

## EPISTEMOLOGY OF CULTURAL STUDY

IF B Sulistyono<sup>1</sup>, A Purwasito<sup>2</sup>, Wardo<sup>3</sup>, and TS  
Pitana<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Lecturer of Interior Design Departement, Faculty of Art and Design, University of Sebelas Maret, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Lecturer of Cultural Studies, Doctoral Programe, University of Sebelas Maret, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup>Lecturer of History Departement, Faculty of Cultural Knowledge, University of Sebelas Maret, Indonesia

<sup>4</sup> Lecturer of Architecture, Faculty of Technique, University of Sebelas Maret, Indonesia

**Abstract:** Actually epistemology is another term for "material logic" or "major logic" which discusses the human mind which is then constructed in terms of "knowledge". The Consensus of Modern Science ultimately positions Philosophy to oversee the branches of the 'truth system', namely: Metaphysics, Methodology, Epistemology, Aesthetics, Ethics, and Logic. The difference in direction was inspired by the opinion of A. Comte who said that "Every science consists of the coordination of facts, the more advanced the sciences, the more they cling to method". This statement has earned him the nickname the Father of Positivism. **Keywords:** Science, Culture, Epistemology, Studies.

### I. Introduction

The term 'epistemology' was first introduced by J.F. Ferrier in his book entitled Institutes of Metaphysics in the XIX Century. The basic idea of epistemology is that Plato conceptually has provided the basis for his understanding with the most basic question, namely "what is knowledge? Can the five senses provide knowledge? Can reason provide knowledge? Where is knowledge generally obtained?" Actually epistemology is another term for "material logic" or "major logic" which discusses the human mind which is further constructed in terms of "knowledge" (Dardiri, 1986: 18). In its development, fragments of knowledge from various experiences and the idealization of the human mind are systematically patterned into "Science". The patterning process is hereinafter referred to as "methodology" which is the result of the formation of logic; but in its essential realm, methodology is actually understood as 'philosophical work.' This happens when the 'hunt' for Science itself has reached its highest "peak of truth", which is hereinafter called "Philosophy". By the area of Science (logic), it is not bothered by claims that methodology and epistemology are under the umbrella of philosophy, it actually creates a sense of confidence that Science is proof that the structural systematics of human thinking potential can achieve "essential truth". The Consensus of Modern Science ultimately positions Philosophy to oversee the branches of the 'truth system', namely: Metaphysics, Methodology, Epistemology, Aesthetics, Ethics, and Logic. From period to period the development of Science, the understanding of Epistemology also experienced an expansion of meaning, this occurs when the existence of science is divided into two categories, namely towards empirical phenomena and towards unknown possibilities which then apply a scientific theory to these new phenomena. The World of Science mentions that the two directions refer to 1) Science as a Closed System, and 2) Science as an Open System. The difference in direction was inspired by the opinion of A. Comte who said that "Every science consists of the coordination of facts, the more advanced the sciences, the more they cling to method". This statement has earned him the nickname the Father of Positivism (Peursen, 1993: 43 & 63). The struggle between science as an open and closed system actually has a major impact on the development of science itself, where the complexity of human problems is getting higher, so that the development of data tracking methods requires not only the development of methods, but also a perspective

or theory approach. At a certain stage, 'mind' becomes an undeniable causality, it is capable of playing a dual role. One side as a data building system, the other side as a data tracking system (see Geerts, 1992: 68-72). This is clearly seen in the Humanities, where human existence lives in two contexts at once, namely civilization and culture. As David Kaplan emphasizes that theory occurs because of knowledge that is coordinated in a certain way that puts facts under general rules that have the potential to be developed (Kaplan, 2002: viii).

## **II. Revival of Cultural Studies.**

Edward Burnett Tylor, a nineteenth-century British anthropologist, defined culture in evolutionary terms (see Tylor, 1871); Margaret Mead, American anthropologist defines culture as a studied phenomenon; Clifford Geertz stated that culture is relative, nothing special, and only the result of local stories (see Geertz 1973). These anthropological definitions are important starting points in tracing to understanding Cultural Studies. From Tylor's Theory of Evolution, Mead's Behaviorism, to Geertz's Relativism, it can be seen some of the main themes that dominate anthropological Cultural Studies. Something that is still being maintained in the field of study until now is simply a commitment around Relativism and Behaviorism, meaning that all cultures are the same, strange, as lessons, and unnatural. To some extent, ethnocentrism has regressed (Kendall, 2001: 8). In the development map of the West Post-Structural Paradigm, the age of emergence of the Cultural Studies discipline is relatively young. Marked by the publication of Raymond Williams's book *Culture and Society* in 1958, which describes two centuries of cultural history related to the history of various institutions and their work practices, the study of popular culture is growing rapidly, including studies of media, film, communication, and other more highlighted is Cultural Studies (Cultural Studies). The early emergence of Cultural Studies always prided itself on its inter-disciplinary, even anti-disciplinary nature. Cultural Studies derives its strength from the fact that it is not a servant of single-disciplinary thought. Cultural Studies positions itself as a discipline more than just an academic science; not 'only' sees himself involved as a tool of power analysis without disciplinary control. Even in connotative language, Cultural Studies sees itself as a guerrilla war against the 'disciplines' that are maintaining their status-quo as a tool to maintain the social order that is considered to have been established. With this series of movements, Cultural Studies can ensure that 'culture' is never the object of simple investigation. The emphasis is on the area of competence, that Cultural Studies is a 'strategic' way of dealing with what is studied, and consequently the decision about what counts as 'culture' is an unresolved and highly complex issue. The history of the use of the term 'culture' and the corresponding term 'Cultural Studies', has always been inseparable from anthropology and sociology, even considering Cultural Studies to be a kind of 'anthropology of home', and it is in this section that we can describe the birth of Cultural Studies as a Modern study in England. (Kendall, 2001: 6). This historical case has finally brought the Cultural Studies discourse into the realm of cultural politics, especially in Europe; thus indirectly positioning Gramsci, Foucault, and de Certeau as the most important figures in Cultural Studies.

## **III. Methodology of Cultural Studies**

In current developments, it can be seen that Cultural Studies emerged from various sources of disciplines that were once given the title as a separate discipline by the Cultural Studies movement in England in the 1960s and 1970s. We have also seen that for a while Cultural Studies established itself in the UK, as an accumulation of various international resources. Cultural Studies voluntarily or not remains a purely British academic endeavor, which opens itself up to each area where each culture can find its own characterization. It becomes important to look at some of the potential variants of local culture. The discourse on the area of competence of Cultural Studies continued, until Wittgenstein elaborated on certainty and suggested that Cultural Studies was a method for "understanding cultural evidence". Various methodological tools and various related theories, ultimately have to be subject to the needs that are in accordance with the field of study, that what is needed will lead to two things, namely about knowing, learning and assessing (Kendall, 2001: 58-59). It is based on the thinking of Raymond Williams and other sociologists and anthropologists, that there is no difference between "learning about culture" and "learning about society. Kendall seems to adopt Emile Durkheim's thoughts on "collective conscience" which is described as a collective representation that binds a society in a common understanding,

standard of values, norms and beliefs held by the people of a cultural area. Departing from that thought, Kendall formulated the problems of Cultural Studies in his study method which was more implementable in several protocols or stages of study, including: • Protocol One: describes how things emerged (including cultural objects and practices). • Protocol Two: thinking, including doubt and certainty, forms a definite, and therefore explicable, system. • Protocol Three: in describing how things appear, we must recognize that appearances arise in context. In a simpler form it is explained that: • Protocol One: describe the appearance. • Protocol Two: describes the appearance of systems thinking and knowledge. • Protocol Three: describes the use of appearances (Kendall, 2001: 63 & 79).

#### **IV. The Concept of Truth and Orientation of Cultural Studies**

Historically, Cultural Studies was shaped by multiple inputs or languages that had sufficient 'family resemblance' to form recognizable 'clans' connected by 'kinship' relationships with other families (Barker, 2004: xiv). Thus, Cultural Studies can be understood as a language game revolving around theoretical terms, which are developed and used by researchers as Cultural Studies. In the same argument, Stuart Hall describes Cultural Studies as a discursive formation, i.e. 'a group (or formation) of ideas, images, and practices, which provide a way of talking about - forms of knowledge and behavior related to - a particular topic, social activity, or institutional sites in society (Stuart Hall in Nash, 1997: 6). Thus, Cultural Studies is based on an orderly way of talking about the 'object' of study that cannot be separated from the concepts, basic ideas, and main objectives. There is a line to be drawn between Cultural Studies in an epistemological sense and Cultural Studies which has become a tradition in the Higher Education environment. Where Cultural Studies is built in various disciplines: Sociology, Anthropology, Literature and so on, as well as in various geographical spaces and cultural institutions. But some of these disciplines may not necessarily be called Cultural Studies. Meanwhile, studies in cultural areas that do not have a clear epistemological basis also cannot be arbitrarily called non-cultural studies. As in the Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies at the University of Birmingham (UK) in the 1960s (Barker, 2004: xv) is an example of an organization under higher education which in its development actually became a 'determinant' for the formation of a new epistemology for the discipline. Cultural Studies. Both the methodology and the specification of the field of study have become references in various world universities, such as: the United States, Australia, Africa, Asia, Latin America, and Europe; by allowing each 'establishment' the study works in a different way. The basic characteristic of the epistemology of Cultural Studies is the application of loose study methods, in the sense that each researcher is open to adhering to theoretical concepts that contextually can assist his study in understanding the world and perhaps conducting empirical research and interpreting cultural signs or evidence under study. . Thus, in theoretical language, Cultural Studies has a distinctive specification, starting from having approaches theories that are in line with its methodology. Some of the theoretical approaches that are often embraced by Cultural Studies are: Ethnography Feminism Marxism Philosophy of language Political economy Postcolonial theory Post-Marxism Post structuralism Pragmatism Psychoanalysis Structuralism Textual analysis (Barker, 2004: xiv) Cultural Studies has always been a multi- or post-disciplinary field of inquiry that blurs the line between itself and other 'subjects of study'. Furthermore, Cultural Studies has become like a magpie; it has its own character, but it likes to borrow the concept of glitter from other nests (Barker, 2004: xvii). The form of naming or an easy way of meaning is that Cultural Studies is centrally concerned with all behaviors and results of human behavior as indicated by the signs, meanings and representations produced by the marking mechanism in the context of human cultural practice. Furthermore, Cultural Studies deals with the construction and consequences of these representations. During the 1970s the writings of Lacan, Barthes, Kristeva and Foucault became increasingly influential in British Science, especially in film journals. Behind that there is indeed a polemic by thinking about Althusserian Marxism and Lacanian psychoanalysis, especially in the Semiotic discourse. However, what was formed was the embryonic of British Post-structuralism, which in turn also included many other disciplines, including cultural studies (Antony, 2004: 70). The consequence is to focus on a series of signifying practices (cinema, advertising, photography, fine arts, music, literature) which are considered autonomous relativity in social formations that are ultimately determined by economic practice.

## V. Cover

The area of cultural studies can be understood as an interdisciplinary or post-disciplinary field study that explores the development and outcomes of culture or the meaning of a cultural area. However, 'Cultural Studies' does not have a reference that can be presented as an independent field of study; because it is based on the use of language game presentations from the results of the study. That is, the theoretical terms developed and used by the actors of Cultural Studies are very loose and open studies of anything in the cultural space. In fact it is a concept that has been used as a tradition in various geographical and ethnographic domains. Cultural Studies suddenly had an exclusive position when the Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies emerged in the 1960s in England which propagated the characteristics of its studies throughout the world. Cultural Studies can also be understood as a discursive formation; i.e. a collection of ideas, images, and practices, which have a dialogical way related to a particular topic, social activity, or institutional area. Thus, Cultural Studies is based on a method of studying objects or studies that can clarify the existence of a phenomenon or cultural product, including the main concepts, ideas and specifications that include articulation, culture, discourse, ideology, identity, popular culture, power, representation. and text. It is still difficult to discuss the boundaries of cultural studies as a coherent and integrated discipline with clear topics, concepts, and substantive methods that distinguish it from other disciplines. This is because Cultural Studies has always been a multi- or post-disciplinary field of inquiry that blurs the boundaries between itself and other 'subjects of study'. Indeed, Cultural Studies collaborates with important concepts from other critical theoretical domains including Marxism, Structuralism, Post-structuralism, and Psychoanalysis. Today, much of Cultural Studies focuses on the question of how the world is socially constructed and in particular on the themes of 'difference' and identity. Thus, the main conclusion of Cultural Studies can be understood as a method of cultural exploration, with the basic aim of finding meaning for the representations produced by the practice of human civilization, in the context in which it occurs, as well as with the specific motives and goals inherent in the cultural practice.

## References

- [1.] Barker, Chris. (2004). *The SAGE Dictionary of Cultural Studies*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- [2.] Dardiri, H.A. 1986. *Humaniora, Filsafat, dan Logika*. Jakarta: Rajawali.
- [3.] Easthope, Antony. 2004. *Literary into Cultural Studies*. London: Taylor & Francis
- [4.] Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretations of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Book Inc. Publishers.
- [5.] Geertz, Clifford. 1992. *Tafsir Kebudayaan*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- [6.] Kaplan, David. & Robert A. Manners. 2002. *Teori Budaya*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- [7.] Kendall, Gavin. And Gary Wickham. 2001. *Understanding Culture: cultural studies, order, ordering*. London: SAGE Publications.
- [8.] Nash, Kate., Alan Scott, & Anna M. Smith. 1997. *New Critical Writings in Political Sociology* (Edt.). London: Taylor & Francis.
- [9.] Peursen, C.A. Van. 1993. *Susunan Ilmu Pengetahuan: Sebuah Pengantar Filsafat Ilmu*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- [10.] Tylor, Edward Burnett. 1871. *Primitive Culture: Researches Into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art, and Custom*. London: John Murray-Albemarle Street.