

Does it matter if our acquisition of knowledge happens in “bubbles” where some information and voices are excluded?

Name

Course

Institution

Professor's Name

Date

Does it matter if our acquisition of knowledge happens in “bubbles” where some information and voices are excluded?

Primarily, the acquisition of knowledge is a vital process in both human sciences and natural sciences, as it allows us to understand the world around us and make informed decisions. However, this process is not always linear and can be influenced by various factors, including the formation of “bubbles” where certain voices and information are excluded. This raises the question of whether or not this exclusion of voices and information matters in the overall acquisition of knowledge. To understand this concept further, it is important to define some key terms. The acquisition of knowledge refers to the process of gaining understanding and insight through observation, experience, and study. Bubbles refer to the phenomenon where individuals or groups tend to surround themselves with like-minded individuals, which can limit their exposure to diverse perspectives and information. Voices or information refers to the different perspectives, ideas, and facts contributing to knowledge acquisition. The knowledge question in this context is: To what extent does the formation of “bubbles” in the acquisition of knowledge affect the validity and reliability of the knowledge obtained in human sciences and natural sciences?

In human sciences, it matters when language acquisition happens in bubbles where some information and voices are excluded. The acquisition of knowledge in human sciences is an ongoing process that relies on diverse perspectives and information to comprehensively understand human behavior, social structures, and cultural norms. However, the formation of “bubbles” where certain voices and information are excluded may affect the validity and reliability of this knowledge. Therefore, how does the formation of “bubbles” in the acquisition

of knowledge affect the validity and reliability of the knowledge obtained in human sciences? One unique example of how the formation of “bubbles” can affect the acquisition of knowledge in human sciences can be seen in the field of cross-cultural psychology (Hande Eslen-Ziya, 2022). Research in cross-cultural psychology aims to understand the similarities and differences in psychological phenomena across different cultures. However, studies in this field have historically been dominated by Western researchers and participants, which has led to a bias in the knowledge obtained. A study by Berry and Kalin (1995) reviewed more than 1,000 cross-cultural studies published between 1960 and 1990 and found that only 5% of the participants were from non-Western cultures, with the majority of studies being conducted in North America and Europe (Hande Eslen-Ziya, 2022). This bias in the selection of participants and locations has led to a narrow understanding of human behavior and cognitive processes that may not be generalizable to other cultures. It has led to a narrow understanding of human behavior and cognitive processes that may not be generalizable to other cultures. Additionally, studies conducted on non-Western cultures often use Western-centric measures, which may not be appropriate or applicable to these cultures. This can result in inaccurate or incomplete findings, which can negatively impact the validity and reliability of the knowledge obtained (Hande Eslen-Ziya, 2022). The formation of “bubbles” in the acquisition of knowledge in human sciences can limit the diversity of perspectives and information, resulting in a narrow understanding of the subject. The formation of “bubbles” in the acquisition of knowledge can affect the validity and reliability of the knowledge obtained in human sciences by limiting the diversity of perspectives and information.

Some argue that the formation of “bubbles” where certain voices and information are excluded may affect the validity and reliability of this knowledge. However, there is also a counterclaim that the formation of “bubbles” can enhance knowledge quality. One unique example of how the formation of “bubbles” can enhance the acquisition of knowledge in human sciences can be seen in the field of expertise (Dr. Andreas Raharso, 2021). Experts in a particular field tend to form their own networks of like-minded individuals who share their knowledge and perspectives. This can lead to the development of more specific and nuanced understandings of the subject. For instance, in a study, researchers found that expertise in chess players was associated with increased memory capacity, the ability to find relevant information quickly, and the ability to filter out irrelevant information (Dr. Andreas Raharso, 2021). Furthermore, experts are able to take advantage of the knowledge accumulated by the group and may arrive at new insights and perspectives that are not available in the broader community. When experts form their own networks of like-minded individuals who share their knowledge and perspectives, they can lead to the development of more specific and nuanced understandings of the subject. The formation of “bubbles” in the acquisition of knowledge in human sciences can enhance the quality of the knowledge obtained.

Acquiring knowledge in natural sciences is an ongoing process that relies on the scientific method to understand the natural world comprehensively. The scientific method is a systematic and rigorous process that involves observation, experimentation, and analysis to understand and explain natural phenomena. However, even within the field of natural sciences, the formation of “bubbles” where certain voices and information are excluded may affect the validity and reliability of this knowledge (Shyam Wuppuluri & Grayling, 2022). Thus, how does

the formation of “bubbles” in the acquisition of knowledge affect the validity and reliability of the knowledge obtained in natural sciences? One unique example of how the formation of “bubbles” can affect the acquisition of knowledge in natural sciences can be seen in the field of climate science. Climate science is a complex and multi-disciplinary field involving studying the Earth’s atmosphere, oceans, and biosphere. However, in recent years, there has been a proliferation of voices and groups that deny the reality of human-caused climate change and reject the overwhelming scientific evidence. This can create a “bubble” where certain voices and information are excluded, leading to a narrow understanding of the subject and potential biases in the knowledge obtained (Shyam Wuppuluri & Grayling, 2022). The formation of “bubbles” in the acquisition of knowledge in natural sciences can limit the diversity of perspectives and information, resulting in a narrow understanding of the subject. In recent years, there has been a proliferation of voices and groups that deny the reality of human-caused climate change and reject the overwhelming scientific evidence in the field of climate science (Shyam Wuppuluri & Grayling, 2022). It can create a “bubble” where certain voices and information are excluded, leading to a narrow understanding of the subject and potential biases in the knowledge obtained. This can also affect the potential future actions to be taken as a result of this knowledge. The formation of “bubbles” in the acquisition of knowledge can affect the validity and reliability of the knowledge obtained in natural sciences by limiting the diversity of perspectives and information.

However, there is also a counterclaim that the formation of “bubbles” can enhance knowledge quality. Therefore, it should not matter that knowledge in natural sciences happens in bubbles. The formation of “bubbles” in the acquisition of knowledge in natural sciences can

enhance the quality of the knowledge obtained. When a group of scientists forms a “bubble” environment, they can control variables more effectively and reduce the influence of extraneous factors, leading to more accurate and precise results. Additionally, when researchers with a common interest and expertise gather together, they have better chances of coming up with solutions and ideas relevant to their research field. One unique example of how the formation of “bubbles” can enhance the acquisition of knowledge in natural sciences can be seen in the field of scientific experimentation (Banzi, 2022). In scientific experimentation, it is essential to control variables to ensure that the results obtained can be attributed to the experimental conditions being studied. The formation of a bubble in a research group can enhance the ability to control variables and reduce the influence of extraneous factors, therefore leading to more accurate and precise results. For instance, a study found that a group of scientists who worked in a “bubble” environment could improve their experiments’ reproducibility by reducing the variability in their results (Banzi, 2022). Therefore, it should not matter that knowledge acquisition in natural sciences happens in bubbles because it leads to an enhancement of the quality of the obtained knowledge.

In conclusion, the formation of “bubbles” in the acquisition of knowledge in human sciences and natural sciences can have both negative and positive effects on the knowledge obtained. In human sciences, the formation of “bubbles” can limit the diversity of perspectives and information, leading to a narrow understanding of the subject and potentially affecting the validity and reliability of the knowledge. However, in certain fields, such as expertise and when individuals in a group share a common goal or belief, the formation of bubbles can lead to the development of an enhanced understanding of the subject. Similarly, in natural sciences, the

formation of “bubbles” can limit the diversity of perspectives and information, leading to a narrow understanding of the subject and potentially affecting the validity and reliability of the knowledge obtained. But it could also enhance the quality of the knowledge obtained when it allows for better control of variables and facilitates the exchange of ideas and information among researchers with a common interest and expertise. Ultimately, researchers must be aware of the potential biases that can arise from the formation of “bubbles” and strive for diversity in their study participants and methods to ensure the validity and reliability of the knowledge obtained.

References

- Banzi, A. (2022). *The Brain-Friendly Museum Using Psychology and Neuroscience to Improve the Visitor Experience*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Dr. Andreas Raharso. (2021). *Escape from System 1: Unlocking the Science Behind the New Way of Innovation*. Marshall Cavendish International Asia Pte Ltd.
- Hande Eslen-Ziya. (2022). *Populism and Science in Europe*. Springer Nature.
- Shyam Wuppuluri, & Grayling, A. C. (2022). *Metaphors and analogies in sciences and humanities : words and worlds*. Springer.

