

# Testimony

PHL 320  
Critical Thinking

## TWO-STEP INFERENCES

- Evidence and explanation
- Evidence for a step in a bigger inference
- Samples—statistical significance—cause
  - $e_1$ . Sample has some properties: A & B  
=====
  - $t_0$ . A and B are correlated (statistically significant) in the population  
=====
  - $t^*_0$ . A caused B in the population

## **TESTIMONY**

- **Dictionary – “a declaration or statement (especially one made under oath)”**
- **Courtrooms**
- **Religious**
- **Evidence based on the word of others**

## **THE WORD OF OTHERS**

- **Where does most of our knowledge come from?**
- **The whole purpose of human communication**
- **What time is it?**
- **“It’s a quarter after two”**
- **The two-step inference**

## VERACITY & ITTBE

- e<sub>1</sub>. Statement - "It's a quarter after two"
  - e<sub>2</sub>. Context - response to a question
  - e<sub>3</sub>. Relevant biography - stranger on the street
- =====
- t<sub>0</sub>. Said it because he believes it

## RIVALS

- Rivals:
  - t<sub>1</sub>. Said it for some other reason
  - t<sub>2</sub>. Said it because it was false
- Rank ordering
  - t<sub>0</sub>. Said it because he believed it was a quarter after two
  - t<sub>1</sub>. Said it for some other reason
  - t<sub>2</sub>. Said it because it was false

## COMPETENCE

- Sincerity is not enough
- Does the he know what he talking about?
- Questions of access to information
- Questions of perceptual bias
- The second inference

## COMPETENCE & ITTBE

- e<sub>1</sub>. Statement - "It's ... "
- e<sub>2</sub>. Context - response to a question
- e<sub>3</sub>. Relevant biography - stranger on the street
- e<sub>4</sub>. Said it because he believes it
- =====
- t\*<sub>0</sub>. He believes that it's a quarter past two because it really is a quarter past two.

## RIVALS

- Rivals:
  - $t^*_1$ . Believes it because his watch had stopped
  - $t^*_2$ . Believed it because he was late for an appointment and was unconsciously compensating when he read his watch
- Rank ordering

$t^*_0$   
 $t^*_1$   
 $t^*_2$

## VERACITY & ITTBE

- $e_1$ . Statement - "Tim has great potential ..."
- $e_2$ . Context - letter of recommendation
- $e_3$ . Relevant biography - colleague in philosophy

=====

- $t_0$ . Said it because he believes it

## RIVALS

- Rivals:
  - t<sub>1</sub>. Said it to get rid of Tim
  - t<sub>2</sub>. Said it because Tim paid him
  - t<sub>3</sub>. Said it because he's mad at the university  
Tim has applied to
- Rank ordering - no reason to endorse any of the rivals
- Charity and presuppositions of communication

## COMPETENCE

- Sincerity is not enough
- Does he know what he's talking about?
- Questions of access to information - Johnson is a philosopher
- Questions of perceptual bias
- The second inference

## COMPETENCE & ITTBE

- e<sub>1</sub>. Statement - "Tim has ..."**
- e<sub>2</sub>. Context - Letter of recommendation**
- e<sub>3</sub>. Relevant biography - philosophy professor**
- e<sub>4</sub>. Said it because he believes it**  
=====
- t\*<sub>0</sub>. He believes that Tim has great potential because Tim does have great potential**

## RIVALS

- **Rivals:**
  - t\*<sub>1</sub>. Believes it because of his lack of knowledge about research standards in psychology**
  - t\*<sub>2</sub>. Believes it because they share the same eccentric views about philosophy of mind**
- **Rank ordering**  
t\*<sub>0</sub> ... t\*<sub>1</sub> ... t\*<sub>2</sub>