# UNIVERSALITY AND PARTICULARITY: THE CAUSE FOR INCONSISTENCY IN ACQUISITION OF KNOWLEDGE

**Joseph Munyoki Mwinzi;** University of Nairobi, Kenya

**Abstract:** A philosophical cause of universality and relevance in the acquisition of knowledge is annexed by the reality of inconsistency in the academic stadium. In essence, knowledge and by extension education is considered by universality as an essential substratum. It follows necessarily that knowledge which is an abstract reality is perceived to be universal, with minimal reference to particularity as the source of knowledge. Accordingly, when all variables are held constant, the acquisition of knowledge should be a form of a linear track which attracts the purview of particularity. This is why universality in the acquisition of knowledge is volatile due to inconsistencies caused by its nature in relation to acquisition of such knowledge in education theory and practice. Therefrom, this article delineates the cause-effect relationship of such discrepancy by emphasizing that there occurs extrication between the knower, the known, and the process of knowing. In this case, the knower is the recipient of knowledge, the known is the subject of knowledge, and the process of knowing is the modality of dispensing such knowledge.
**Key Terms**: acquisition, inconsistency, knowledge, particularity, universality

✉ joemwinzi@live.com

## INTRODUCTION

In philosophy, universality in the acquisition of knowledge is perceived as the conviction that facts exist irrespective of the being of the recipient of such ideas. Thus, the concept of universality in the acquisition of knowledge emphasizes that existence of facts is not relative to the assertions of the perspectives of an individual which is derived from Plato's theory of forms that all reality is based on universals, immutable concepts called forms and that for a thing to exist it must share or participate in such forms (Vezina, 2007, p. 101). Concurrently, logical inference emphasizes the validity of an argument which emanates from the universality ensuing from a proposition provided it does not display any form of rational contradiction. It is accentuated that the universality in the acquisition of knowledge and validity of such knowledge transcends the limits of time and space. Similarly, in metaphysical demesne, universality in the acquisition of knowledge is shaped by the type of proposition, its property, or relation, but equally instantiated by the diversity of particulars. Hence, from the theory of forms, it is argued that acquisition of knowledge cannot be derived through perceptions of sensible realities, but by means of contemplating about the forms (Vezina, 2007, p. 101). A position contrary to Plato's theory of forms, is held by Aristotle who argues that reality is not dependent on universal abstracts (forms), but on particular substances of physical realities (Vezina, 2007, p. 101).

As a consequence, it follows necessarily that universality in the acquisition of knowledge is applicable to epistemological considerations provided that it is applicable in its totality – definite imperative. Hence, emanating from the theory of forms, it is abstracted that knowledge of a prime substance is construed from what is eminent about its causes. It follows necessarily that the certainty of universality in the acquisition of knowledge can be determined by rational abstraction and verification of empirical observation. However, there is always an element of discrepancy that the certainty of universality of knowledge is subject to restrictions. This explains why there are multiple types of knowledge that exist, but though universal in nature, the brain of a human being cannot always retain such knowledge.

On the other hand, this paper articulates that in the teaching learning scenario, there are glaring possibilities that the learner is expected to attain universalized ideas classified as a form of acquisition of knowledge. It is at this point that the inclusive ideas are perceived to be sensitive to abstract causal structure, and consequently, assumed to be translating into knowledge. However, there is an incompatibility that the index of measuring that generalized ideas is itself ambiguous errand, and subsequently translates to inconsistencies in the acquisition of knowledge. In the contrary to the concept of universality is the notion of particularity. In a philosophical stadium, knowledge depicts diverse perspectives including the universal, the global and the local. The focus of this paper is to explicate the universality in acquisition of knowledge and integral limits daunting the process of acquiring knowledge.

An automatic cause of discrepancy is that the element of particularity is ignored in favor of universality as it is perceived from the efforts to foster sensitivity to cause-effect factor in the acquisition of knowledge. Thus, the necessity to explicate what is fundamental to improve understanding of particularities in the acquisition of knowledge protrudes beyond opprobrium. Therefore, fostering cause-effect structure of generality in the acquisition of knowledge is identified as an anomaly. Accordingly, this treatise proposes that the trait of particularity in the acquisition of knowledge remains as an alien facet of in the acquisition of knowledge – this explains the propensity of isolating the concept of relational form in numerous contexts in the acquisition of knowledge and consequently

demonstrates the cause-effect of the disconnect of particularities in teaching and learning processes.

It follows necessarily that the rudiments of knowledge and its subject are defined by the concept of particularity. Subsequently, an attempt to enhance generality in form of universality is marred with the possibility of paradox and an inherent degree of ambiguity. As such, the inference engine of logical standard translates to incongruity. Thus, the meaning of incongruity is strongly independent of that to which the subject refers. The inconsistency subject is pair and a set of elements defined by the negation of the particularity reflected in the interpolation parameters. In this case, the negation of particularities in the in the acquisition of knowledge is perceived as critical inconsistency in the process of attaining relevant knowledge.

It is necessary to underline that the notion of inconsistency emanates from flouting the concept of 'particularity' as an essential component in the acquisition of knowledge, and as such the implication of flouting the element of particularity is more intricate than the concept of ambiguity in the process of acquiring knowledge. Thus, the subject to which the inconsistency refers is the discrepancy between what is claimed to be knowledge and its particularity, as reflected in the relational continuum of trajectories. It is the view of this paper that assumption of universality of knowledge contradicts the essence of identity benchmark or edge which is the particularity factor.

### Objectives

α   to assess the nature and limits of 'universality' in the acquisition of knowledge

α   to explain the concept of 'particularity' in the acquisition of knowledge

α   to substantiate the cause-effect factor of 'inconsistency' in the acquisition of knowledge

### Acquisition of Knowledge

In a natural sense, human beings are in an incessant search for knowledge, to acquire knowledge, own knowledge and dispense knowledge, and as such, this is a continuum of acquiring knowledge. The process of acquisition of knowledge is an important and necessary such that acquisition of knowledge involves internalizing of practices and this does not necessarily pre-suppose acquiring formal explicit knowledge (universal or particular) about a practice (Chia, 2009, p.18). It is fundamental because it leads individuals to undertake responsibilities with ease and this is because in the contemporary society, every human enterprise has become based on knowledge. As such, acquisition of knowledge can be defined as the process and activity in which an individual can obtain the required acquaintance to accomplish certain tasks with ease and efficiency.

The acquisition of knowledge is the process of extracting, structuring and organizing knowledge from diversity of sources. According to Chia (2009, p.19) such a non-explicit form of knowing is generated in the immediate intimacy of lived experience, acquired through trial and error and hence does not lend itself to scientific validation or precise codification. It is within the mind that acquisition of knowledge is visualized to be useful through abstraction, induction, and conception. According to this article, an acquisition of knowledge is the process of gathering or amassing ideas from various sources. It is the process of adding new content to augment what is already known and eventually proliferate and escalate a knowledge base. An acquisition of knowledge is an important and necessary process because it involves refining or improving knowledge that was previously acquired. Acquisition of knowledge is the process of expanding the capabilities or improving performance at some specified task. Thus, acquisition of knowledge is the goal

oriented creation and refinement of ideas. Acquired knowledge may consist of facts, rules, concepts, procedures, heuristics, formulas, interactions, etc.

It is glaring that the acquisition of knowledge is a continuous process and is spread over entire lifetime. It may be a process of autonomous creation or refinement of knowledge which is based on the absorptive capacity in terms of knowledge acquirement, knowledge assimilation, transmission and utilization (Peng, Zhang, & Ho, 2019, p.25). There is no inclusive definition of acquisition of knowledge however; an interim meaning endorsed by this paper is that it [acquisition of knowledge] is the process that comprises of principles and ontologies that lead towards an attainment of academic proficiency. However, the process of acquiring knowledge and adopting it undergoes problems that require requisite resolves. Any knowledge that is newly acquired should be integrated with existing knowledge to generate a meaningful upshot. It is thus necessary that the acquired knowledge is accurate, non-redundant, consistent and fairly complete. An acquisition of knowledge supports activities such as education based on dynamic structures to refine existing knowledge or rather the activation of existing knowledge in the process of attaining knowledge (Servant-Miklos, 2019, p.623). Acquisition of knowledge enables the recipient to be familiar with objectivity of indelible world in terms of empirical universe and of knowledge itself. Hence, it is equally crucial that determining the nature of acquired knowledge require accuracy and correctness which is based on its quality and precision.

Even though knowledge is alleged to be power, its acquisition is imperative, and by extension, nobody needs to be convinced about the value of knowledge, and therefore, the acquisition of knowledge process gains its significance from the importance of knowledge itself. The process of acquisition of knowledge is

the precise tactic that can lead to accurate knowledge in terms of meaningful and functional ideas. In the acquisition of knowledge, abstract ideas are philosophically perceived as the basis of human intelligence. A fundamental question about the meaning of 'abstract ideas' may arise, and as such, this is an issue of colossal significance, and the confusion in terminology may lead to a greater deal of confusion in the context of teaching and learning strategies as well as the acquisition of knowledge itself.

In the process of acquisition of knowledge, the concept of universality is perceived to be parallel to generalization which is a course in which the significance of details is ignored to preserve the deeper element of structure which is defined by configuration and connectivity. The term overlaps with abstraction, conceptualization, inductive reasoning, modeling, theorization, categorization, conclusion, unification, colligation, de-concretization, pattern extraction, pattern separation, and many more which can occur under the actuality of particularity. Hence, it is obvious that sufficient frame of reference is necessary to better understand the application of this knowledge within the locations identified (Bakken & Dobbs, 2016, p. 18).

In a similar thread, the concept which describes universality refers to a generality of a set of objects/nouns. It overlaps with idea, entity, notion, etc. that subsist in particulars where details are compulsory. The universality perspective of a concept may emanate from objects so as to include the ideas of property, attribute, quality, etc. i.e. the abstraction of object characteristics (e.g. the concept of being) in order to generate a rule which is the upshot of an overview of that whose regularity of occurrence is observed. It overlaps with formula, theorem, principle, proposition, law, statement, and more. Often, human beings are extremely reluctant in ratifying schemas, but there is always a propensity to preserve rational consistency, and when the latter tendency wins over and a

schema change is engaged, the acquisition of knowledge truthfully begins (Servant-Miklos, 2019, p.626).

Accordingly, there is a proposition that 'no pleasure, no good learning' is a fundamental law of learning. It signifies a general rule that determines learning strategies model, so that a set of rules that apply to a specific phenomenon are ratified and cogently endorsed in the processes and activities of education. It overlaps with the notions of theory, symbol, opinion, schema, view, (concept) map, and many more. A good indicator is about a model of how knowledge coherence emerges in the process of learning abstractness where universality of a concept or a rule is less abstract (i.e. more concrete or more specific) than applicability as defined by the usefulness of a rule or model. It overlays with usability in counting, but not in learning abstract knowledge which is pervasive as well as highly applicable knowledge that is conceptual or abstract in nature.

**UNIVERSALITY OF KNOWLEDGE OF ACQUISITION OF KNOWLEDGE**

An epistemological view is that acquired knowledge is considered to be universal if its logical validity transcends the limits of time, space, and place. It is palpable that the universality of knowledge takes a global paradigm, algorithm, trajectory, and model. Thus, universality of acquisition of knowledge must transcend the state of the physical universe. Accordingly, the universality concept can be inferred as the basis where acquisition of knowledge is obtained from outside. The universality of knowledge involves acquiring and formulating a type of connectivity that translates to generality of ideas that related within a construct of knowledge. In this case, there is a collection of relevant pieces of notions from diversity of sources such as experts. It comprises of a construction of a universal replica of the knowledge and creation of perspectives which involves

building a prototype similar to a defined form of knowledge.

As such, logic tries to make sense by judging what is apt based on an inference and the universal claims of coherent validity. As an important theme of philosophical theory of knowledge, universality tries to assess the epistemic and interactions in the global–local polarity, which complement the cultural-historical orientation within the attributes of collective transactions (Mwinzi, 2012, p.147). This is essential in identifying the unifying theme as the interplay of the universal, the global, and the local in the construction and validation of knowledge claims. The universality of knowledge is daunted by the view that concrete processes of knowledge construction take place in settings that are local in terms of place, culture-bound, and time-limited. It is by extension that from the epistemic perspective, successful cases are emancipated from the above settings through generalization in order to develop a global outreach and attain what is designated as universal validity.

The position of this paper is that the universality view of acquisition of knowledge is a self-reflecting reality where knowledge itself is preserved at the memory level of the mind with minimal reference to the idea of being. However, there occurs perception which implicates seeing things as they are and not as they appear to be. This is why knowing is subjective and arises in specific trajectories. As such, it is opposed to knowledge, which is objective and can easily be acquired by one or all, [but with reference to the particular of the 'all'] like any other object, by means of education, reading and listening. Therefore, it is argued that acquisition of knowledge binds whereas knowing liberates, but knowledge can exist only within contextual reference (Bakken & Dobbs, 2016, p.17). Consequently, knowledge is of no value when it comes to seeking, rather, it is a hindrance because knowledge gives a false sense of knowing.

Hence, the inconsistencies observed from acquisition of knowledge align to the binding and liberating realities ranging from knowledge to knowing. There are outstanding scholars who uphold the character of universality as the only means towards acquisition of knowledge, although there are others who have reached convergent conclusions from diverse kinds of practices and experiences, in order to refute such hegemonic representations of the ideas. The acknowledgment of this situation calls for a deep debate. On the other hand, the concept of knowing is existential in nature, which means that it is only possible under the being of the 'being' i.e. it arises by getting in touch with the reality of 'being' (Vezina, 2007, p. 102). As such, Aristotle holds that it is hard to ground human beliefs in the sensible world with significance assurance, and this explains why this paper concurs with Aristotle's criticism of Plato's theory that the idea of universality cannot subsist separate from particulars.

It is therefore true that knowledge ensues from the external, while knowing arises from within. It follows necessarily that knowing as such is the very nature of this existence – it is the core of human existence. An encounter that involves the knower, the known translates into what is perceived as 'knowing' which is considered to be an incessant process (Mwinzi, 2020, p. 121).

**PARTICULARITY OF ACQUISITION OF KNOWLEDGE**

The concept of particularity in the acquisition of knowledge makes reference to an individual who constructs knowledge from diversity of sources. It is during the acquisition of knowledge that human mind is able to conceptualize the forms that shape the entire framework in logical abstraction from its inherent details are meant to be self-evident. The reality of self-evident perspective relies on imperatives and principles rather than accruing of prevailing facts. Thus, it is

equally relevant that it is an individual who can utilize the imperatives and principles in a logical course to generate and acquire knowledge. Accordingly, the particularity of acquisition of knowledge becomes the means to minimize inconsistencies while maximizing usability, applicability, and abstractness of knowledge.

An epistemological challenge in the acquisition of knowledge is that knowledge is naturally complex and cannot be captured devoid of its context. It follows necessarily that the ability of an individual to draw distinctions within a collective domain of knowledge focuses on reference to context or theory, or both, such that that knowledge is context-sensitive as human beings become competent within specified or particular circumstances (Pyrko, Eden, & Howick, 2019, p.236). It is also glaring that global perspectives of philosophical abstraction occurs within the precincts of rational engagements whose focus is on precise trajectories and definite localities. This is where the idea of coherent intellectualism, empirical thinking, phenomenological orientations, continental philosophies, and analytic thinking tend to acquire its relevance. The influence of every rational involvement squarely emanates and is equally prompted by the ideas aligned to the experiences and extant debates. In this regard, it is notable that even the groundbreaking academic inquiry is propelled by existential apprehensions.

An alignment of acquisition of knowledge has to consider the position of human proficiency, where the focus is on specificity to the problem domain or to the problem-solving trajectories including meta-knowledge (knowledge about knowledge).

It is the role of particularity phase that acquisition of knowledge is represented according to its source. The activity of knowledge representation comprises of knowledge map and encoding it. It is after representation that knowledge validation follows which involves verifying the

knowledge to ensure that its quality is acceptable. Finally, inferencing knowledge is required using logical consistency reflected in a logical flow of the argument (Chia, 2009, p.27).

Hence, an acquisition of knowledge involves the processes, activities, and interaction with human experts whose particular existence is of paramount significance. It is after the created and acquired knowledge is coded and placed in representation scheme that it [knowledge] is verified and validated. In the process of acquiring knowledge, the human expert serving as the source of ideas posits the working domain that is used to codify concepts. It is at this point where the expert possesses the qualities of knowledge acquisition, depiction, substantiation, inferencing, elucidation, and preservation (Kaba & Ramaiah, 2018, p.4). This is the demesne of particularity, and if there is insertion of peripheral forces, then it is probable that acquisition of knowledge turns to be unstructured and not explicitly expressed.

Accordingly, this article ratifies that acquisition of knowledge ought to culminate at helping an individual learner to embrace the essences of learnedness, ingenuity, and critical-thinking. Moreover, it is essential to underline that in the acquisition of knowledge, abstraction should not be confused with the element of irrelevance or error in deductive and inductive logic. In this case, embracing universality as the means towards acquisition of knowledge can easily translate to reclining towards erroneous learning practices in which abstractness is underestimated. Aristotle observed that proper knowledge concerns true logical statements about what exists. In other words, [for Aristotle], it is not being practically competent or 'hands-on' that makes human beings to be knowledgeable but possession of a detached universal understanding of the underlying causes of phenomena such as education (Chia, 2009, p.8).

In a teaching and learning scenario, there is a possibility that inconsistency occurs when a learner may perceive, comprehend, or become familiar with a specific phenomenon while another learner has a different understanding of the same concept. It is within the representations framework of ideas that certain orientations are constructed with reference to the superficial existence of acquisition of knowledge, including the validity character of universality and the eccentric intensity of particularity whose crucial effects reflect in academic work. It is from the locality framework that human beings are able to study and acquire knowledge such that the processes and activities cannot be alienated from the context of orientation, and therefore universality is exposed to the processes and complications, rigidity and resentments in infinite purviews of knowledge.

According to this paper, existence of particularity has supremacy in the processes of constructing knowledge and acquiring of knowledge, such that universality cannot transcend the local context where production of knowledge is deemed to take place in each of the academic disciplines. The implication is the assumption that knowledge can only be called so if it is logically and rigorously arrived at and presupposed the possession of mental representations mirroring an external reality of an individual about particular situation (Chia, 2009, p.8). It is notable that production and acquisition of knowledge occurs within particular places, in particular cultures, and at particular times. In the contrary, the knowledge which is generated is in terms of results and consequently it is taken up by universality which tends to make a universal claim of its coherent validity!

This article responds to such propositions by attempting to integrate into the debate a reflection on the shortcomings of prerogative academic prospects of acquisition of knowledge in order to understand the existential processes

profoundly marked by cultural divergences, historical encounters and disparities, as well as significant perspectives formulated by some outstanding intellectuals who self-identify as aboriginal, and the experiences of some indigenous intercultural backgrounds are indispensable. As knowledge is acquired, either by ongoing experiences or direct participation, it must be organized and interpreted according to its relative milieu (Bakken & Dobbs, 2016, p.18). In this case however, it is empirical that the concept of acquiring knowledge is relatively cultural and the implication is that knowing arises from within. An overestimation of universality at the expense of particularity can actively eradicate individual adherence to abstraction and consequently mean isolation from the reality of acquisition of knowledge as well as meaningful education. The same term can then mean two opposite realities including what is most coherent which refers to applicable knowledge as well what is most abhorred which is the reversal and disconnectedness of knowledge! Consequently, the disconnectedness arising from the acquisition of knowledge translates to incoherencies.

## INCONSISTENCY IN ACQUISITION OF KNOWLEDGE

An idea of inconsistency in acquisition of knowledge involves the concepts of epistemology and ontology, but why these terms, why persist on only the 'how' and the 'what' matter, and there is nothing else that is relevant enough to consider as a reference to academic reasoning and the creation of knowledge. According to Gert (2021, p.90), the inviolability is that epistemology and ontology possess indispensable references that are integral to the objects or processes in the real world such as real objects, problems, events, scenarios, etc.

As derived from the teaching and learning ambiance, there are potential differences that occur when an individual who tries to acquire knowledge is unable to formulate specific opinions by extracting an analogy between ideas. As an upshot, an individual learner fails to identify recurring patterns between identified lines of thoughts – the patterns that define the links behind acquisition of knowledge which translates to education. This explains why the capacity to formulate and solve complex issues by the mind of human being is minute compared to the prospects required by the idea of universality in the real world – or even for a reasonable estimation to parallel universal purview in acquisition of knowledge. In this regard, the view that a human being is limited implies that production and acquisition of knowledge occurs within a sphere which is equally limited (Gert, 2021, p.96).

This paper phonates that there are only two types of learners who are destined to the acquisition of knowledge, fast and slow learners. The concept of inconsistency in acquisition of knowledge emanates from the idea of individual differences among the two categories of learners. In addition, the nature of inconsistency in acquiring knowledge comprises of protocols which suggest several categories of processes including the facets of responsiveness, encrypting, estimation, and regulation. It is within this backdrop that this paper poses the following interrogations: in what way can universality account for making an inference and approve the universal claims of logical validity aligned to specific incidents?, how do universal standards of validity become the basis of explaining knowledge obtained from specific domains of particular instances?, what is the relation between particularity of acquisition of knowledge and universality claims?, and how does knowledge attained from particular purview and culturally specific traits be parallel to the preferences of protocols in universality purview?. Consequently, articulated and documented knowledge may be redundant, and eventually may turn out to be obsolete.

A fundamental task for all humans is to explain the cause-effect relationship of phenomena. Such explanation is meant to generate causal knowledge to make predictions, engage in effective interventions, and thus construct new knowledge (Legare, Gelman, & Wellman, 2010, p.929). The notion of inconsistency of acquisition of knowledge occurs when there is negation of coherency and an influx of ambiguities. In a similar trend, the reality of inconsistency in the acquisition of knowledge necessarily tends to emanate from contradictions. It is at this juncture that the basis of logical formulae translates to false inference. An acquisition of knowledge cannot subsist and have the best utility without elimination of potential inconsistencies. This paper proposes that acquisition of knowledge is solved and justified by means of effective reconsideration of the role of particularity. It follows necessarily that inconsistency of knowledge may refer to an index whose impact on knowledge may translate to incoherency of ideas or incompatibility between (or negation of) convergence of possibilities. This paper avers that inconsistency in acquisition of knowledge is a diversion that consists of propositions along with a degree of verity or an interval of possible degrees of veracity. It is glaring that inconsistent upshots involves internal causal properties, overriding perceptual appearances, and require construct explanations in the service of discovery of knowledge and its acquisition (Legare, Gelman, & Wellman, 2010, p.932). Hence, measuring inconsistency ensues from an alteration of the propositions that are necessary to make the acquisition of knowledge consistent within the frame of its particularity.

The idea of inconsistency indicates that the element of particularity is withdrawn and minimal attention is given to the recipient of knowledge, the learner. Socrates questioned the status of all knowledge by revealing the contingency of knowledge upon individual perception and experience, wherein the claims for universality could not withstand being actual or individually experienced. This interrelates with a dialectical relation between the universal and the conditions of its possibility in being known to individual minds (Tubbs, 2016, p.5). The inconsistencies in acquisition of knowledge are catalyzed by the diversity of learners. Thus, it is from the techniques and perspectives of learners that diversity ensues during the engagement with spatial abstraction based on the ability to accurately evaluate learning progress and ability to focus attention on unlearned abstracts. It is at this point that learning depends on particular procedures and not on familiarity with the task. There are many scholars who indorse that learning occurs from reading, seeing, hearing, and writing down. Others are for the view that learning occurs best from a combination of all the four [reading, seeing, hearing, and writing] trajectories. However, this treatise is of an obvious conviction that besides the reality of trajectories, the probable differences is founded on how human brains can acquire and retain knowledge. It is in the context of acquiring and retaining knowledge where the modes of apprehension requires logical abstraction to assess what is learned, the model of learning, and the means to process or discern the acquisition of knowledge. In this case, the greater fluency of interaction or apprehension signifies a representative sense, abstraction, or learned object whereby there may occur discrepancies represented by numbers, spellings, numerals, replica of characters, or concrete objects in order to avoid rehearsing with the intricacies of contestation instead of drawing out the meaning that the limitations and frailties of knowledge has. The critical view is that acquisition of knowledge should not solidify on an endless regression to expose epistemology into the illusion of timeless knowledge (Tubbs, 2016, p.4). It is from how the learner tries to connote or symbolize a concept based on the strength in learning and reliance on the

mode of presentation, and the subject that spawns to inconsistencies. This article suggests that there is a necessity of generating some levels of precise parallelism to close the discrepancy between reading and hearing, mode of study, subject matter, and the capacity of the learner to make sense out of what is learned in order to abate the feasible inconsistencies whose impact is noticeable in the acquisition of knowledge. Therefore, an analysis of experiential cases and the facet of particularity remain to be the dominant elements that suffice drawing any relevant backdrop in the acquisition of knowledge.

The existence of cause-effect disconnects and the spontaneously drifted attention to the subject or content domain competes with causal patterns [e.g. constructive response] in the acquisition of knowledge. This is where acquisition of knowledge has to be concomitant to a positive connectivity reflected where familiarity point of the learner is highest (Rajaram & Bordia, 2013, p.7). It is in this context that learning experiences that are required to attract exemplary fluency in detecting key cross-domain patterns remains alien and open for inconsistencies between the demesnes of universality and particularity. It is at this level that the necessity of explicating phenomena tends to focus on particulars and subsequently upsurge precision in the acquisition of knowledge. In the contrary, it is substantial that an emphasis of universality may become the cause for proclivity of escalating disparity to the causal patterns. Therefore, reference to universality purview only draws attention to skewed perception of acquisition of knowledge, and thus, an analogical comparison between parallel perspectives may deter a greater propensity to detect the causal patterns in the acquisition of knowledge.

**Universality versus Inconsistency in Acquisition of Knowledge**

In an epistemological stadium, there are many flouts that refute acquisition of knowledge including familiarity with the source the knowledge, complexity of knowledge, numerous perspectives of knowledge, and subjectivity of knowledge. In this scheme, Plato seemed have preserved universal knowledge in the transcendental forms as apriori, or discovered a dialectical relation between the universal and the conditions of its possibility in being known to individual minds (Tubbs, 2016, p.4). On the other hand, Aristotle perceived acquisition of knowledge as aposteriori that which ensues from the actual individual forms, thinking, and the experience to substantiate each piece of acquired knowledge. As a process, acquisition of knowledge requires adequate familiarity whereby there is a necessity to create some coherency between the subject, the learner, and the process of learning. This is where there is a prerequisite for connectivity of the notions of the known, knower, and knowing. Accordingly, this treatise proposes a framework for serious consideration of particularity of acquisition of knowledge as ideal and perpetual measure to counteract the inconsistencies emanating from universality as perceived in the acquisition of knowledge.

In a similar vein, the global paradigm, algorithm, trajectory, and model may obviate adequacy in dealing with many real issues in the world and is in sharp contrast with the being of particularity defined by the experiences of an individual (Tubbs, 2016, p.7). It follows necessarily that universality is subject to inconsistencies as perceived from diverse circumstances. This paper does not underrate the universality, but it underscores that reference to particularity is necessary to refine and augment acquisition of knowledge in order to restrain potential inconsistencies that are encountered. The implication is that reference to particularity translates to an incessant framework of inconsistency-reduction process. The framework hinges on the necessity of recognizing inconsistencies in acquisition

of knowledge, or meta-knowledge, identifying the cause of inconsistencies, revising and augmenting the position of particularity to resolve the issue of inconsistency in acquisition of knowledge. It follows necessarily that negation of particularity and influx of inconsistency can serve as crucial stimuli and consequently as apt means that incrementally can improve on acquisition of knowledge. Accordingly, there is a strong parallelism that the fundamental purpose of education is the acquisition of knowledge (Amini & Najafi, 2015, p.121). The contrary makes it hard for acquisition of knowledge to be parallel to the source of the particular reference, which means that relying on universality of acquired knowledge is assumed, whereas, the absence of particularity factor negates the necessity of using the protocols that facilitate acquisition of knowledge. In a similar trend, acquisition of knowledge which is a value for experts as its main source that defines identity and ownership in certain academic domains, remains isolated. Thus, experts tend to be reluctant to share knowledge in order to remain competitive and avoid exposure to a possibility of being replaced. It is also glaring that there are complexities surrounding acquired knowledge. In this case, the complexity as such occurs most in the tacit facet which cannot be captured without altering such knowledge to explicit knowledge (externalization), which is difficult to adapt. In other words, tacit knowledge means knowledge is non-verbal, intuitive and cannot be specified in detail (Peng, Zhang, & Ho, 2019, p.25). In consequence, the only way to denote tacit knowledge is by expressing the most relevant aspects of a specific academic domain, and as such, this turns to be the cause for controversy in regard to universality as opposed to particularity.

In an equal measure, it is also necessary to be conscious of the element of subjectivity in the process of acquisition of knowledge, whereby subjectivity may emanate when acquiring knowledge from different experts. It is at this point that the

experts may provide highly controversial and subjective perspectives with minimal reference to the particularity factor in the acquisition of knowledge. At this point, it is difficult to map an element of inter-subjectivity, to recognize reciprocity in understanding, and identify potential conflicts that can hinder specifity towards acquisition of knowledge. Hence, in essence, particularity in the acquisition of knowledge is not directed towards propositional or dispositional knowledge, but about the particular individual who is either the source or recipient of knowledge. In this case, although the reality of universality is characterized by qualities commonly possessed by ordinary substances identified in form of types, properties, or observable relations, it is subjected to critical constraints. On the other hand, human brain retains knowledge which is directed towards practical ends or applicable reasons, the practical relevance of knowledge based on constructs of mental representations and models (Chia, 2009, p. 32). It is at this point that universality in the acquisition of knowledge may fail to subsist because there is the possibility of continuous expansion. This means that the being of universality in the acquisition of knowledge is a purposeful reversal within the cause of education theory and practice.

**CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, it is apt to note that the concepts of universality and particularity are two relative terms that are used in this treatise as opposite notions affecting the acquisition of knowledge. In this antithesis, this paper tried to reflect on two main tendencies including the idea of universals and particulars, the collective norm and the parochial where specificity is emphasized. It is argued that in the context of acquisition of knowledge, universality is insufficient and therefore, particularity is a necessary framework to reach the margin of meaningful education. This explains why this treatise avers that it is one thing to have an idea

about reality, while it is equally different to ascertain the veracity of such an idea. In this regard, the idea of universality concerning the acquisition of knowledge runs into a problem because its focus is to identify analogical responses from the learner based on question-answer similarity/similitude. This is propositional knowledge, which is knowledge about facts deprived of any further reflection of other variables.

This paper alludes that any attempt to compare universality versus particularity translates to a framework about the ontological and epistemological specificity of the 'being' whose 'universality' is in question, and subsequently about the meaning of 'universality' as a qualifier of the 'being' in question such that it is next to impossible for a substance to be separated from what it is the substance of (Vezina, 2007, p.102). In this case, the acquisition of knowledge depends on the being of 'being' serving as recipient of knowledge. Accordingly, this is the view that acquisition of knowledge cannot exist if there is disharmony between the learner, the process, and knowing seem to disagree, and therefore, particular orientations should be reconsidered, and that a dialogue that crosses the borders should be possible only if it is informed by the particularities.

**REFERENCES**

Amini, M. & Najafi, M. (2015). To Explain the Educational Arguments of Ontology Thought by Sabzevari. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(7): 120-124.

Bakken, R. & Dobbs J. (2016). The Relevance of Four types of Knowledge for Leader Preparation in Radically Different Settings: Reflections on data from a case study in Qatar and teaching at a United States military academy. *Creighton Journal of Interdisciplinary Leadership*, 2(2): 17-23.

Chia, R. (2009). 'The Nature of Knowledge and Knowing in the Context of Management Learning, Education and Development' in Armstrong, S. & Fukami, C.(eds.), *Sage Handbook of Management Learning, Education and Development*, p. 1-35.

Gert, de Roo (2021) Knowing in Uncertainty, *disP-The Planning Review*, 57(2): 90-111

Kaba, A. & Ramaiah, C. K. (2018). Investigating Knowledge Acquisition among Faculty Members. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management*, 13(1):1-20.

Legare, C., Gelman, S., & Wellman, H. (2010). Inconsistency with Prior Knowledge Triggers Children's Causal Explanatory Reasoning. *Child Development*, 81(3): 929-944.

Mwinzi, J. M. (2020). Injecting New Perspective, Meaning and Relevance into the Philosophy of Education. *International Dialogues on Education Past and Present*, 7(2):117-129.

Mwinzi, J. M. (2012). Integrating the Philosophy and the Goals of Education at the Kenyan High Schools. Unpublished Thesis. University of South Africa.

Peng, Y., Zhang, Z., & Ho, S. (2019). A Study on the Relationship among Knowledge Acquisition Sources at the Teacher and College-Level, Student Absorptive Capacity, and Learning Outcomes: Using Student Prior Knowledge as a Moderator. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 19(2): 22-39.

Pyrko, I., Eden, C. & Howick, S. (2019). Knowledge Acquisition Using Group Support Systems. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, 28(1):233-253

Rajaram, K. & Bordia, S. (2013). East versus West: Effectiveness of Knowledge Acquisition and Impact of Cultural Dislocation Issues for Mainland Chinese Students across Ten Commonly Used Instructional Techniques. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 7(1/11): 1-24.

Servant-Miklos, V. F. (2019). Problem Solving Skills versus Knowledge Acquisition: the Historical Dispute that split Problem-Based Learning into two Camps. *Advances in Health Science Education*, 24(1):619-635.

Tubbs, N. (2016). Epistemology as Education: Know Thyself. *Education Sciences*, 6(41):1-10.

Vezina, B. (2007). Universals and Particulars: Aristotle's Ontological Theory and Criticism of the Platonic Forms. *Undergraduate Review*, 3(1/16): 101-103.