

Original Paper

Scientificity of Psychology in the Context of Science

Philosophy

Yener Ozen¹

¹ Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Head of Special Education Teaching Department, Erzincan Binali Yıldırım University, Turkey

Received: April 3, 2023

Accepted: April 26, 2023

Online Published: May 8, 2023

doi:10.22158/jetss.v5n2p61

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/jetss.v5n2p61>

Abstract

Meaningfulness for the mind is being able to think, live and fight for the higher values that it knows and adopts. When the meanings we create are not produced enough, they turn into a burden over time. The only thing we can be sure of by looking at scientific advances is that we are past the point of error more and more. In this way, we hope that we have gradually reduced our old ignorance and, therefore, come closer to the truth. But knowing this does not give us any information about how far we are from reality. For much of psychology, practice is more theoretical or systematic, and psychology is public rather than private. Today's psychology studies the human being, which we define as a social being. Much of the origins of scientific psychology are in everyday life and emerged from knowledge of such things as temperament, children's resemblance to their parents, and the expression of emotions. It is because psychology that claims to be scientific has often progressed through practice rather than research in the name of research. In this study, the formation of modern psychology in the context of philosophy of knowledge has been taken with a critical eye.

Keywords

science, philosophy of science, psychology, mind, belief

1. Introduction

Science; The way of knowledge, regular and consistent information, which reaches some laws by considering the universe, a part of the phenomena and events in the universe, using some methods and experimental ways, and based on reality and reality (Dictionary of Turkish Language Institution, 2022). Since science is a “so-called” truth-seeking activity, in order to know whether we have reached such a final state, we must have a model of the truth and be able to compare the situation we have reached with it. This is impossible. It is therefore imperative that we continue our research without end. The

phenomenon we call scientific progress means correcting our old erroneous views by reasoning on new research findings or discovering points we never knew (Özakpınar, 2016: 18).

Just because an information, symbol, code is used in a way that we do not want, it does not turn into a direct error or into nothing. The fact that someone else misunderstands the information does not indicate that that information is the cause of the mistake. The scientific process runs on two pillars: Context and Meaning. The context is the local world, and it makes it meaningful and important to think and do something rather than something else, namely a certain thing. Contexts change over time and differ by location. The second purpose is to make sense: we want to understand what it is, so “Hah! Now I understand” (Smith, 2015: 13).

Meaning is not from the nature of the being, if the meaning is attributed to it, it becomes meaningful. For things to be valuable in themselves, they must have a self. For this reason, the value of the item is as valuable as the attribution of the superior being who says “you are valuable” to it. In order for a person to say “I am valuable”, someone had to say “you are valuable”. Consciousness is valuable because it provides this (Clarke, 1968: 598).

Meaningfulness for the mind is being able to think, live and fight for the higher values that it knows and adopts. When the meanings we create are not produced enough, they turn into a burden over time. When an icon is worth more than the main value that spawned it, the floor cannot support the symbol. You can build a skyscraper on mud, but we must condemn the foolishness that put steel on mud, not steel structure when it collapses. The relationship between meaning/value and symbol is similar. Today, the meaning ground, which cannot bear the weight of the symbol, is decaying and people are moving away from both science and its indicators (Bayraktar, 2023).

The only thing we can be sure of by looking at scientific advances is that we have left more and more points of inaccuracy behind (Is that right!). In this way, we hope that we have gradually reduced our old ignorance and, therefore, come closer to the truth. But knowing this does not give us any information about how far we are from reality.

There are great differences between attributing human actions to a soul, as Aristotle and Plato did, and attributing (or imprisoning) them to the body, as neuropsychologists now do. In traditional approaches, a story of the rise of science combines antiquity and the modern era: modern knowledge rises above previous views and replaces them, enabling them to face the facts of nature. The narrative is strikingly imperialistic, making truth (or whatever comes closest to it) the property of modern naturalists. But the law of nature does not change; whatever it is. The facts we obtain by observation are examples taken from the whole of natural phenomena. Therefore, our explanations for the whole of nature are only conjecture!!! (Özakpınar, 2016; Smith, 2015).

However, we cannot know what kind of facts the whole of nature contains until those facts occur under certain conditions. Here, the theory should be tested because it is based on a limited number of observations. We cannot know that the theory that is consistent with the observed phenomena is also consistent with the whole of nature. However, with new experimental probes made during the testing

process, we can speculate as to whether such a possibility exists. Science is a set of many different practices. In the English-speaking world, a science is (or so designed) a natural science; In continental Europe (especially in German-speaking areas), a science is a field of knowledge based on rational principles and considered to be true and correct, and even theology can be a science. Knowledge and belief are intertwined structures. Starting with the rejection, that is, “there is no!” Secular science, which started with the pronouncement, makes belief in its own scale of values assuming, and this is called the “Religion of Science”.

2. Mind in the Context of Knowledge and Belief

Knowledge and Belief: The condition of knowing up to a certain level is to listen, see, learn. Exercising the senses, classifying and dividing the data coming from them. It happens after a moment. All those accumulated sensations, experiences, knowledge and data block the way of people. One has to make a decision. Should I continue with this, or should I forge a new path for myself? It is the transition from knowing to wisdom, from believing to faith, at that moment, time, space and critical questions are asked. What will I do with my first? My previous knowledge, beliefs, friends, environment. Will I reject them completely, will I be able to carry them into my new self, will I be alienated from them and my old self when they refuse to move there? The human body is a structure whose intelligence grows until the forties and develops by understanding itself and its environment. When my body completes its development, it begins to collapse slowly, either my inner world. Will I leave it as it is or will I rebirth it? Nature whispers this truth to us. Two opposites must come together for birth. If I am going to give birth to myself again, I must first come to terms with myself and then unite with the self I hate. A person is born again when he sees his own contradictions and faults and makes peace with them. He rebuilds his knowledge and belief. He becomes wise and a believer.

Wisdom is possible with the abandonment of knowledge, faith and belief. Abandoned old values should not be left on the ground, they should be filled in a saddlebag, and one should remind oneself that this is what I was and left it. To do this, one must first of all love oneself, make peace with oneself, and treat the self with compassion, which he condemns for conflict with himself. A “dispersion” beyond the conflict becomes infinite when man is reconciled with his two futures and pasts, just like the endless proliferation of the object between these two mirrors. If there is someone whose body is soil and whose ideas are alive, this is what I am talking about (Bayraktar, 2023).

Using the knowledge revealed by science also requires wisdom, and the use of knowledge economy has become mandatory. We are beings who produce or consume something in every moment of our lives. Everyone who spends energy has to get energy because our body wants food. Information, like potatoes and onions, is a value that is produced and consumed. We call those who produce knowledge as scholar, wise, scholar. Teachers and masters for those who share the knowledge they produce. Teachers, preachers to those who teach knowledge that they do not produce; Opening the mind to use knowledge for any purpose is what we call learning. Everyone starts with being a student. First we learn by tasting

and touching, then we start asking and researching. Thinking is the highest level of learning and we give titles such as scholar, doctor, philosopher to those who can reach it. Scientists produce knowledge. What is information? For the baby, knowledge is sensation. To know something, he touches it, bites it, mouths it, swallows it if necessary. There is no thinking, there are sensations. A baby who can make sounds reduces the tactile sensations it will throw in as much as the sounds it expels. Fingers take the place of language and begin to learn by seeing and touching. Objects taken into the mouth and the frequency of putting into the mouth decrease and end. With the development of speech, knowledge continues with questioning and thinking. He can answer the question “What is this” by himself, but since the answer will not satisfy himself, he asks, the questions become more frequent. Speech is promoted from imitation to comprehension. What is this, the answer to the question is not satisfactory. What does it do, the question comes into play. What is done with it, what can I do with it, and the question “what am I good for” arises. He sees the object and himself as a useful object. I will also make a request. As abstraction develops, the concept of “me” and “other” settles. Categories and classifications become clear and condensed. Each category develops the brain. Curiosity and intelligence develop simultaneously. As you learn, relationships are built, relationships are seen in the void. Well, then why is this, second and third generation questions are derived. The era of one-step thoughts is over. This is what it means, an answer of the sort that does not satisfy. Complexity is more attractive than order. The last stage of the question of who am I and what am I comes up with adolescence, it seems as if the concrete has no value for the brain. Self, otherness, institutions, fictions, meanings, expressions are questioned.

When puberty fever passes, a period that we can call second childhood begins. During this period, basic concepts, teachings, values, questions, and queries related to a field begin to be acquired. One-step questions are returned again. In this period, the questions are for a single area. This pressure is tolerated in order to be able to say I am an engineer, an architect. After the basic skills are acquired, the period of earning money by working in the profession begins. Knowledge will no longer be learned from someone, but from life. The controlled and purified environment ends. The diploma is in hand, but then a life that has to be overcome awaits. The hardest part of this life is having to start all over again. A supervisor, girlfriend, lover, spouse, friend, who has to get along, is running around. Past experiences are ready for this confusion, but the new “I” and the “other” compelled a new design, to compose. At maturity, “acquired knowledge” ends. Now knowledge is what is produced and presented. Someone else’s knowledge is blended with the experience and thoughts of “I AM”. The producer, not the consumer, is the main identity. At the last stage, knowledge is organization. There is a rethinking of what is already known. The person learns from himself. He questions himself, arranges, corrupts, corrects. This is the level of wisdom. The kind that makes you say “I don’t know anything”.

When we wonder about a subject and write it to Google, the reputation of the book, article, video that comes to us is as much as the qualification of its owner, at least. If you get information from a Youtuber with a sweaty mustache, it will not connect us. The teacher and the preacher direct the ball in the

midfield of knowledge. They are interested in what information will be given to whom and how. Scientists are not concerned with where the knowledge they produce will go. Who uses this information and how is not his question or problem. For the scientist, the issue is the accuracy of that knowledge. Is it duly produced, does it fit the data and logic? If it is important to whom this information will be useful, the manager points to that subject and has research done in that area. This is the job of management. Management directs, science seeks, education uses it, disseminates it, restricts it.

The patrons of the knowledge economy have mostly been scholars and scientists. Modernity has disrupted this perception and organization, those who produce knowledge can be despised - they can be thought of as peasants - preachers who spread knowledge have become famous and appreciated - desired, desired. As such, students who consume knowledge and the people we call the common people have a direct relationship with science. He was the teacher near the summit information of the people who did not want more information than they needed. Later, he opened the media's relationship with the ulama and the field. However, as a result of the proliferation of information at this time, there was a need for someone to organize it, information intermediaries. Teachers and preachers became necessary and popular in this process. Teachers and preachers who market knowledge value knowledge, but this value may also be something that knowledge does not want. It is perceived as a beautiful thing for a person to love another, but some loves can kill the loved one and harm the loved one. The reason for the disagreement is the difference in understanding between the objector and the user of the information. It may not be possible to solve this problem, but it is in the interests of the parties to realize this in every respect and to spend their words and energies correctly. It should be kept in mind that those who produce the information as well as those who use the information have good intentions (Bayraktar, 2023).

3. General Criticism of Psychology in the Context of Philosophy of Science

The scientificization process of psychology, which began in 1879, was conceived as the adoption of the scientific-objective method of observation used by psychologists in controlled experiments and tests throughout the twentieth century. But in the last decade of the twentieth century and in these first two decades of the twenty-first century, the biology of the brain and behavior has evolved into the claim that it has become a science. When we study psychology, we study ourselves; The psychological subjects we study as objects of psychological research are us. Is it then possible for people to have objective knowledge of people? After all, much of psychology's field of study has taken its subject matter not from the subjective world of individual thoughts and feelings, but rather from something externally observed, such as animals or behavior or the brain. Psychologists have examined other people, but there has not been a complete consistency in dealing with their own characteristics, self, consciousness or subjectivity (Smith, 2015: 18).

For much of psychology, practice is more theoretical or systematic, and psychology is public rather

than private. Today's psychology examines the human being we define as a social being (Is that so?). Man is a social creature, but psychology is a biological science. Psychology points to an ideal. What is the core subject of psychology? Is it mind, soul, behavior, brain, personality, discourse, mental structure or something else? In this case, psychology focuses on discovering the workings of the mental system of the individual living organism, even when examining the social aspect of human behavior. In this respect, psychology, as a biological science, comes into play as a unifying approach that examines the ambiguous neuropsychology from neurobiology as functions that can adapt to the brain.

There is no single psychology or branch of psychology. Strictly speaking, there are multiple psychologies, not a singular psychology. Striking local and national variations have existed. Psychology has roots dating back to antiquity. Such a history begins with the knowledge of Ancient Greece, Egypt and China and even earlier. However, there are also forms of psychology that are not based on western science. If psychology is understood as any belief in the nature of individual people (including soul, spirit, mind, body, behavior, or any object), then I guess we can consider psychology to be universal. On the other hand, there is another great reason for confusion in the history of psychology. Psychology is part of everyday social life. The problem, however, is that the boundary between the field of pseudo-scientific psychology and the field of so-called popular psychology has always been extremely blurred.

Much of the origins of scientific psychology are in everyday life and emerged from knowledge of such things as temperament, children's resemblance to their parents, and the expression of emotions. It is because psychology that claims to be scientific has often progressed through practice rather than research in the name of research. In psychology, the situation has not been as science progressed and practice followed; rather, the quest to solve problems has produced science. Also, since people are both people who know and people who are the subject of that knowing, informational development or the emergence of new kinds of practice changes people. In psychology, there is a circle back to where it started: new information changes the subject of the information in question, and this is called a "circulation".

We need to distinguish between PSYCHOLOGY (with a capital letter) and psychology (with a lower case letter); This makes thinking easier. The first is science and the profession: psychologists, institutions, books and knowledge; The second is the situations and processes that science and the profession examine and work on. While an angry person exhibits a psychological state, on the other hand, there are Psychological studies on anger. The strong reflexive claim is that psychology changes as psychology changes; and vice versa. Conversely, modern forms of life have also brought an orientation to psychotherapy as a marketable approach to everyday problems. To further clarify this issue; this means much more than the axiom that the existing society constantly influences the development of the science of psychology.

There is not a single time when psychology started, nor a single hero who started it; nor has psychology followed a single line of development. So people will tell different stories depending on what kind of

psychology their audiences want. The existence of different psychologies is the real wealth, rather than a problem. The development process of psychology is not based on boring facts; it is a lively discussion about what kind of knowledge and practice we want (Smith, 2015).

Psychology helps people adapt to life and understand their behavioral causes. In the 1970s, studies of people who are formally interested in psychology in terms of structural studies of the brain and the ways in which emotional intelligence is affected began. Science historians are concerned with whether social sciences are considered science; They cannot answer clearly due to the problematality brought about by the variety of easily changeable values.

4. Conclusion

In order to say that psychology is a science, it is necessary to classify and systematize the knowledge in the basic logic of science. When the findings are systematized, they become a theory and become open to generalization, which indicates scientific knowledge. In this respect, Abraham Maslow (1908-1970) developed a view on the scientificity of psychology. According to him, human behavior is holistic and human. To understand this complexity, it is necessary to break the whole into parts and generalize from the part to the whole. In other words, the main purpose is to consider the human being holistically, which is what the Gestalt approach adopts. Therefore, the humanistic psychology and gestaltist approach, which are among the modernist views, do not object to the separation of psychology when necessary, while evaluating it as a science, but consider it necessary to reach a whole that will ensure that it does not break with being scientific as the final goal (Kuzgun, 1985: 1-2).

From the thinkers of antiquity to today's social scientists in order to understand the "unknown" called human and the "crowds" made up of people, the studies carried out to understand the human being are discussed in a somewhat tragic, somewhat dramatic, but mostly tragicomic discourse in the following pages. It's a mind-blowing adventure if one really has to meet "NORMAL" and "CONFLICT"...

References

- Bayraktar, A. (2023). *Bilgi Fıkhı*. İlahiyat Wordpress. Ankara, Türkiye.
- Clarke, W. Norris. (1968). The Self as Source of Meaning in Metaphysics. *The Review of Metaphysics*, 21(4), 597-614.
- Kuzgun, Y. (2015). *Rehberlik ve Psikolojik Danışma*. Nobel Yayınevi. Ankara, Türkiye.
- Özakpınar, Y. (2016). *Psikoloji Tarihi*. Ötüken Neşriyat, İstanbul, Türkiye.
- Smith, R. (2013). *Between Mind and Nature*. Reaktion Books, London, England.
- Smith, R. (2015). *Zihin ve Doğa Arasında*. Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul, Türkiye.
- T.D.K. (2022). *Dictionary of Turkish Language Institution*. Ankara, Türkiye.