



# Reframing Universal Access to Information through Accessism: A Structural Epistemological Validation of Grenon et al.'s Conceptual Model

Albert U. Green<sup>1</sup>; Ikechukwu V. Ezenwa<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> St. Paul's Theological College, Awka, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup> Heron Preserve, KBar Ranch, Tampa, Florida 33647, USA

Received: 10.05.2026 | Accepted: 05.06.2026 | Published: 01.07.2026

\*Corresponding Author: Albert U. Green

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.21064100](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21064100)

## Abstract

## Original Research Article

Information access is essential to inclusion and participation, but its epistemological significance is understudied. This study theoretically validates Accessism-based information access and understanding. Grenon et al. suggest a multidimensional framework of availability, accessibility, acceptability, cost, and usability, however this research contends that these dimensions implicitly imply knowledge production structural circumstances. The study uses qualitative conceptual analysis to map each dimension into the epistemic sequence from information to knowledge, based on Accessism, which holds that knowing depends on accessibility and exposure. The findings show that availability and cost facilitate access, accessibility and acceptability mediate exposure and engagement, and usability is the result of successful epistemic interaction. The absence of any of these dimensions disturbs epistemic processes, causing structural ignorance rather than cognitive failure. By recreating the model within an Accessist hierarchy, the study shows that information access is an epistemic infrastructure rather than a communication system function. The study bridges epistemology and information design, improving theory and practice. It develops Accessism as a meta-epistemological paradigm for access studies and expands Grenon et al.'s model. To enable knowledge, the paper concludes that expanding access to information is not simply an issue of inclusion but also a fundamental prerequisite for epistemically informed design, policy, and research.

**Keywords:** Accessism, information access, epistemic infrastructure, knowledge production, structural ignorance.

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

## Introduction

Modern society relies on information, but structural, cognitive, and socio-cultural barriers limit access. Conceptualising information access and understanding provides a multidimensional framework for equitable access through availability, accessibility, acceptability,

affordability, and usefulness to solve these issues. Literacy, user variety, and inclusive communication system development make this notion a big advance in universal design and information accessibility.

The framework is descriptive and useful despite its benefits. It explains how to acquire



information but not why knowledge growth requires it. So, the model values access without a knowledge theory. This constraint suggests that information studies are shifting from epistemic to logistical or technological access issues. Thus, the deeper implications of access restriction, notably its role in ignorance, are unknown. We employ Accessism to validate our theory to address this gap. Accessism maintains that exposure and accessibility structure knowledge, that no person can know what they have not experienced, and that language, institutions, technology, and culture affect such encounters. Access facilitates comprehension and requires epistemic involvement. Accessism describes structural ignorance as systemic restrictions preventing information, not cognitive insufficiency.

Accessionism places Grenon et al.'s model in a philosophical context, making it relevant to our investigation. Grenon et al (2021) establish practical access factors, while Accessism defends their epistemic need. Exposure requires availability, whereas accessibility provides structural mediation for information encounter and comprehension. Acceptability influences cognition, cost affects economic access, and usability affects learning.

This study uses Accessism to validate three goals. It first shows that Grenon et al.'s dimensions fit Accessism's knowledge generation stages. Second, it argues that access limits are epistemic failures that impede knowledge gain. Third, it redefines information access as knowledge-enabling epistemic infrastructure.

This confirmation is crucial considering worldwide information access disparities. Low literacy, language variances, digital gaps, and institutional opacity keep large parts of the population out of educational, technological, and socio-cultural knowledge systems. Accessists say these barriers limit convenience and create structural ignorance by preventing access to vital knowledge. Access improvement is an ethical imperative for epistemic justice and inclusiveness.

Epistemology-applied information science

research benefits from this study. Traditional epistemology has focused on knowledge's internal conditions belief, justification, and truth assuming the subject had relevant information (Kelly, 2021). Focusing on external, structural variables that provide access weakens this premise. It includes socio-technical knowledge-acquisition systems in epistemology. This perspective improves Grenon et al.'s framework's understanding of information access as practical and theoretical.

This qualitative conceptual validation study analyses theory rather than data. Grenon et al.'s paradigm is compared to Accessism's Exposure, Accessibility, and Structural Mediation Principles. The study analyses how each dimension affects epistemic process using analytical mapping. This rigorous method assesses conceptual coherence and identifies model refinements or TT.

This paper argues that information access is an epistemic need, not just a design aim. Accessism strengthens inclusive information practices and emphasises access's role in knowledge, participation, and social fairness, validating Grenon et al.'s notion. The next parts will explain both frameworks' conceptual foundations, describe validation, and evaluate how each access dimension fits into knowledge formation's structure.

### Conceptual Clarifications

A rigorous validation of Grenon et al.'s framework through Accessism requires careful clarification of the key concepts that underpin both models. This section therefore situates "access to information" within its original formulation while simultaneously articulating the epistemological commitments of Accessism, before establishing the conceptual bridge that justifies their integration.

### *Access to Information in Grenon et al. (2021)*

Information is broadly defined as any communicative substance communicated by oral, textual, or digital means (Adegbola, 2021). These definitions eschew restrictive disciplinary

boundaries and emphasise the relational structure of information, emphasising that meaning derives from sender, medium, and receiver interaction. This perspective views information as a process that requires interpretation, contextualisation, and integration into existing knowledge frameworks. This framework defines “access” broadly. It's shaped by environmental, social, and individual elements, not only physical or technological availability. Grenon et al, (2021) extend Fougeyrollas' work by establishing five interdependent dimensions, availability, accessibility, acceptability, affordability, and usability that describe information access and comprehension.

This concept emphasises understanding as part of access, which is important. This transforms discourse from information delivery to meaningful assimilation. The framework successfully defines the prerequisites that enable this process, but it does not theorise the epistemic repercussions of their absence. That is, it does not explain how failures in any of these aspects disrupt information exposure to knowledge generation.

### ***Core Tenets of Accessism***

Accessism's distinct beginning point highlights this problem. Accessism focuses on knowledge conditions, not information design or transmission. It claims epistemology has ignored a crucial precondition: accessibility-enabled exposure.

Accessism holds that knowledge is structurally conditioned (Green and Ezenwa, 2026). To form views, analyse evidence, or support assertions, a person must first encounter relevant information. Exposure is contingent on language, literacy, institutional frameworks, and technology systems. Accessibility is the key to exposure, not a side issue.

Accessism redefined ignorance, a major contribution. It proposes structural ignorance instead of cognitive failure or laziness. This type of ignorance occurs when systemic barriers prevent information access. Such knowledge

gaps are structural, not personal. Inclusion, disability, and social equity disciplines are greatly affected by this divide.

To clarify this further, Accessism distinguishes three forms of ignorance:

- ❖ Cognitive ignorance, where the individual has access but fails to understand.
- ❖ Volitional ignorance, where the individual chooses not to engage with available information.
- ❖ Structural ignorance, where access itself is absent or restricted.

Among these, structural ignorance is the most foundational, because it prevents the very possibility of epistemic engagement. Without access, there can be no exposure; without exposure, belief formation cannot begin (Green and Ezenwa, 2026).

### ***Epistemic Convergence Between Both Frameworks***

Grenon et al.'s model's conceptual foundations converge with Accessism. Both practical and design-oriented and philosophical and epistemological intellectual traditions recognise that access precedes understanding. Different levels of abstraction express this idea. Grenon et al. construct inclusive information systems by operationalising access using observable dimensions. According to accessism, knowing requires access within an epistemological framework (Green and Ezenwa, 2026). Accessism can interpret Grenon et al.'s functional categories as knowledge production phases or conditions.

This relationship is better explained so. Availability, accessibility, acceptability, affordability, and usability influence whether information is available, encountered, decoded, meaningfully received, economically feasible, and comprehended (Hollimon et al., 2025). Accessists see them as structural epistemic elements, not design factors.

Grenon et al.'s approach can become theoretical due to convergence. Accessism provides the

missing justification by showing that each dimension is important for information-to-knowledge (Green and Ezenwa, 2026). Instead, Grenon et al.'s approach helps Accessism implement and evaluate its abstract ideas. They strengthen each other. Accessism promotes information access theoretically, while Grenon et al. provide actual and practical data. The study's validation does not force an external theory onto an existing model, but rather shows compatibility that allows both frameworks to be integrated into a more complete understanding of access as an epistemic necessity.

### Theoretical Framework

To get from conceptual alignment to rigorous validation, this investigation needs a clear theoretical structure. Green and Ezenwa (2026)'Accessism organises how knowledge originates through accessibility and exposure. Accessism validates Grenon et al.'s framework by assessing its epistemic sufficiency by determining whether its aspects meet knowledge creation requirements.

Accessism is based on interconnected axioms that define knowledge's structure. These axioms redirect epistemological inquiry from cognitive processes to their external supporting conditions. The first is the Exposure Condition, which states that subjects cannot know a proposition without encountering it (Tahko, 2023). Knowledge requires awareness, which requires exposure. This seemingly obvious claim implies that any barrier to exposure limits knowledge. Another condition, the Accessibility Condition, states that exposure depends on accessibility (Green and Ezenwa, 2026). Objectively existing information is inert for the subject unless it is made accessible through proper channels such as linguistic, technological, institutional. Accessibility enables knowledge to become experience.

The third axiom, the Structural Mediation Principle, emphasises that all access is mediated, deepening this awareness (Green and Ezenwa, 2026). Every interaction with information is impacted by language, culture, education, and technology. These mediating mechanisms

determine exposure and information interpretation.

The Structural Ignorance Principle, which defines ignorance as structural inaccessibility rather than individual failure, is also important (Rohrer, 2024). Without information, people are ignorant due to social exclusion, not intellectual incompetence. Disability, literacy, and social inequality studies typically normalise access hurdles rather than question them, making this reframing crucial.

Accessism upholds necessity without sufficiency. Accessibility and exposure are important but not sufficient for knowledge (Rusho & Raban, 2020). Misinformation or misinterpretation may occur. Accessism holds the conventional epistemological needs of belief, justification, and truth within a larger framework.

These axioms build a hierarchy of dependence: knowledge is the result of a process that originates outside the individual, in access structures.

From these axioms emerges a coherent model of knowledge formation, one that can be expressed as a sequence of interdependent stages. At its core, Accessism proposes that:

- ❖ Accessibility enables exposure
- ❖ Exposure enables belief formation
- ❖ Belief enables justification
- ❖ Justification culminates in knowledge

Conditional linear sequence. Next level depends on previous level accomplishment.

Exposure, belief, justification, and knowledge are impossible without accessibility. First failure destroys epistemic process.

This approach highlights pre-epistemic conditions, unlike traditional epistemology. Classical theories start with belief, then justification and truth. What prerequisites begin believing, asks accessism? This shift stresses how external structures permit or constrain knowledge, which is crucial for assessing information access models.

This context regards information access as the cornerstone of all epistemic action, not only

usability or convenience. Implications are vast. Epistemic value is lost to someone who cannot get accurate, well-justified information. Access enhances exposure and comprehension (Strømsø, 2024).

Accessionism validates information availability and understanding, demonstrating a big interpretation shift. Accessism divides epistemic phases into availability, accessibility, acceptability, affordability, and usability (Green and Ezenwa, 2026).

This reinterpretation has two main impacts. Epistemic necessity is assessed first. Do each dimension's absence hinder knowledge acquisition? Unaccessible information breaks the chain before exposure, inaccessible hinders exposure, and useless limits understanding. We introduce epistemic coherence. Information access models are coherent if their components meet knowledge formation structural circumstances. Accessism evaluates coherence by mapping dimensions to epistemic phases. With strong alignment, the model is theoretically resilient; gaps allow refining.

The technique also reveals that information access is a complicated system of interrelated factors. Access is determined by availability and price, while accessibility and acceptability affect exposure quality. Usability indicates information comprehension.

Validating these dimensions within an Accessist hierarchy shows the model's logic. Even without epistemological terms, Grenon et al.'s approach describes knowledge formation.

Accessism interprets the model's concealed epistemic structure. It illustrates that information access fosters knowledge. Thus, access improvement is epistemic.

### Methodology of Validation

Validating Conceptualising access to and understanding of knowledge using Accessism as the theoretical lens is described below. By rigorous analytical mapping, this theoretical–conceptual validation tests an established paradigm's epistemic resilience.

Conceptual analysis drives this qualitative, interpretive study. This study tests Grenon et al.'s dimensions for Accessism's knowledge production structure. Instead of empirical validation, conceptual validation promotes internal coherence, theoretical congruence, and explanatory sufficiency. Epistemological mapping connects framework creations with axiomatic structure (Don-Solomon & Eke, 2018). Researchers can carefully test the model's epistemic functioning.

Analysis involves two main sources. The dimensions, indicators, and access and comprehension assumptions of Grenon et al.'s conceptual model come first. The second is Accessism's theoretical framework, including accessibility, exposure, mediation, and knowledge generation. Two complementary levels provide operational categories and epistemic grounding. Validation depends on their connection.

A structured, multi-stage analytical process provides validation clarity and rigour. Grenon et al.'s model's core dimensions must be extracted and isolated first. Separate analyses examine availability, accessibility, acceptability, affordability, and usefulness.

Step two converts these dimensions to Accessist axioms. Check each dimension against the Accessibility Condition, Exposure Condition, and Structural Mediation Principle. Our question is whether each dimension is necessary for epistemic sequence.

The third level evaluates epistemic function. Each dimension is examined to see if removing it might impair knowledge accessibility. This helps the study distinguish basic from other factors.

The fourth and last step finds conceptual gaps and extensions. According to Accessism, misalignments or under-theorized locales offer changes. This stage guarantees validation is confirmatory and generative, furthering theory.

To guide the analytical process, three interrelated criteria are employed. These criteria provide a consistent framework for evaluating the epistemic relevance of each dimension:

❖ **Epistemic Necessity:**

This criterion examines whether a dimension is indispensable for knowledge formation. A dimension is considered necessary if its absence prevents exposure, belief formation, or understanding.

❖ **Structural Relevance:**

Here, the focus is on whether the dimension contributes to enabling or constraining accessibility and exposure. Dimensions that shape the conditions under which information becomes reachable or interpretable are considered structurally significant.

❖ **Functional Coherence:**

This criterion evaluates the extent to which a dimension aligns with the overall epistemic process. A coherent dimension integrates smoothly into the sequence from accessibility to knowledge without redundancy or contradiction.

These criteria work together. A dimension that meets all three is epistemically foundational, but those that meet one or two may need theoretical development.

The nature of both frameworks makes conceptual validation appropriate. Accessism is meta-epistemological, while Grenon et al.'s model involves synthesis and theoretical creation. Thus, empirical approaches cannot thoroughly investigate their relationship. This approach also follows philosophy and social theory, which validates models by logical coherence, explanatory power, and conceptual integration rather than statistical verification. The study ensures its conclusions are theoretically sound by setting the investigation in this tradition.

The methodology remains practical. The study helps build and evaluate real-world information systems by analysing how each dimension functions in the epistemic process. Validation connects abstract theory to practice.

**Analytical Validation of Grenon et al.'s Dimensions through Accessism**

The study aims to validate Accessism's epistemological structure's five dimensions of information access and interpretation. These dimensions are defined and assessed for knowledge development need, structural significance, and coherence.

Access starts with availability. Information is available, timely, and accessible. According to the Accessibility Condition, exposure requires structurally available information. Available implies possibility epistemically (Gauker, 2025). Without knowledge in a specific venue or appropriate dissemination, engagement is impossible. Access, exposure, and information are lost without availability.

This illustrates that availability underpins all aspects. Grenon et al., (2021) emphasise forms, methods, and timely distribution, implying this. Accessism indicates availability empowers knowledge, not just provision. So availability fulfils all three validation conditions. Accessist-coherent, epistemically required, structurally relevant. This flaw prevents people from receiving knowledge, causing structural ignorance.

Availability guarantees information, but accessibility determines its value (Olaode, 2019). This involves readability, intelligibility, format compatibility, and reducing physical or technological barriers. The Structural Mediation Principle, which argues that all knowledge is mediated by information access and interpretation, best describes Accessism. Users can obtain information at the interface. It makes content accessible. Low-literate folks may not be able to read technical documents. Incompatible digital information excludes disabled users (Johansson et al., 2021). Both cases involve mediation failure, not information. Accessists gain awareness through accessibility. This affects subject engagement. Exposure and epistemic development suffer without it. Accessibility impacts exposure quality (Zhang et al., 2018). Though theoretically accessible, poor readability or complex structure may distort understanding and lead to inaccurate knowledge.

This suggests that accessibility influences epistemic outcomes on a continuum. Accessibility helps validate epistemic claims. Exposure, mediation, and Accessist sequence require it. Readability, intelligibility, and multimodal design are epistemologically important, not merely technical, according Grenon et al., (2026)

Meaning, values, and culture enrich acceptability. Information's relevance to users' ideas, experiences, and expectations affects engagement (Meesad & Mingkhwan, 2024). Accessist acceptability is related to exposure and belief development. Acceptability determines cognitive engagement, whereas accessibility exposes. Culturally wrong, socially insensitive, or irrelevant knowledge may be rejected, stopping epistemic processes.

This dimension refines Accessism: exposure does not ensure knowledge. Subject must be interested in information. Acceptability filters this engagement. Though accurate and accessible, health information that contradicts strongly held cultural beliefs may be overlooked. Inability to believe is the issue, not exposure. Architecturally important, acceptance is less important than validation availability or accessibility. Impacting the exposure-to-belief transition increases secondary epistemic need. It suits Accessionism as a mediator of interpretation and acceptance.

Thus, cultural–epistemic acceptability ensures information is encountered and internalised to assist knowledge generation (Tovar-Gálvez, 2021).

Costs of information access affect affordability (Reddy, 2025). Purchases like equipment and internet connections or indirect ones like travel or time can apply.

Accessism links affordability with structural ignorance. Epistemic discourse is limited by economic barriers. Instead of cognitive limits, structural constraints make them ignorant. Accessibility is socio-economic and technical. (Ternenge & Kashimana, 2019). Financial restrictions restrict access, interrupting the epistemic chain. Thus, affordability controls. Knowledge system inclusion and exclusion

depend on it. Its absence fosters population-wide epistemic inequality.

Validation requires affordability in economic resource-mediated access circumstances (Khemakhem & Dalhoum, 2025). It is structurally relevant and epistemically necessary, especially in the actual world where access is rarely free. The setting determines its impact more than availability and accessibility. Accessism highlights economic restrictions as epistemic impediments. This makes affordability an epistemic justice concern. Usability completes access (Csontos & Heckl, 2021). Easy knowledge discovery, comprehension, application, and reuse. Effectiveness, efficiency, contentment, and user experience quality are included.

Usability comes after belief, justification, and knowledge in the Accessist model. Usability defines useful information and application, while early characteristics increase exposure and engagement (Csontos & Heckl, 2021). Ultimately, utility is epistemic realisation (Khaleel & Avdukić, 2020). Shows previous conditions were met. Usability clarifies rather than disengages when knowledge is available, accessible, acceptable, and affordable. Feedback is essential for usability (Meraji et al., 2025). Positive and negative user experiences affect information system interactions. This recurring practice supports Accessism's idea that knowledge formation is dynamic and systemic. Total epistemic chain validation demands usability (Grecic, 2024). It is vital for knowledge but not exposure. Since it completes availability and accessibility, its model coherence is great.

When examined collectively, the five dimensions form a coherent structure that aligns closely with the Accessist model of knowledge formation. They can be understood as operating at different but interconnected levels:

- ❖ Foundational conditions: availability and affordability
- ❖ Mediating conditions: accessibility and acceptability
- ❖ Outcome condition: usability

Grenon's paradigm implicitly encompasses all epistemic circumstances, from information

existence to knowledge integration, through its layered structure. Accessism proves this structure by showing that each dimension is necessary for the epistemic sequence. The research also shows how the framework might be logically reinforced, notably by making epistemic implications of each dimension clear. By placing the model within Accessism, information access becomes a unified system that allows the transition from information to knowledge.

### Synthesis and Theoretical Reconstruction

The preceding study indicated that conceptualising access to and comprehension of information's five dimensions are epistemic phases and conditions, not operational categories. Reconstructing the model into a theorised framework that reflects knowledge formation's hierarchical hierarchy confirms these findings.

Accessist validation demonstrates an epistemic dependency-based order, while Grenon et al. illustrate five interrelated, non-hierarchical dimensions. Some factors are prerequisites, others mediators or outcomes. Recognising this pattern helps explain how information becomes knowledge.

Key are availability and affordability. Information is shared, but cost determines affordability. Together, these dimensions provide access-enabling structures. The subject cannot experience information without them, hence the epistemic process cannot begin. Next, accessibility and acceptance mediate. Format, language, and design barriers are overcome to make information usable. How relevant, trustworthy, and significant this content is depends on its acceptability. Engagement and understanding depend on exposure quality and efficacy.

The process ends with usability. It assesses information comprehension, application, and retention. Thus, prior layers' requirements determine usefulness.

This hierarchical reconstruction may be expressed succinctly as follows:

- **Structural layer:** Availability, Affordability
- **Mediating layer:** Accessibility, Acceptability
- **Outcome layer:** Usability

This reordering enhances Grenon et al.'s framework. It reveals that dimensions are not parallel but sequenced according to Accessist knowledge development.

This hierarchy reflects the Accessist dependence chain, which ties structural circumstances to knowledge. Stages in this sequence can be sized. Information is accessible due to cost and availability. Accessibility and acceptability let subjects experience and meaningfully engage with knowledge. From exposure to belief, justification, and knowledge, usability reveals that the person has integrated the material into their cognitive framework.

Grenon et al.'s dimensions match epistemic growth periods in this mapping. Practical concerns are a structured knowledge flow in their model. An underlying process in the original framework is articulated by accessism theory. Most importantly, this reconstruction reframes information availability as epistemic infrastructure. Access becomes central to knowledge formation, not just communication. Perspective shifts have tremendous implications. It calls access failures epistemic. Inaccessible, expensive, or unavailable knowledge undermines knowing, not just efficiency or exclusion. In addition to being disadvantaged, these barriers prevent knowledge system participation.

Second, it highlights dimension interconnectivity. Betterments in one area cannot compensate for deficiencies in another. Highly accessible knowledge is pointless without cost or availability. Usable systems cannot learn from culturally unsuitable or poorly communicated material. System effectiveness depends on hierarchical component integrity.

Third, it stresses access ethics. Epistemic justice requires structural conditions for information availability. Availability, accessibility, and affordability improvements go beyond

technological fixes to increase human comprehension and involvement.

By integrating Grenon et al.'s framework into the Accessist model, this study advances a more comprehensive understanding of access to information. The reconstruction demonstrates that:

- ❖ Access is not a singular condition but a multi-layered system that operates across structural, mediating, and outcome levels.
- ❖ Each dimension corresponds to a necessary stage in the epistemic process, from the existence of information to its assimilation as knowledge.
- ❖ The absence or *فعدم* of any dimension results in a breakdown of the epistemic chain, producing forms of structural ignorance.

This synthesis also clarifies the relationship between design and epistemology. While Grenon et al. focus on improving information systems through inclusive design, Accessism reveals that such improvements have direct implications for knowledge formation. Designers are therefore not merely facilitators of communication but participants in shaping the epistemic landscape.

The integration achieved in this section points toward a unified model in which access to information and knowledge formation are understood as parts of a single process. In this model, access is not external to epistemology but constitutive of it. Knowledge does not emerge independently of access; it is produced through it.

Such a perspective invites a reorientation of research and practice. Instead of treating access as a secondary concern, it becomes the starting point for understanding how knowledge is distributed, acquired, and applied. This reorientation is particularly relevant in contexts marked by inequality, where disparities in access translate directly into disparities in knowledge.

## Discussion

This study's validation and reconstruction offer

theoretical and practical insights. Accessionism elevates information availability and comprehension from a functional to an epistemological issue. This shift affects theory, practice, inclusiveness, and knowledge discourse.

One of its major achievements is providing an epistemological underpinning for information access. While wide, Grenon et al.'s concept emphasises design and policy. This study uses Accessism to demonstrate that access dimensions are practical tools and necessities for knowledge generation.

A couple ways this integration improves the field. First, it links epistemology with practical information studies. Traditional epistemology promotes belief, justification, and truth if the subject has enough information. Accessism requires exposure and accessibility, challenging this assumption (Green and Ezenwna, 2026). Using Grenon et al.'s approach, access is epistemology.

Second, the study promotes Accessionism. Accessism provides a generic theory of access-conditioned knowledge, but a concrete case reveals its analytical strength. The Accessist dependency chain matches Grenon et al.'s dimensions, suggesting it can be used as a meta-theoretical framework to analyse and develop access models across disciplines.

Information system design is affected by epistemic infrastructure reconstruction. If knowledge is access-dependent, designers create knowledge conditions and communication tools. Rethinking design priorities is needed. Designers must consider the epistemic chain, not only usability or efficiency. Comprehensive dissemination assures availability, accessibility meets different language, cognitive, and technical needs, acceptability considers cultural and social settings, cost reduces exclusion, and usability improves understanding and implementation.

Inclusive design is epistemic obligation. Information access depends on structure, language, and delivery. (Lalitha, 2025). This study found that access restrictions create structural ignorance. This idea reframes the

digital gap, low literacy, and disability. These are systemic information access barriers, not individual deficiencies. This stance affects epistemic inequality greatly. Groups without information are excluded from knowledge acquisition and validation, not only practical disadvantage (Brown & Palincsar, 2018). Restricting access to knowledge inhibits social, economic, and political activity, marginalising. The Accessist perspective emphasises structural changes. Improved access increases knowledge and convenience. Literacy, affordable technology, and multilingual communication policies reduce structural ignorance. Validation highlights access debate neglected variables. The epistemic framework requires affordability and acceptability, which are often overlooked. Accessible under contemporary economic conditions is possible if affordable. Without funds, even the best information systems can't produce knowledge. Economic structures matter in epistemic analysis. Acceptability reflects cultural knowledge formation (McGrath, 2019). Technical information may be misinterpreted if it doesn't match users' assumptions and experiences. This insight challenges technical access and emphasises culturally sensitive information design. These elements demonstrate how economic, cultural, and structural factors affect access. A holistic approach is needed to convert access to knowledge.

This study suggests an epistemic access ethics. (McGrath, 2019). Knowledge and knowledge system restrictions are ethical, not administrative.

Cross-domain ethics apply. Curriculum and methods should prioritise accessibility and exposure. Tech priorities include digital equality and inclusive platforms. It promotes government transparency and openness.

Despite significant theoretical support, this work has flaws. Conceptual analysis does not test purported relationships. Research might study how Accessist operates in education, internet platforms, and healthcare communication. Better epistemic result measurement requires more investigation. Usability measures comprehension and application, although

knowledge acquisition may require more specific indicators (Lu et al., 2022). Despite these limitations, the study prepares for further research. Accessism meets information access models to create philosophically rigorous and practical research pathways.

## Conclusion

Accessism was used to conceptualise access to and understanding of information in this study to validate the conceptual model. Analysis shows that the five dimensions availability, accessibility, acceptability, affordability, and usability are not just functional components of inclusive design but fundamental circumstances for knowledge production. The study found that access to information is an organised pathway to exposure, belief, and knowledge by matching these dimensions with the Accessist dependency chain.

This validation shows that information systems require access as a fundamental epistemic criterion. The lack or deficiency of any dimension hinders the flow from information to knowledge, causing systemic structural ignorance. This reframes the discussion from usability and inclusivity to epistemic possibility and limitation. It shows that access restrictions are hurdles to understanding, elevating access beyond technical and policy issues.

Adding Accessism to Grenon et al.'s theory deepens our understanding of access as an epistemic infrastructure. It links applied information design and philosophical investigation to show that inclusive access is both practical and theoretical. The work places the original model inside a larger, structurally informed account of knowledge, validating its robustness and increasing its significance. This synthesis strengthens future research, policy development, and information system design that promotes equitable knowledge involvement.

## Recommendations

1. Adopt Accessism as a guiding principle for studying information access, communication design, and inclusive

systems. It provides a robust epistemological foundation for access-related models. Accessism makes access a prerequisite for knowing, unlike functional or descriptive approaches. The emphasis on accessibility, exposure, and structural mediation allows researchers and practitioners to go beyond surface-level interventions to address epistemic participation's deeper circumstances.

2. When developing information systems, designers and institutions should address epistemic factors
3. Governments and organisations should mitigate economic, language, and digital inequality through policy. These hurdles must be overcome to reduce structural ignorance and promote knowledge equity.
4. Accessism needs further empirical testing and refinement in education, healthcare communication, and digital platforms. Such research should examine how access factors interact in real-world situations and how accessibility and exposure enhancements affect knowledge outcomes.

## References

- Adegbola, T. (2021). Orality and Information Communication Technology. In *The Palgrave Handbook of African Oral Traditions and Folklore* (pp. 835-848). Springer.
- Brown, A. L., & Palincsar, A. S. (2018). Guided, cooperative learning and individual knowledge acquisition. In *Knowing, learning, and instruction* (pp. 393-451). Routledge.
- Csontos, B., & Heckl, I. (2021). Accessibility, usability, and security evaluation of Hungarian government websites. *Universal access in the information society*, 20(1), 139-156.
- Don-Solomon, A., & Eke, G. J. (2018). Ontological & epistemological philosophies underlying theory building: A scholarly dilemma or axiomatic illumination-The business research perspective. *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research*, 6(2), 1-7.
- Gauker, C. (2025). Epistemic versus objectively relevant possibilities. *Theoria*, 91(2), e12587.
- Grecic, D. (2024). The epistemological chain: A tool to guide TNE development. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 28(3), 319-334.
- Hollimon, L. A., Taylor, K. V., Fiegenbaum, R., Carrasco, M., Garchitorea Gomez, L., Chung, D., & Seixas, A. A. (2025). Redefining and solving the digital divide and exclusion to improve healthcare: going beyond access to include availability, adequacy, acceptability, and affordability. *Frontiers in digital health*, 7, 1508686.
- Johansson, S., Gulliksen, J., & Gustavsson, C. (2021). Disability digital divide: the use of the internet, smartphones, computers and tablets among people with disabilities in Sweden. *Universal access in the information society*, 20(1), 105-120.
- Kelly, M. (2021). Epistemology, epistemic belief, personal epistemology, and epistemics: A review of concepts as they impact information behavior research. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 72(4), 507-519.
- Khaleel, F., & Avdukić, A. (2020). Exploring the epistemology of utility Function in islamic economics: Foundation of islamic finance. In *Islamic Finance Practices: Experiences from South Eastern Europe* (pp. 23-40). Springer.
- Khemakhem, R., & Dalhoum, S. (2025). Artificial Intelligence Adoption in Sustainability Reporting: Opportunities and Challenges for African Small-Medium Enterprises. *Journal of African Business*, 1-21.

- Lalitha, A. (2025). Beyond compliance: A user-autonomy framework for inclusive and customizable web accessibility. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.10324*.
- Lu, J., Schmidt, M., Lee, M., & Huang, R. (2022). Usability research in educational technology: A state-of-the-art systematic review. *Educational technology research and development*, 70(6), 1951-1992.
- McGrath, S. (2019). *Moral knowledge*. Oxford University Press.
- Meesad, P., & Mingkhwan, A. (2024). User experience and engagement in smart digital libraries. In *libraries in transformation: Navigating to AI-powered libraries* (pp. 273-326). Springer.
- Meraji, M., Shariatnia, S., & Ameri, F. (2025). Examining the Usability of The SIPAD System Using an Exploratory Evaluation Method.
- Olaode, A. J. (2019). AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION AND ITS SECURITY MEASURES. СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ТЕХНОЛОГИИ: АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ, ДОСТИЖЕНИЯ И ИННОВАЦИИ,
- Reddy, K. J. (2025). Accessibility and affordability of technologies. In *Innovations in neurocognitive rehabilitation: Harnessing technology for effective therapy* (pp. 285-304). Springer.
- Rohrer, I. (2024). Ignorance. In *The Fear of Erring: Mistrust, Ignorance, and Imagination in the Argentine Justice System* (pp. 141-236). Springer.
- Rusho, Y., & Raban, D. R. (2020). Experiencing information, acquiring knowledge, and making decisions regarding web accessibility. *Online Journal of Applied Knowledge Management (OJAKM)*, 8(1), 32-52.
- Strømsø, H. I. (2024). Does students' exposure to websites moderate the positive relationship between print exposure and text comprehension? *Reading and Writing*, 37(8), 2151-2171.
- Tahko, T. E. (2023). Possibility precedes actuality. *Erkenntnis*, 88(8), 3583-3603.
- Ternenge, T. S., & Kashimana, F. (2019). Availability, accessibility, and use of electronic information resources for research by students in Francis Sulemanu Idachaba Library University of Agriculture, Makurdi. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, 2352, 1-41.
- Tovar-Gálvez, J. C. (2021). The epistemological bridge as a framework to guide teachers to design culturally inclusive practices. *International Journal of Science Education*, 43(5), 760-776.
- Zhang, X., Chen, X., & Zhang, X. (2018). The impact of exposure to air pollution on cognitive performance. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(37), 9193-9197.