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 SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 8[PHILOSOPHY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND APPLIED SCIENCES]

 The chapter basically talking about so many structures and philosophy of social sciences such that it was stated that the success recorded in natural science in the 18 and 19 century was enormous on the social and the intellectual like of the Europe. The positive response to science happened as a result of a change, the socio-cultural milieu in which positivity grew is called renaissance and the elightment period the Greek heritage of using reason in matter in public concern and not the dictate of religion as it was in the age pioror to this time. The aeon prior to the renaissance period was called dark ages because it was the time religious beliefs resigned supreme

 The effects of that scientific approach to things grew out of philosophical approach to issues, but science was restricted to study of natural phenomena because it was a material but was believed to behaved to behave in a regular and predictable way ,not until a French social philosopher called AUGUST COMTE thought otherwise .This is said to be the beginning of social sciences especially that of sociology and comte is being regarded till date as a father of sociology and social science in general.

 Then it was stated that there are problems with this concepts of ideal knowledge seeking enterprise, but first the problems where observed upon the basic justification of positivism these include ;1 observation are concept laden 2 observations are value laden 3 observations are theory laden etc…

 Then we went further by defining Social science by saying it is an area of studying dedicated to explain of that of human being behavior, interaction, and manifestation as an individual in a society or collectively as a group. It is also said that disciplines in social sciences include sociology, economics political science etc... Social sciences seek to employ the methods of sciences in investigation of social phenomena taking the humans person as object of study

 Then we further by saying that to understand this problem with social sciences better we basically need to understand that one of the essential features of sciences and scientific explanation is to provide a casual or correlational correction between an event and its cause, Although explication of causality goes back to David Hume, Ernest Nagel the exposition of the notion of causation in a bullet from which is endearing to our analysis here

 Then it continued saying that one way to solve this problem is to accept reasons are not causes but motives or intent, another reason or problem is that if reasons are causes then getting canned by the effects and causes. There were some scholars have argued on whether it is not better to leave reason as motive drive or intent and not cause. Nonetheless, there are some other scholars who insisted that reasons can be treated as causes, A scholar named Robin Collingwood who argued to the extreme that reasons are not only causes but they are the ultimate casual power which lies in human and that ascribing casual power to inanimate things and objects in the physical world may be too naïve of us.

THE problems of human person as object of study in social science The philosophy of social science is the study of the logic, methods, and foundations of social sciences such as psychology, economics, and political science. Philosophers of social science are concerned with the differences and similarities between the social and the [natural sciences](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Natural_science), causal relationships between social phenomena, the possible existence of social laws, and the [ontological](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ontology) significance of [structure and agency](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Structure_and_agency).

 The positivist perspective, however, has been associated with '[scientism](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scientism)'; the view that the methods of the natural sciences may be [applied to all](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Absolute_%28philosophy%29) areas of investigation, be it philosophical, social scientific, or otherwise. Among most social scientists and historians, orthodox positivism has long since fallen out of favor. Today, practitioners of both social and physical sciences recognize the distorting effect of [observer bias](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Observer_bias) and structural limitations. This scepticism has been facilitated by a general weakening of deductivist accounts of science by philosophers such as Thomas Kuhn, and new philosophical movements such as [critical realism](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical_realism_%28philosophy_of_the_social_sciences%29) and [neopragmatism](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neopragmatism). Positivism has also been espoused by '[technocrats](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Technocracy)' who believe in the inevitability of [social progress](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_progress) through science and technology.[[5]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosophy_of_social_science#cite_note-5) The philosopher-sociologist [Jürgen Habermas](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/J%C3%BCrgen_Habermas) has critiqued pure [instrumental rationality](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Instrumental_rationality) as meaning that scientific-thinking becomes something akin to [ideology](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ideology) itself.[[6]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosophy_of_social_science#cite_note-6)

[Durkheim](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Durkheim), [Marx](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marx), and [Weber](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Max_Weber) are more typically cited as the fathers of contemporary social science. In [psychology](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Psychology), a positivistic approach has historically been favoured in [behaviourism](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Behaviourism)

 Other approaches that deny that the interpretation of meaning is of fundamental import in the social sciences include [systems theory](https://www.britannica.com/topic/systems-theory) and [structuralism](https://www.britannica.com/science/structuralism-anthropology). Systems theory conceives of society as an entity each of whose various parts plays a certain role or performs a certain function in order to maintain society or to keep it in equilibrium; such roles are played by those who inhabit them, whether they know that they are doing so or not. Structuralism asserts that agents do not create the structure of meanings through which they act; rather, as social subjects, they are “created” by this structure, of which their acts are mere expressions. As a result, the purpose of social science is to unearth the elements of this structure and to reveal its inner logic. In both systems theory and structuralism, the meaning that behaviour has for those engaging in it is ultimately irrelevant to its explanation. Behaviourists, systems theorists, and structuralists base their approaches on the assumption that human behaviour is the result of prior causes in the same way that the behaviour of plants and animals.

This chapter aims to provide the reader with an understanding of the philosophy of the

social sciences or, rather, since there is no single generally accepted philosophy, the

most important philosophies. This pluralism is made intelligible by first taking a

historical perspective to clarify the emergence and interaction of different philosophies

in the course of four developmental phases marked by important controversies. Then the

focus shifts to the most important contemporary philosophies, each of which is outlined,

assessed and probed for their latest advances and relevance.