketplace reflects the confusions generated by language and social communication; and the Idol of the Theatre reflects the distorting influence of philosophical and intellectual traditions.

Bacon's proposed remedy was a systematic method of inductive inquiry — the gradual accumulation of carefully organised observations and experiments, proceeding from the particular to the general by cautious and disciplined steps. His vision was essentially cooperative and institutional: the production of knowledge about nature was too large a task for any individual mind and required organised, collective endeavour. In this respect, Bacon anticipated key elements of both the sociology of scientific knowledge and the philosophy of scientific methodology.

Yet Bacon's empiricism has significant limitations that subsequent philosophy of science has brought to light. His account of induction as a straightforward accumulation of observations ignores the theory-ladenness of observation — the extent to which what scientists 'see' is shaped by the theoretical frameworks they bring to the act of looking (Hanson, 1958). It also faces the fundamental problem of inductive logic identified by Hume: no amount of particular observations logically entails a universal generalisation (Hume, 1748/1975). Bacon's inductivism, in short, rests on epistemological foundations that his own method of radical critique would need to interrogate more rigorously.

2.2 Hume's Sceptical Challenge

David Hume's analysis of inductive inference stands as one of the most important and philosophically consequential contributions to the epistemology of science. In his Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding (1748/1975), Hume argued that the inference from observed regularities to unobserved cases — the inferential move at the heart of all empirical science — cannot be rationally justified. All arguments for induction are either deductive (and therefore incapable of establishing the contingent truth of empirical generalisations) or inductive (and therefore circular, presupposing precisely what they purport to justify). The 'uniformity of nature' — the assumption that the future will resemble the past — is itself an empirical claim that cannot be verified without circularity.

The implications of Hume's argument are radical: it suggests that scientific laws and theories, insofar as they claim to hold universally and necessarily, transcend what can be justified by empirical evidence alone. Science, on this analysis, is a practice grounded ultimately in habit, custom, and psychological expectation rather than in strict logical necessity (Hume, 1748/1975). This is a conclusion that the scientific community — and many philosophers who value the achievements of science — has understandably found difficult to accept, and much of subsequent philosophy of science can be read as a sustained attempt to respond to the Humean challenge.

Kant's attempt to resolve the problem by positing the categories of the understanding (including causality) as conditions of the possibility of experience represents one such response, though it does so at the cost of introducing a transcendental idealism that many find metaphysically implausible (Kant, 1781/1998). The logical empiricists of the Vienna Circle — Carnap, Schlick, Reichenbach — attempted a different resolution through the probability calculus: inductive inference could be justified not as a guarantee of truth but as a procedure for rationally assigning probabilities to hypotheses in the light of evidence (Carnap, 1950). However, this probabilistic reformulation, while technically sophisticated, does not fully dissolve the Humean challenge, since it must itself presuppose a prior probability framework that requires justification (Salmon, 1966).

2.3 Logical Empiricism and the Verificationist Criterion

The Vienna Circle's logical empiricism, developed in the 1920s and 1930s, represented the most systematic attempt in the twentieth century to provide rigorous foundations for scientific knowledge on empiricist principles. Central to the logical empiricist programme was the verificationist theory of meaning: a statement is cognitively meaningful if and only if it is either analytically true (true by virtue of the meanings of its terms) or empirically verifiable in principle (Ayer, 1936). Metaphysical claims — about God, the soul, the ultimate nature of reality — are on this view not false but meaningless, since they are neither analytic nor empirically verifiable.

The verificationist criterion served a dual purpose: it demarcated science (meaningful, verifiable) from metaphysics (meaningless, unverifiable) and provided a criterion for the meaningfulness of scientific statements. However, the criterion encountered a series of devastating objections. Hempel (1965) showed that the criterion, as stated, was either too restrictive (excluding many genuinely scientific statements such as universal laws, which cannot be fully verified by any finite number of observations) or too permissive (including metaphysical statements that can be trivially conjoined with empirical content). The criterion also proved self-refuting: the verification principle itself is neither analytically true nor empirically verifiable, and therefore, by its own lights, meaningless.

The collapse of the verificationist programme opened the field for alternative approaches to the demarcation of science, the most influential of which was Karl Popper's falsificationism.

3. Popper and the Logic of Scientific Discovery

3.1 Falsificationism as Demarcation Criterion

Karl Popper's The Logic of Scientific Discovery (1935/1959) represents a decisive turning point in the philosophy of science. Popper accepted Hume's argument that inductive inference cannot be logically justified and concluded that the logic of science is not inductive but deductive — specifically, the deductive logic of refutation (modus tollens). A scientific theory, for Popper, is not characterised by its ability to be verified but by its susceptibility to falsification: a statement is scientific if and only if it makes definite empirical predictions that could, in principle, be shown to be false by observation or experiment. Genuine scientific theories take risks — they rule out certain possible states of the world, and if those ruled-out states are observed, the theory is refuted.

This criterion allowed Popper to demarcate science from what he regarded as pseudo-science: psychoanalysis (Freudian and Adlerian), Marxist historical theory, and astrology are, on Popper's analysis, unfalsifiable because their proponents can always accommodate apparently disconfirming evidence through auxiliary hypotheses or reinterpretation. Relativity theory and quantum mechanics, by contrast, are genuine sciences because they make precise and empirically risky predictions — as Einstein's general theory spectacularly demonstrated in Eddington's 1919 measurement of the bending of starlight.

Popper's epistemological framework also entails a distinctive account of scientific progress. Science advances not by accumulating verified truths but by a process of conjecture and refutation: bold hypotheses are proposed, subjected to the most severe tests possible, and, when falsified, replaced by new and bolder conjectures. This process does not culminate in certainty but in an ever-growing body of conjectural knowledge that has survived rigorous attempts at refutation (Popper, 1963). Knowledge, for Popper, is essentially fallibilist: all scientific theories are provisional, and the history of science is a history of successive approximations to truth rather than a linear accumulation of established facts.

3.2 Critical Assessment of Falsificationism

Popper's falsificationism has been enormously influential and captures something genuinely important about the critical character of scientific inquiry. However, it faces a series of serious objections that have substantially qualified its authority as a comprehensive account of scientific methodology.

The most fundamental objection is the Duhem-Quine thesis, developed independently by Pierre Duhem (1906/1954) and W. V. O. Quine (1953). Any scientific test of a hypothesis requires a large number of auxiliary assumptions about instruments, background conditions, and collateral theories. When an experimental prediction fails, logic alone cannot tell us which component of the total system of belief — the central hypothesis or one of the auxiliary assumptions — is responsible for the failure. Scientists always have the option of saving a cherished hypothesis by adjusting the auxiliary assumptions, and there are no purely logical constraints on how far this strategy can be pressed. The Duhem-Quine thesis therefore undermines the clean logic of falsification: experimental results do not unambiguously falsify individual hypotheses.

A further difficulty concerns the actual practice of science. Historians and sociologists of science have documented many cases in which scientists have rationally maintained theories in the face of apparently falsifying evidence — not because of obstinacy or bad faith but because the background conditions for a fair test were not yet in place, or because the anomaly was likely to be resolved by future theoretical or instrumental developments (Lakatos & Musgrave, 1970). Newton's gravitational theory was retained for decades despite known anomalies (such as the precession of Mercury's perihelion) that were eventually explained by Einstein's general theory of relativity. On a strict falsificationist account, Newton's theory should have been abandoned much earlier; the fact that it was not, and that this was scientifically rational, suggests that Popper's account of scientific rationality is too simple.

Imre Lakatos (1970), a student of Popper's, developed a sophisticated response to these difficulties in his methodology of scientific research programmes, which we examine in the following section.

4. The Historicist Turn: Kuhn, Lakatos, and Feyerabend

4.1 Kuhn and the Structure of Scientific Revolutions

Thomas Kuhn's The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (1962/2012) inaugurated a new era in the philosophy and sociology of science by arguing that the history of science, properly understood, is incompatible with the rationalist and progressivist accounts offered by both the logical empiricists and Popper. Kuhn introduced the concept of the paradigm — a constellation of shared exemplary problems, methods, theoretical commitments, and values that define a scientific community's normal practice — to describe the intellectual framework within which scientists work during periods of what he called 'normal science.'

During periods of normal science, the scientific community is not primarily engaged in testing or potentially overturning its fundamental commitments; rather, it is engaged in the sophisticated puzzle-solving activity of extending and deepening the implications of the reigning paradigm. Anomalies — experimental results that resist accommodation within the paradigm — are typically set aside or explained away; they are treated as puzzles to be solved rather than refutations to be acted upon. However, when anomalies accumulate to the point where the scientific community can no longer ignore them, a 'crisis' develops that eventually precipitates a scientific revolution: the old paradigm is replaced by a new one that reframes the entire field.

Kuhn's account has several epistemologically provocative implications. Most controversially, he argued that successive paradigms are 'incommensurable': they define different problems, employ different concepts, and rest on different metaphysical assumptions to such an extent that scientists working within different paradigms literally inhabit different worlds and cannot fully translate each other's claims. This thesis challenges both the idea of cumulative scientific progress and the idea that paradigm shifts are governed by straightforward rational criteria of theory choice (Kuhn, 1962/2012).

Kuhn's work generated enormous controversy. Philosophers of science objected that his account of paradigm change conflated the psychology and sociology of science with its epistemology: the fact that scientists are influenced by non-rational factors in accepting or rejecting theories does not show that there are no rational criteria for theory choice. Kuhn himself subsequently clarified his position, arguing that there are shared epistemic values — accuracy, consistency, scope, simplicity, and fruitfulness — that guide scientists across paradigm shifts, even if the application of these values is not algorithmic (Kuhn, 1977). This clarification, however, raised the question of whether these values are sufficient to determine rational theory choice, or whether they merely set the stage for a discourse that is ultimately underdetermined by purely epistemic considerations.

4.2 Lakatos and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes

Imre Lakatos's methodology of scientific research programmes (MSRP) was developed as an attempt to reconstruct the history of science in a way that was both more faithful to actual scientific practice than Popper's naive falsificationism and less susceptible to the irrationalist implications that Lakatos perceived in Kuhn's account (Lakatos, 1970). For Lakatos, the basic unit of scientific appraisal is not the individual hypothesis but the research programme: a sequence of theories sharing a 'hard core' of fundamental commitments (protected from falsification by a 'negative heuristic') surrounded by a 'protective belt' of auxiliary hypotheses that can be modified to accommodate empirical challenges.

A research programme is 'progressive' if it successfully predicts novel facts and its modifications to the protective belt are not merely defensive but generate new empirical content. It is 'degenerating' if its modifications are merely ad hoc — adjusting the auxiliary hypotheses in response to anomalies without generating new predictions. On this account, the history of science can be rationally reconstructed as the competition between research programmes: progressive programmes expand and attract scientists, while degenerating programmes are eventually abandoned.

Lakatos's framework is intellectually impressive, but it faces difficulties of its own. The criteria for distinguishing progressive from degenerating research programmes are not always clear in practice, and there is a significant degree of temporal indeterminacy in assessments of progressiveness: a programme that appears to be degenerating at one moment may become progressive again with a new theoretical development. Furthermore, as Feyerabend (1975) pointed out, even apparently degenerating programmes have sometimes survived long enough to make important contributions, and rigid adherence to the progressive/degenerating distinction might have led to the premature abandonment of ultimately productive research traditions.

4.3 Feyerabend's Epistemological Anarchism

Paul Feyerabend's Against Method (1975) represents the most radical challenge to the idea that science is governed by a rationally articulable methodology. Drawing on detailed historical case studies — most notably Galileo's defence of the Copernican system — Feyerabend argued that every methodological rule that philosophers of science have proposed as constitutive of scientific rationality has been violated in the history of science by scientists who, in so doing, advanced science rather than impeding it. The conclusion Feyerabend drew was that science has no characteristic method and that the only methodological principle that does not impede scientific progress is 'anything goes.'

Feyerabend's argument has been widely misunderstood as a wholesale rejection of science or an embrace of irrationalism. In fact, his position is more nuanced: he was not arguing that all theories are equally good or that there are no reasons for preferring some scientific claims over others. Rather, he was arguing against the dogmatic imposition of any single methodological framework as the unique criterion of scientific rationality. He was also making a political argument: the privileging of one particular style of scientific inquiry (Western, quantitative, experimental) as the uniquely legitimate form of knowledge is, he argued, a form of intellectual imperialism that marginalises other knowledge traditions (Feyerabend, 1978).

While Feyerabend's anarchism is difficult to sustain as a positive epistemological position, his critique identifies genuine limitations in both falsificationism and the MSRP: scientific practice is more various, more contextually sensitive, and more dependent on tacit knowledge and community norms than any codified methodology can fully capture.

This insight connects to the social epistemology of science that became a major research programme in the 1970s and 1980s.

5. Scientific Realism and Its Alternatives

5.1 The Scientific Realism Debate

The debate over scientific realism concerns whether the theoretical entities posited by successful scientific theories — electrons, quarks, genes, space-time curvature — really exist independently of our theories, or whether scientific theories are merely instruments for organising and predicting observable phenomena. Scientific realism is the view that the world is largely as our best scientific theories describe it to be, including its unobservable dimensions, and that the predictive success of science is best explained by the approximate truth of scientific theories (Putnam, 1975). The 'no miracles' argument, associated with Putnam, holds that the extraordinary success of science would be a cosmic coincidence — a miracle — if scientific theories were not at least approximately true descriptions of the world.

Against scientific realism, instrumentalism holds that scientific theories are not descriptions of reality but instruments for generating predictions: they are assessed not by their truth but by their empirical adequacy. Van Fraassen's (1980) constructive empiricism represents a sophisticated development of this position: science aims not at truth but at empirical adequacy, and a rational scientist need only believe that a theory 'saves the phenomena' — correctly describes observable reality — without being committed to the existence of unobservable theoretical entities. Van Fraassen argues that the inference from empirical success to truth is unwarranted because we can never rule out the possibility that a theory is empirically adequate but radically false in its claims about unobservable reality.

The pessimistic meta-induction, developed by Laudan (1981), poses a serious challenge to scientific realism: the history of science is littered with theories that were once regarded as successful but are now known to be false in their central theoretical commitments (phlogiston theory, caloric theory, the luminiferous ether, classical Newtonian mechanics). If past successful theories were false, what grounds do we have for thinking that our current successful theories are true? The realist response — that science exhibits increasing verisimilitude, or truth-likeness, over time — requires a coherent account of verisimilitude that has proved difficult to provide (Niiniluoto, 1987).

5.2 Structural Realism

Structural realism, proposed by John Worrall (1989) as a way of conciliating the insights of realism and anti-realism, holds that what is preserved across scientific revolutions is not the specific ontology of theories (their claims about the nature of entities) but their mathematical structure (the structural relations they posit). Fresnel's equations for light, for example, were preserved in Maxwell's electromagnetic theory, even though the entities they referred to changed dramatically — from mechanical vibrations in the ether to oscillating electromagnetic fields. This suggests that the structural content of scientific theories, rather than their representational content, is what approximates the structure of the world.

Structural realism has been developed in two directions: epistemic structural realism (we can only know the structural relations of the world, not the intrinsic nature of the entities that instantiate them) and ontic structural realism (the world itself is fundamentally relational, and individual objects are derivative abstractions from structures). Both versions face significant philosophical difficulties — the former risks collapsing into a sophisticated form of instrumentalism, the latter raises difficult questions about the coherence of a purely relational ontology without primitive relata (Ladyman & Ross, 2007).

The debate over scientific realism remains unresolved and is likely to remain so, since it ultimately touches on deep metaphysical questions about the relationship between theory and reality that no purely empirical evidence can settle. What the debate does clarify is the importance of distinguishing different dimensions of the realism question: ontological realism (concerning the existence of theory-independent entities), epistemological realism (concerning our ability to know the properties of these entities), and semantic realism (concerning the truth-aptness of theoretical claims).

6. Social Dimensions of Scientific Knowledge

6.1 The Sociology of Scientific Knowledge

The sociology of scientific knowledge (SSK), associated with the Edinburgh School (Bloor, 1976; Barnes, 1977) and the Bath School (Collins, 1985), developed in the 1970s as a research programme that sought to explain the content of scientific beliefs — not merely the social organisation of science — by reference to social and cultural factors. David Bloor's 'strong programme' in the sociology of knowledge proposed four principles: causality (sociological explanations should identify the causes of scientific beliefs), impartiality (the same types of causes should explain both true and false, rational and irrational beliefs), symmetry (the same types of explanation should apply to both sides of any epistemic dichotomy), and reflexivity (the programme should be applicable to itself).

The strong programme generated intense controversy among philosophers of science, many of whom objected that the symmetry and impartiality principles entailed that there are no epistemic distinctions between true and false, rational and irrational beliefs — a view that appeared to dissolve the very category of scientific knowledge. Bloor and his collaborators responded that they were not making claims about the epistemological status of scientific beliefs but about the methodology appropriate for sociological explanation of belief formation. The proper object of sociological inquiry is the social conditions that explain why scientists hold the beliefs they do; the evaluation of the epistemic status of those beliefs is a separate philosophical question (Bloor, 1991).

Laboratory studies, a further development within the sociological tradition (Latour & Woolgar, 1979; Knorr-Cetina, 1981), brought ethnographic methods to bear on the day-to-day practice of science, treating the laboratory as a social site in which scientific facts are constructed through complex negotiations among scientists, instruments, funding agencies, and theoretical commitments. This constructivist perspective challenged the realist assumption that scientific facts are simply read off from nature, suggesting instead that they are the outcome of a contingent social process — though the extent to which this social contingency compromises the epistemic authority of scientific knowledge remains deeply contested.

6.2 Feminist Epistemology and Standpoint Theory

Feminist epistemology emerged in the 1980s and 1990s as a critique of the alleged universalism and neutrality of mainstream epistemology and philosophy of science. Feminist epistemologists argued that the dominant paradigm of scientific rationality — objective, value-neutral, disembodied, universal — was in fact a masculine construction that systematically excluded women and women's experiences from the production of scientific knowledge (Harding, 1986; Longino, 1990).

Sandra Harding's (1986) standpoint epistemology is among the most influential contributions to this tradition. Harding argued that the social position of the knower is epistemically relevant: those who occupy subordinate social positions — women, workers, colonised peoples — have access to forms of experience and insight that are invisible from the perspective of the dominant group. Far from introducing bias, attention to standpoint can generate what Harding called 'strong objectivity' — a more complete and less distorted picture of social and natural reality, because it incorporates perspectives that dominant epistemology suppresses.

Helen Longino's (1990) social epistemology represents a somewhat different approach: she argues that objectivity in science is not a property of individual cognitive processes but of the social processes of scientific inquiry. A scientific community is epistemically virtuous to the extent that it maintains genuine uptake of criticism, publicly shared standards of evidential evaluation, public scrutiny of background assumptions, and equality of intellectual authority among its members. On this account, the exclusion of women and minorities from science is not only a moral injustice but an epistemological impoverishment: it removes perspectives and cognitive resources that would improve the epistemic quality of scientific inquiry.

Feminist epistemology has been criticised for risking a form of identity-based relativism — the view that different social groups have access to fundamentally different and incommensurable epistemological frameworks. Harding's later work attempted to respond to this challenge by distinguishing between 'strong objectivity' and relativism, arguing that standpoint epistemology requires not the abandonment of objectivity but its reconceptualisation on more rigorous and socially inclusive grounds (Harding, 1991). This remains a live debate in feminist philosophy of science.

6.3 Postcolonial and Indigenous Science Studies

A further and increasingly prominent challenge to mainstream epistemology of science comes from postcolonial and indigenous science studies. Scholars in this tradition argue that the dominance of Western science as the global standard of epistemic authority is not simply the result of its superior efficacy but reflects the historical conditions of colonialism and imperialism through which non-Western knowledge systems were systematically subordinated, appropriated, and erased (Mignolo, 2000; Connell, 2007).

Vandana Shiva (1988) documented the ways in which Western agricultural science displaced traditional Indian farming knowledge that, in many respects, was better adapted to local ecological conditions and more sustainable in the long term. The concept of 'epistemic injustice,' developed by Miranda Fricker (2007), provides a philosophical framework for understanding how the credibility and intelligibility of knowledge claims can be systematically diminished by reason of the claimant's social identity — in colonial and postcolonial contexts, this typically involves the delegitimation of non-Western knowledge traditions by their classification as 'mere belief,' 'tradition,' or 'superstition' in contrast to genuine scientific knowledge.

Indigenous science studies scholars have argued for a 'two-eyed seeing' approach (Bartlett et al., 2012) — a pedagogy and research methodology that brings Western scientific and indigenous knowledge systems into a productive dialogue of mutual respect and mutual critique, rather than treating the former as the standard by which the latter must be assessed. This approach has demonstrated significant practical value in areas such as environmental management, public health, and biodiversity conservation, suggesting that the epistemological plurality it proposes is not merely an ethical desideratum but a condition of more adequate and inclusive scientific knowledge.

7. Toward a Critically Reflexive Methodological Pluralism

7.1 The Limitations of Single-Framework Epistemology

The survey of major epistemological traditions in philosophy of science conducted in the preceding sections reveals a consistent pattern: each framework captures important and genuine features of scientific practice while proving inadequate as a comprehensive account of it. Logical empiricism identified the centrality of empirical testing and the importance of distinguishing scientific from metaphysical claims, but failed to provide a viable criterion of meaningfulness and underestimated the role of theoretical frameworks in structuring observation. Falsificationism clarified the logic of empirical refutation and the importance of bold, risky hypotheses, but was undermined by the Duhem-Quine thesis and the non-algorithmic character of theory choice. Kuhn's historicism illuminated the role of shared intellectual frameworks in structuring scientific inquiry and the discontinuous character of scientific progress, but risked a problematic relativism about the rationality of paradigm shifts. Lakatos offered a more sophisticated account of the rationality of research programmes, but introduced temporal indeterminacy and did not fully resolve the tensions between the methodological standards he proposed and the actual history of science.

The social epistemologies — SSK, feminist standpoint theory, postcolonial science studies — enriched the epistemological picture by demonstrating that the production of scientific knowledge is irreducibly social and that the social conditions of inquiry are epistemically, not merely sociologically, relevant. However, they faced the challenge of articulating a positive epistemological position that could account for the undeniable achievements of science without collapsing into relativism.

7.2 Pluralism, Values, and the Norms of Inquiry

A number of contemporary philosophers of science have argued for a principled pluralism that takes the insights of multiple epistemological traditions seriously without committing to any single framework as exhaustive (Chang, 2012; Kellert et al., 2006). Hasok Chang's (2012) notion of 'complementarity' — developed in the context of the history of chemistry and physics — holds that different scientific theories or frameworks that appear to be incompatible at the theoretical level may generate complementary empirical insights, and that progress in understanding is best achieved by maintaining multiple active research traditions rather than insisting on a single dominant paradigm.

Philip Kitcher (1993) has argued that a scientifically productive epistemic community should ideally include a degree of cognitive diversity: not all scientists should pursue the same research programme, since the exploration of multiple approaches increases the probability that productive avenues will be discovered and dead ends recognised. This argument for diversity is epistemological, not merely ethical — it holds that the distribution of cognitive effort across multiple approaches is rationally justified by the uncertainty about which approaches will prove productive, even if, within each approach, individual scientists are rationally committed to their particular programme.

The question of the role of values in science has been a central concern of recent philosophy of science (Longino, 1990; Douglas, 2009). Heather Douglas (2009) has argued that the distinction between cognitive and non-cognitive values in science is less sharp than traditional accounts of the value-neutrality of science assumed. Non-epistemic values — ethical, political, social — legitimately play a role in scientific inquiry at points of genuine uncertainty, particularly in assessing the costs and risks associated with different types of error (false positives versus false negatives). This does not compromise the objectivity of science but requires a more sophisticated account of scientific objectivity — one that acknowledges the role of values while specifying the norms that prevent their illegitimate intrusion into scientific inference.

7.3 Reflexivity and the Epistemological Self-Understanding of Science

A critically reflexive approach to the epistemology of science requires scientists and philosophers of science to maintain awareness of the epistemological assumptions embedded in their own practice and to subject those assumptions to the same critical scrutiny that they bring to the claims of their subject matter. This reflexivity is not a counsel of scepticism — it does not imply that scientific knowledge is unreliable or that methodological self-criticism leads to the paralysis of inquiry. Rather, it is a condition of genuine intellectual maturity: the recognition that the frameworks through which we pursue knowledge are themselves historically conditioned, socially situated, and liable to revision in the light of new evidence and new arguments.

The concept of 'situated knowledge,' developed by Donna Haraway (1988) in the context of feminist epistemology, offers a productive framework for this reflexive stance. Haraway argues that all knowledge is produced from a particular embodied, social, and historical position, and that the claim to view from nowhere — the 'god-trick' of traditional objectivism — is a mystification that conceals the specific conditions under which knowledge is produced. The appropriate response is not relativism (the abandonment of the concept of objectivity) but a commitment to 'partial, locatable, critical knowledges' that acknowledge their situatedness while maintaining rigorous standards of evidence and argument.

This reflexive approach has significant implications for scientific methodology. It suggests that methodological choices should be made not on the basis of allegiance to a single philosophical framework but through a critical evaluation of what approaches are appropriate to the specific questions being investigated, the specific disciplinary context, and the specific social and ethical implications of the research. It also suggests that the inclusion of diverse perspectives — from different disciplines, cultural traditions, and social positions — is not merely a political concession but an epistemological necessity: diversity of perspective is a condition of the critical dialogue through which knowledge is improved and purified.

8. Conclusion

This article has traversed a wide landscape of epistemological and methodological debate in the philosophy of science, from Bacon's programme for the reform of natural philosophy through the logical empiricism of the Vienna Circle, Popper's falsificationism, the historicist turn of Kuhn and Lakatos, Feyerabend's epistemological anarchism, the debate over scientific realism, and the social epistemologies of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. The trajectory of this survey reveals both the richness and the irreducible complexity of the epistemology of science.

Several substantive conclusions emerge from this critical review. First, there is no single, logically unassailable criterion of scientific demarcation: the boundaries of science are drawn and redrawn through a complex interplay of philosophical argument, institutional practice, and social negotiation, and no algorithm for distinguishing science from pseudo-science commands universal assent. Second, the logic of science is not fully captured by either inductivist or falsificationist accounts: scientific reasoning is a complex, context-sensitive practice that draws on deductive, inductive, abductive, and analogical forms of inference, and that is shaped by theoretical frameworks, background assumptions, and implicit norms of inquiry that no explicit methodology fully codifies. Third, the social dimensions of scientific knowledge are not external contaminants of an otherwise pure epistemic process: they are constitutive of the ways in which scientific questions are formulated, evidence is collected and interpreted, and knowledge claims are evaluated and communicated.

Fourth, and perhaps most importantly for the contemporary intellectual situation, the claim of Western scientific epistemology to universal validity is itself a historical and philosophical claim that requires critical examination. The exclusion of non-Western knowledge traditions from the canon of legitimate epistemic authority is both an injustice and an impoverishment: it removes from the global pool of intellectual resources traditions of inquiry, observation, and reflection that have sustained human communities for millennia and that continue to generate insights of genuine scientific and practical value.

The appropriate response to the complexity of the epistemological situation in science is not scepticism, relativism, or the abandonment of the aspiration to objective knowledge, but a committed and self-critical pluralism: a willingness to employ multiple epistemological frameworks, to engage seriously with challenges from outside the dominant tradition, to submit one's own methodological assumptions to critical scrutiny, and to maintain the kind of genuinely open and inclusive intellectual community that Longino (1990) identified as the social precondition of scientific objectivity. Science, at its best, is not the execution of a fixed methodology but the practice of a demanding intellectual virtue: the willingness to follow evidence and argument wherever they lead, even when they challenge the frameworks through which we have learned to see the world.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Author Contact Information

E-mail: m.bakiri@univ-dbkm.dz

References and Appendices:

Ayer, A. J. (1936). Language, truth, and logic. Victor Gollancz.

Bacon, F. (2000). The new organon (L. Jardine & M. Silverthorne, Eds. & Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1620)

Barnes, B. (1977). Interests and the growth of knowledge. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bartlett, C., Marshall, M., & Marshall, A. (2012). Two-eyed seeing and other lessons learned within a co-learning journey of bringing together indigenous and mainstream knowledges and their ways of knowing. Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences, 2(4), 331–340. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13412-012-0086-8

Bloor, D. (1976). Knowledge and social imagery. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bloor, D. (1991). Knowledge and social imagery (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Carnap, R. (1950). Logical foundations of probability. University of Chicago Press.

Chang, H. (2012). Is water H2O? Evidence, realism, and pluralism. Springer.

Collins, H. M. (1985). Changing order: Replication and induction in scientific practice. Sage.

Connell, R. (2007). Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science. Polity Press.

Douglas, H. (2009). Science, policy, and the value-free ideal. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Duhem, P. (1954). The aim and structure of physical theory (P. P. Wiener, Trans.). Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1906)

Feyerabend, P. (1975). Against method: Outline of an anarchistic theory of knowledge. New Left Books.

Feyerabend, P. (1978). Science in a free society. New Left Books.

Fricker, M. (2007). Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing. Oxford University Press.

Hanson, N. R. (1958). Patterns of discovery: An inquiry into the conceptual foundations of science. Cambridge University Press.

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. Feminist Studies, 14(3), 575–599. https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066

Harding, S. (1986). The science question in feminism. Cornell University Press.

Harding, S. (1991). Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives. Cornell University Press.

Hempel, C. G. (1965). Aspects of scientific explanation and other essays in the philosophy of science. Free Press.

Hume, D. (1975). Enquiries concerning human understanding and concerning the principles of morals (L. A. Selby-Bigge & P. H. Nidditch, Eds., 3rd ed.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1748)

Kant, I. (1998). Critique of pure reason (P. Guyer & A. W. Wood, Eds. & Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1781)

Kellert, S. H., Longino, H. E., & Waters, C. K. (Eds.). (2006). Scientific pluralism. University of Minnesota Press.

Kitcher, P. (1993). The advancement of science: Science without legend, objectivity without illusions. Oxford University Press.

Knorr-Cetina, K. D. (1981). The manufacture of knowledge: An essay on the constructivist and contextual nature of science. Pergamon Press.

Kuhn, T. S. (2012). The structure of scientific revolutions (4th ed.). University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1962)

Kuhn, T. S. (1977). The essential tension: Selected studies in scientific tradition and change. University of Chicago Press.

Ladyman, J., & Ross, D. (2007). Everything must go: Metaphysics naturalized. Oxford University Press.

Lakatos, I. (1970). Falsification and the methodology of scientific research programmes. In I. Lakatos & A. Musgrave (Eds.), Criticism and the growth of knowledge (pp. 91–196). Cambridge University Press.

Lakatos, I., & Musgrave, A. (Eds.). (1970). Criticism and the growth of knowledge. Cambridge University Press.

Latour, B., & Woolgar, S. (1979). Laboratory life: The construction of scientific facts. Sage.

Laudan, L. (1981). A confutation of convergent realism. Philosophy of Science, 48(1), 19–49. https://doi.org/10.1086/288975

Longino, H. E. (1990). Science as social knowledge: Values and objectivity in scientific inquiry. Princeton University Press.

Mignolo, W. D. (2000). Local histories/global designs: Coloniality, subaltern knowledges, and border thinking. Princeton University Press.

Niiniluoto, I. (1987). Truthlikeness. D. Reidel.

Popper, K. R. (1959). The logic of scientific discovery. Hutchinson. (Original work published 1935)

Popper, K. R. (1963). Conjectures and refutations: The growth of scientific knowledge. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Putnam, H. (1975). Mathematics, matter and method (Philosophical Papers, Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.

Quine, W. V. O. (1953). Two dogmas of empiricism. In From a logical point of view (pp. 20–46). Harvard University Press.

Salmon, W. C. (1966). The foundations of scientific inference. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Shiva, V. (1988). Staying alive: Women, ecology and development. Zed Books.

Van Fraassen, B. C. (1980). The scientific image. Oxford University Press.

Worrall, J. (1989). Structural realism: The best of both worlds? Dialectica, 43(1–2), 99–124. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-8361.1989.tb00933.x

CITE THIS ARTICLE AS: Bakiri.M.A, (2026). Epistemology and methodology of science:Foundations, controversies, and contemporary challenges. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Development Research*. 10(1).83-104. https://doi.org/10.30546/2523-4331.2026.10.1.83