

## APPENDIX

### A PARTIAL INVENTORY OF EPISTEMIC CONCEPTS [20, 26]

<i>Epistemic Level</i>	<i>Epistemic Dimensions</i>	<i>Sample Epistemic Concepts</i>
<b>OBSERVATIONAL</b>	<b>Observations and measurements</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Verifiable information versus values</li> <li>• Systematic study (vs. anecdote)</li> <li>• Relevant observations</li> <li>• Accuracy, precision / measurement uncertainty</li> <li>• Completeness of data</li> <li>• Proxy variables</li> <li>• Material contaminants</li> </ul>
	<b>Experiments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Controlled experiments</li> <li>• Blind and double-blind studies</li> <li>• Sample size and replicates</li> <li>• Randomized sampling</li> <li>• Documentation (lab notebooks)</li> </ul>
	<b>Instruments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New instrument technology</li> <li>• Calibration</li> <li>• Artifacts</li> <li>• Models and model organisms</li> <li>• Ethics of human-subject experimentation</li> </ul>
<b>CONCEPTUAL</b>	<b>Forms of reasoning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Causation vs. correlation</li> <li>• Probabilistic inference</li> <li>• Statistical analysis of uncertainty</li> <li>• Alternative explanations</li> <li>• Heuristics</li> <li>• Logical fallacies</li> <li>• Models</li> <li>• Robustness</li> </ul>
	<b>Creativity &amp; history</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consilience with established evidence</li> <li>• Analogy</li> <li>• Interdisciplinary thinking</li> <li>• Imagination and creative synthesis</li> <li>• Conceptual change</li> </ul>
	<b>Human dimensions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Motivations for doing science</li> <li>• Confirmation bias/role of prior beliefs</li> <li>• Availability bias</li> <li>• Flaws in probabilistic reasoning</li> <li>• Motivated reasoning</li> </ul>
	<b>Cultural contexts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gendered perspective</li> <li>• Race-based perspective</li> <li>• Class/political-based perspective</li> <li>• Religious/ideological perspective</li> </ul>

<i>Epistemic Level</i>	<i>Epistemic Dimensions</i>	<i>Sample Epistemic Concepts</i>
<b>SOCIAL-LEVEL</b>	<b>Economics/funding</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Choice of research question</li> <li>• Conflict of interest</li> </ul>
	<b>Institutions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaboration and competition among scientists</li> <li>• Forms of persuasion</li> <li>• Peer review / forums for open debate</li> <li>• Academic freedom / conflict of interest</li> <li>• Consensus panels</li> <li>• Social responsibility of scientists</li> </ul>
	<b>Publication &amp; peer review</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Norms for handling and sharing scientific data</li> <li>• Pre-registration of data analysis methods</li> <li>• Nature of graphs</li> <li>• Publishing conventions</li> <li>• Pre-publication peer review</li> <li>• Professional credibility</li> <li>• Fraud or other forms of malpractice</li> <li>• Diversity and critical consensus</li> </ul>
	<b>Credibility</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Verifiable credentials</li> <li>• Track record of honest reporting</li> <li>• Institutional framework</li> <li>• History of responsible gatekeeping</li> <li>• Conflict of interest / neutrality</li> </ul>
<b>PUBLIC (COMMUNICATIVE)</b>	<b>Expertise</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Record of past achievements</li> <li>• Educational background</li> <li>• Experience</li> <li>• Peer recognition and leadership</li> <li>• Peer certification</li> <li>• Consensus of relevant experts</li> </ul>
	<b>Deceptive tactics</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• False experts</li> <li>• Identity politics and social emotions</li> <li>• Blind skepticism</li> <li>• Repetition</li> <li>• Style over substance</li> </ul>
<b>PERSONAL AND PUBLIC DECISION-MAKING</b>		