"Areas of Knowledge Are Most Useful in Combination With Each Other."

Student's Name

Course

Professor's Name

Institution

Date

"Areas of knowledge are most useful in combination with each other."

The aim of this study is to determine the degree to which a mixture of different areas of knowledge is useful in knowledge creation. This subject invites one to find out if correct information is a result of partnerships within a particular branch of knowledge between various areas of knowledge or individual efforts. In other words, this subject implies that the influence of information is determined by the degree to which it is produced as a result of cooperation between fields of knowledge. The word "most useful" is the capacity to use, whilst the process of combining different objects together is "combination." This article would also discuss whether the potential of natural science and history knowledge to be beneficial for an end relies on a combination with other fields of knowledge. Is the depth of expertise in the natural sciences and history, in this scenario, based on what other fields of knowledge help it?

A field of science that is interested in studying the natural world is natural science. The development of knowledge in the natural sciences revolves around the description, prediction and calculation of theories to clarify natural phenomena. Within a systematic context designed to ensure rigor and objectivity in knowledge statements, knowledge creation is carried out. In this scenario, knowledge creation starts with findings that are evaluated or experimented within systematic systems in order to ensure that results are true and impartial. The research framework is supplemented by methods to guarantee the legitimacy and efficacy of scientific progress, such as peer review (Grattan-Guinness, 2008). Is the strength of natural science expertise, then, based on scientific data or on a combination with other fields of knowledge? Natural sciences are mainly interested in transforming natural occurrence evidence into measurable ideas that can be interpreted as simple statements. This concept is why mathematics plays a major role in maintaining the truth of natural science understanding (Lin 2018). Acknowledged natural science

experience has proven that knowledge of mathematics is important for all scientists since it is the instrument or vocabulary that scientists use to formulate natural laws (Grattan-Guinness, 2008). Natural science mathematics reflects methods of inference that are used to guarantee knowledge reliability of the data. For example, scientists use statistical models in scientific experiments to examine associations with natural phenomena, such as the association between smoking and cancer. In this situation, scientists gather data from smokers and non-smokers and place it in quantitative form. The data is then analyzed using statistical formulas, such as correlation analyses, which have correlation coefficients that display the relationship between two variables.

For example, mathematical models have helped scientists to determine that smoking raises the risk of contracting lung cancer by 20 times (Grattan-Guinness, 2008). This is a measurable principle that makes awareness about the association between smoking and cancer more end-to-end. In other words, it should be well known that smoking raises their risk of contracting lung cancer by 20 times. Ideally, figures or math phrases have had an effect on general perception of negative consequences. Some organizations such as the CDC go on to offer information on obesity and poor health to help the public consider the risks of smoking. This example illustrates how mathematics increases the strength or applicability of expertise in natural sciences. It illustrates how mathematics helps scientists to summarize abstract phenomena into simple and observable terms that are useful for studying the natural world. For this reason, expertise of natural sciences is most valuable when paired with ideas from other fields of knowledge, for example, with mathematics.

To the contrary, a fusion of natural sciences with other fields of expertise cannot be used as a test of the capacity of knowledge claims to fulfill a purposeful intent. The universalizing and applying knowledge relies on logic or scientific facts and not on a mixture of other fields of

knowledge (Asúa, 2018). In addition, there are fields of science that include subjective strategies of knowledge learning, such as faith and creativity. These forms of knowing do not need proof to support the results. Thus, the incorporation of fields of expertise that include certain means of knowledge in the development of knowledge in the natural sciences produces a probability of subjective knowledge (Asúa, 2018). Trust and imagination in the natural sciences can contribute to assertions of understanding that are not supported by facts. Any Protestant parents, for example, refuse to vaccinate their children on the basis of religious history. These parents argue that vaccination is beyond their trust in God's providence. These parents use cases of children who display the side effects of vaccination as a warning that prevention is over the will of God. As a result, false material on vaccines has been released on different websites (Asua, 2018). This instance illustrates the negative effect of integrating information fields. In short, knowledge is most valuable in natural sciences when it is generated under the constraints of scientific methodology and not in conjunction with other fields of knowledge. Knowers of natural sciences, however, are expected to discuss topics from a number of points of view in order to make conclusions more generalizable. As a result, a synthesis of natural sciences and other fields of expertise allows scientists to test their theories from multiple backgrounds and resulting in strongly rational conclusions. Awareness in natural science is most effective when it comes to various viewpoints.

By definition history is an area of knowledge that offers interpretations or facts about the past. The development of information in history requires seeking facts to justify historical events. So, is knowledge of the history most valuable when paired with other fields of knowledge? In this case, is historical information better understood within the boundary of history or as a product of a fusion of other fields of knowledge? Historical approaches include analyzing the facts to justify as things have been in the past. The incorporation of other fields of knowledge into history has

helped historians to understand important historical occurrences. For example, a mixture of history and natural sciences has helped historians to collect scientific data to support conclusions regarding historical events. Paleontology is a field of anthropology that has evolved from a fusion of history and natural sciences (Bribiescas, 2020). Paleontology centered around the study of fossil-based life history on earth. Paleontologists study the fossils of plants, creatures, sing-celled love artifacts in rocks and sediments. Paleontologists have examined the fossils and shown the history of man (Duar et al., 2017). In this case, there is ample proof that man has adapted from ape-like constructs to a civilized man. Data has helped these specialists to classify the various phases that show how man has changed over the years, especially as a reaction to the climate. In fact, the advent of natural sciences has added a use or justification that involves physical proof to support hypotheses. Previously, people relied on words and religion to describe previous incidents (Bribiescas, 2020). For example, Christian religion and the story of life have been used to describe the history of man. Scientific techniques, however, have overturned this hypothesis by providing physical evidence of how man arose from ape-like animals (Bribiescas, 2020). Thus, the understanding about the history of life on earth proves to the most integral and essential if it combined with other parts of the different areas of knowledge.

Instead, we may argue that the use of historical knowledge does not rely on other fields of knowledge. Information in history is better known within the limits of historical approaches and not in tandem with other fields of knowledge. Ideally, historical approaches dictate that the most valuable knowledge of history is the knowledge that is validated by primary sources. Primary sources revolve around knowledge from people who observed a historic occurrence (Wolf, 2018). The combination of primary sources makes historical information more valuable than the combination of other sources from various areas of knowledge. For instance, the journal of a

soldier who fought in the Vietnam War is far more relevant than the articles published by other practitioners, such as writers, politicians and war lawyers. Politics, economists, and journalists will provide a secondary viewpoint on the war, making their experience less true than that of a soldier (Wolf, 2018). Understanding history within its limits enables knowledge seekers to rely on primary sources in order to verify their observations. Other fields of expertise add secondary viewpoints that can hinder the capacity of historical knowledge to reach a purposeful end. Events can be easily explored in varying facets when the different areas of knowledge are combined.

Lastly, this investigation found that fields of expertise are more valuable in tandem with each other. Arguments in natural sciences and history have outlined how a mixture of fields of expertise leads to more true, empirical and understandable results. In natural sciences, mathematics allows acquaintances to make simple and observable statements that are more intuitive. In history, natural sciences have brought an analytical approach into history that has contributed to more reliable hypotheses. Thus, both fields of knowledge demonstrate how other areas of knowledge add new insights that make knowledge more valuable for an improved ending. Information that is generated as a product of a mixture of knowledge fields is more useful because it incorporates multiple viewpoints. However, it is important to discuss the subject in areas of science, such as mathematics, which require complex concepts.