HUMANIORA

VOLUME 29 Number 3 October 2017 Page 265–277

Preliminary Study on Worldviews

Sartini Sartini, Heddy Shri Ahimsa-Putra
Universitas Gadjah Mada
E-mail: tini-sartini@ugm.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Worldviews are an important part of human life because they illustrate the ways people think and act. This article aims to review studies conducted by scholars, definitions of the term "worldview", and scientists' explorations of worldviews, and to examine how such categories may be applied to capture reality. This study concludes that worldviews have been the focus of intensive studies since the 1980s. Many scientists have defined the concept of "worldview" and attempted to explain its dynamics. Studies of worldviews can be grouped into several paradigms. Because of the extent of the study area, theoretically worldviews can be classified into several categories based on, for example, views of self and others, time, space, relationships, and causation. In reality, the worldview of a society can be seen in how members of the society live in relation to God, nature, people, and the environment. In examining the worldviews held in social reality, the specific categories mapped by scholars must be made congruent with the realities in the field, because sometimes these categories are interrelated and difficult to understand separately.

Keywords: *worldview, definition, category, reality.*

INTRODUCTION

Every person or society has a specific way of thinking and acting. This way of thinking and acting is determined by the values and experiences that shape it, and thereby formed by the long history of human life. This mindset is relatively permanent, difficult to change, and if it does change it does so slowly, over time. In academic study, the pattern of thinking that affects the actions of human beings, whether as individuals or groups, is often referred to as a worldview. Worldviews play an important role in human life, both in private life and in community life. The following references support this statement.

Worldviews are important aspects and determinants within communities. Worldviews are sets of beliefs regarding fundamental aspects of reality, which form the basis of and influence the form of perceptions, thoughts, thoughts, knowledge, and actions (Abdullah & Nadvi, 2011, p. 270). Worldviews are fundamental assumptions, held by individuals or shared among groups of interconnected people, that are cognitive, affective, and evaluative in nature and that inform every action used and approach taken to live and manage their lives (Hiebert, 2002, p. 13).

The term "worldview" also refers to the shared views of a nation or ideology. These life views orient group members in their day-to-day lives and began to develop within primitive, simple communities to explain or bring order to everything in the universe. Ideology is more narrow in scope, as a worldview offers—albeit implicitly—a more global orientation (Oesman & Alfian, 1991, p. 48). The term philosophy has also been defined as similar to worldview, namely as a system of views, life guidelines, or values (Woodhouse, 2006, p. 13). Worldviews, aside from

.DOI: 10.22146/jh.v29i3/29690

being systems of thoughts that exist to bring order and meaning to communities' lives, are also often used to emphasize specific historical or personal aspects (Abdullah & Nadvi, 2011, p. 269).

Although theoretically these descriptions seem easy to understand, when a scientist examines the worldview of a society, it is not easy to get results, because each worldview contains a broad understanding. The definition and exploration of the elements of the worldview are important for seeing reality. It is impossible for a worldview to be viewed as a whole without being organized into more specific elements. Furthermore, by looking at these elements, researchers can see specific elements, such as how people understand the concept of self, other, time, and space, in greater detail. It is interesting to trace how researchers understand and explore worldviews and how these theories may be applied to capture social reality.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Scholarly Attention to Worldview

Research into worldviews has drawn the attention of numerous scholars. According to Berghout (2006, p. 118), worldviews and their application in various fields have been investigated since about the 1980s. The contributions of these investigations into worldviews include, for example, material subjects, goals, methods, typologies, conceptual frameworks, and applications in different contexts and activities. Most works investigating worldviews have emphasized the contributions of Western and Muslim scholars. Studies have mostly discussed the epistemological, ontological, cosmological, theological, anthropological, and axiological dimensions of worldviews. The connection between worldviews and terminology has also drawn attention.

Jones recorded and classified the use of "worldview" and other, similar terms. According to his findings, the term "worldviews" was already used by Redfield, while other terms used have included "primitive categories" (Phillips), "cognitive maps" (Tolman), "ethos" (Bateson), "forms of life" (Wittgenstein), and "experiments for living" (MacBeath). Other writers have opted for terms such as "ideology" and "theme" (Opler), "style" and "superstyle" (Kroeber), "ultimate cosmology" and "pattern" (Benedict), "world hypothesis" (Pepper) and "climate of opinion" (Whitehead). The use of such varied terms has led to varied perspectives regarding and unclear understandings of worldviews, and as such many students have focused on directly observing and examining institutions and cultural practices (W. T. Jones, 1972, p. 79) rather than conceptual details. A different list, compiled by Hiebert, notes several words used with a similar meaning to worldview, including ethos, zeitgeist, cosmology, world event, world metaphor, world order, world theory, world hypothesis, social-life world, root paradigms, collective unconscious (Durkheim), cultural unconscious, and planibility structure (Hiebert, 2002, p. 13).

According to Hiebert (2002, p. 12), the term "worldview" was first introduced by Immanuel Kant in his *Critique of Judgment*, published in 1790 (Conradie, 2014, p. 1). Kant's term, the German-language *welthanchauung*, was also used by Kierkegaard, Engels and Dilthey. The term "worldview" is actually rooted in anthropological concepts of examining culture. In anthropology, societies are divided into two categories, namely primitive societies and civilized societies. These are also known as pre-logical and logical societies. According to this discipline, at the essential level all humans are the same. However, some develop rapidly, while others stagnate. Nevertheless, it should be recognized that all societies and communities have their own systems of belief and practices that differ from those of other groups and give their social lives meaning. Anthropologists have recognized that there are many standards for comparing different cultures and that no culture is superior to another.

Further Definition of Worldview

Several scholars have attempted to define and explain the worldview concept. The definitions of worldview used tend to promote specific essences, positioning worldviews as (for example) systems of beliefs or values, with specific organizational, functional, and characteristic aspects. Several definitions are presented below.

Abdullah and Nadvi explain that "a worldview is the set of beliefs about fundamental aspects of Reality that ground and influence all one's

perceiving, thinking, knowing and doing". When applied to individuals, worldviews are related to individuals' philosophy, mindset, outlook on life, formula on life, ideology, faith, and even religion (Abdullah & Nadvi, 2011, p. 270). For Kearney, "worldviews are culturally organized systems of knowledge" (Kearney, 1975, p. 248), while for Carvalho (2006, p. 113) worldviews are belief systems "concerning the nature of reality and how one acts as a subject in reality". From these different definitions, it can be concluded that worldviews are ways of thinking that are formed in social life and function to direct humans in their behavior and life.

Although they are important parts of life, worldviews are implicit in nature. Implicit, in this case, meaning that they are not readily exposed. Worldviews are what humans think through them, not what humans think of them. It can be said that worldviews function as glasses. Glasses are worn for seeing other objects, rather than for being seen as objects. The objects seen are thus determined by the glasses (Hiebert, 2002, p. 14).

According to Abdullah and Nadvi, worldviews are systems of value-principles. These principles may be inspired by religions principles or other, non-religious, moral philosophies. The different spiritual and material aspects of social and individual lives determines the shape their worldview takes. Although all individuals have their own principles, they essentially accord with the behavioral standards agreed upon by society. This process includes its own dynamics, which are identified as "evolutionary and architectonic". In reality, social phenomena are always transforming and in motion. Interactions occur continually, and as such individual and group perceptions have temporal dimensions (Abdullah & Nadvi, 2011, p. 270).

Worldviews are also defined as sets of life guidelines or values (Woodhouse, 2006, p. 13), patterns of thought used to organize and give meaning to social life (Abdullah /& Nadvi, 2011, p. 269). According to Veeger, individuals and communities are complementary and mutually dependent in their thoughts, feelings, desires, utterances, and culture. Individuals and communities, as reflections, are mutually supportive and dependent (Veeger, 1993, pp. 107–108). As such, one's worldview has implications for one's awareness in identifying the self and responding to their relations, including those that can be considered traditional, including relations with God, nature, and other humans (Peursen, 1992, p. 233). Relations with other humans include, for example, relations with family, co-workers, and the public.

As such, the worldviews of individuals and communities are not fixed. They are dynamic, transforming in response to interpersonal interactions and changing along with historical developments.

The Dynamics of Worldviews in Reality

Worldviews involve the thoughts of individuals or shared among groups. The worldview of every person or community/group is unique and firmly held, and as such it is difficult to change. It takes an extensive period of time to change a person or community's worldview, and any attempt to force rapid change may cause conflict. This is recognized by individuals involved in proselytization and missionary work, as shown by the research into religious conversion and transformation undertaken by Hiebert (2002, pp. 7–11). There are three levels to the conversion process: actions and rituals, beliefs, and worldview. As an example, Hiebert notes that a Hindu who converts to Christianity will, at least at first, only transform his or her actions at a syncretic level. At the belief and worldview level, meanwhile, people and groups cannot easily change, as both have been shaped over their holders' lives by their social contexts. Changing one's worldview cannot be instantaneous, as seen from the conversion of the Javanese people.

In Java, a "religious compromise" has occurred. It has been incapable of offering spiritual satisfaction because the community (the inland Javanese, also known as the *abangan*) have nominally entered Islam but continued to follow previous religious understandings and practice old rituals (Masroer Ch. Jb., 2004, p. 31). When Islam spread to Java, the island's population had already been influenced by Hinduism and held strong local understandings. As such, the Sufis who spread Islam throughout Java accommodated local beliefs and, through a syncretic process,

shaped Javanese rituals into more Islamic ones. For example, the groups of Muslim missionaries known as the Wali Sanga offered a compromise, through which Islamic teachings existed side-by-side with different beliefs to better promote peace and tolerance (Ridwan, 2008, p. 1,4). The use of the mystical approach in the conversion process allowed greater tolerance, adaptation, and openness to opposing views, and as such this approach was considered ideal for accommodating the existing religion and belief system (Ridwan, 2008, p. 13). Such compromise can also be found within the world of the *pesantren* (Islamic boarding schools). Research by Pranowo (2011, pp. 181–235) into the *pesantren* of Tegalrejo, Magelang, indicates that the lives of the *santri* (students) involves *tasawuf*, or Sufistic rituals (Pranowo, 2011, p. 192). Some of their activities resemble the self-control rituals found among the Javanese, including the *mutih* (only consuming plain rice and water), *ngrowot* (avoidance of rice), and *ngebleng* (one-day fast) fasts (Koentjaraningrat, 1994, p. 407).

Based on the above, it can be concluded that a mixing of acts and rituals has occurred within Javanese society. Over a long period, a shift—shaped by historical changes—has occurred in Javanese beliefs. This has led to acceptance, rejection, and even conflict within society, which has led to increased need for adaptation.

Owing to the broadness and dynamicity of worldviews in reality, much research has examined worldviews from various perspectives. Various discussions of worldviews are grouped below based on the paradigm used.

Research Paradigms on Worldview

As individual and group perspectives that can be found throughout history, worldviews consist of many dimensions. Scholars have thus tended to focus on one specific perspective or view. From a research perspective, this perspective or view is often understood as a paradigm, an analytical framework for the research object. Academic writing is, at its most basic, prepared using a specific framework, which contains within it the research's basic assumptions, values, models, goals, and implementation. This framework, known as the paradigm, can be included in categories such as evolutionism, functionalism-structuralism, cultural interpretation, ethno-science, variable analysis, etc. (Ahimsa-Putra, n.d., p. 27). In the following section, the studies of worldviews are classified in the frame of these paradigms.

Based on the literature, these paradigms can be explained as follows.

1. Structuralism

To discuss structure is to discuss the important elements or parts that contain within them the rules that organize the structure as a whole. These parts do not stand by their own and accumulate as individual elements, but are bound by three key concepts: wholeness, transformation, and self-regulation. A structure involves both its elements and the relations that connect them (Rieppel, 1990, pp. 294–295). Karsten emphasizes that structure as a concept refers to the organization of different parts of a system into a ruled and interlinked whole (Karsten, n.d., p. 180). In each worldview, various elements are mutually related. The literature indicates that one element of this worldview is language.

Two articles, by Mannheim and Cope, indicate the role of language and its relations with worldviews. Mannheim's article provides a review of the interests of three scholars: Boas, Sapir and Whorf. It extensively discusses the linguistic relativity expressed in these scholars' thoughts and underscores important reinterpretations that can lead to new programs being developed. Mannheim concludes that these scholars gave equal attention to patterns of language, patterns of human knowledge, and patterns of human experience, and emphasized universal connections. As such, by using the relations constructed through specific linguistic terms, cultural and ideological systems can be better approached. Mannheim hopes a new synthesis will promote greater understanding of how language shapes and is shaped by "the nature of our knowledge" (Hill & Mannheim, 1992, p. 399). More explicitly, Cope (1959, p. 51) claims a cooperative relationship between linguistic and anthropological works. There are links between the linguistic and non-linguistic aspects of human behavior in culture; in other works, connections exist between what is said verbally (verbal behavior) and cultural behavior. There is a relationship between language

and culture and between "language-in-culture" and worldview. Aside from language, a worldview also includes an understanding of the relationships between magical, scientific, and religious aspects, as investigated by Wax, or between religion and science, as explained by Carvalho.

Wax explains the connection between magic, science, and religion. Comparing the categories of magic and science, magic is considered more supernaturalistic. When compared to religion, it is considered more manipulative. Religion is considered more supplicative and worshipful. When magic, science, and religion are compared, magic and science are considered more practical. However, the delineation or categorization of these three terms is unclear. In modern theories applying an ethnocentric perspective, the trichotomy of science and religion is considered a "magico-religious-system" (Wax & Wax, 1962, pp. 179–180).

According to Carvalho IV (2006, p. 113), to understand the structure of a scientific worldview, it is important to open dialog between science and religion. The article defines a comprehensive worldview and distinguishes it from a non-comprehensive worldview. Scientific elements include the general presupposition of science, method of science, and articles that justify the conclusions of developing science. Carvalho indicated that a general belief exists that positions modern scientific research in opposition with non-scientific views. However, even though philosophical and theological principles may appear opposed to the scientific paradigm, in reality they are differentiated by the scope of their comprehensiveness.

2. Functionalism

The word function means "having the capacity to connect different parts into a whole". This function gains meaning only if it is part of a whole (Karsten, n.d., p. 181). One view holds that worldviews' function can be found at three levels, namely cognition, feelings, and values. Cognitively, worldviews function to provide a reasoned justification for beliefs and to integrate them into a reality that is more or less total. On the feelings level, worldviews offer emotional security. At the values level, worldviews function to validate the most basic cultural norms. Worldviews function to monitor responses to cultural changes and to filter out external influences. As such, worldviews may undergo a process of change over time. Worldviews function to help their holders understand the meaning of life and choose the greatest meaning, possibly rejecting the old and adopting the new (Hiebert, 2002, p. 15).

The term worldview is also used to explain the life views of a nation or ideology. These views provide humans with orientation for their lives. Life views developed in the simple and generalized lives of primitive societies to explain and organize everything found in the universe. Unlike ideology, life views provide an implicit global orientation (Oesman & Alfian, 1991, p. 48). The term philosophy also has a similar definition, referring to a system of perspectives, life guidelines, and values (Woodhouse, 2006, p. 13). This refers to worldviews' function to provide valuable guidelines or directions.

3. Evolutionism

Evolution is a change, organized by human thought, that leads from the primitive to the positive (Lopreato, 1990, p. 188). One evolutionary process is formal transformation, which has occurred throughout history and which represents a formal-temporal process similar to the biological growth of organisms (White, 1986, p. 225). An evolutionist investigation of worldviews was conducted by Hanapi (2013, p. 213) when he researched Islamic educational philosophy while considering historical factors and pre-Islamic practices. His analysis identified various pre-Islamic practices that continued to be accepted and practiced within Islam, and analyzed the worldview behind these practices in relation to Islam. At their core, the conceptual background of Islamic practices differs from that of pre-Islamic practices. Islamic concepts are characterized by a worldview based in *akidah* (character), *ibadah* (worship), and *akhlak* (morals). The revelation received by the Prophet Muhammad serves as proof that Islam is absolutely free of pre-Islamic practices. Hanapi concludes that an Islamic education system cannot be realized so long as the worldview at its core is not Islamic (Hanapi, 2013, p. 221). Practices from the pre-Islamic period have been revised and repackaged as Islamic doctrine, as

seen in discussion of worship and social relations, including marriage, nation, *qisas* (the right of a murder victim to take the murder's life), *tawaf* (circling of the Kaaba), *haram* (prohibition), and slavery (Hanapi, 2013, pp. 217–219). Hanapi applies four categories to explain this worldview: religion and belief, society, economics, and politics. For Hanapi, worldview functions as "the core or mould to all aspects of life" (Hanapi, 2013, pp. 215–216).

4. Ethnoscience

Ethnoscience is a new development in anthropology, one oriented towards explaining human behavior and its variations as being based on relative values (Durbin, 1966, p. 22). This approach is based on the knowledge systems and understandings presented by the culture studied (Sturtevant, 1964, p. 99), allowing said culture to be explored "from within" using the beliefs and culture of "a native" (Amundson, 1982, p. 236). Ethnoscience focuses on knowledge regarding various cultural domains, rather than actual cultural behaviors. For example, in examining language, ethnoscience focuses on principles of classification as expressed by a native speaker rather than those determined by anthropologists' observations (Perchonock & Werner, 1969, p. 229). In this process, it is possible for significant differences between the cultural patterns being researched and the researcher's own cultural patterns to become apparent (Ryan, 1978, p. 242). One example of this is research by Gu (2013, p. 1), which examines the thoughts of selected Western scholars that contributed to the development of sinologism and explores the motivations, logic, rationality, epistemology, methodology, and lengthy efforts to transform China into a western-centered worldview. This article specifically examines the history and development of sinologism in the context of globalization. In the conclusion, Gu writes that, from a Western perspective, sinologism is an obstacle to the globalization process, while globalization is considered a positive part of cultural modernization despite frequently leading to conflict. In research into the East and West, the conflict between different cultures' ideas and traditions is a purely epistemological conflict, as it is dominated by Western ideas. According to sinologism, globalization in general is a modernization process centered around Western models of development that gives little attention to the broad differences between the cultures, traditions, religions, social conditions, moralities, lifestyles, and cultural values of different societies (Gu, 2013, p. 8).

These different perspectives are in-line with the findings of Jones, who writes that differences in worldview result in an inclusive disapproval in academia. These same differences lead to variations in approaches and methods for producing different characteristics in cultural models in different places and at different times (W. T. Jones, 1969, p. 25). However, in reality, all people and groups have their own views of different things. Gabenesch (1972, p. 857) uses authoritarianism as an example of a worldview involving the reification, objectification, and concretization of an orientation in social reality. In another example, Berghout examines two different worldviews, namely Western and Islamic. A Western perspective is based on a positivistic and rationalistic paradigm. This worldview is based in knowledge and mental constructions that are rooted in historical and intellectual developments, and prioritizes personal assumptions and views that emphasize the superiority of the human mind to intellect over worldview formation. This Western view is positivistic in nature (Berghout, 2006, p. 119). Opposite to the rationalistic and positivistic Western worldview is the Islamic worldview, which is "a revealed guidance", a guided vision of existence and vicegerency that can be translated into a unified vision of existence and power. For Berghout, the Islamic perspective offers a comprehensive life vision based in a comprehensive system ideas and beliefs, both of which are part of the Islamic perspective's power and consistency. It is the logic and vitality of belief. This perspective originates from a divine text, which includes within it a differentiation of the visible and invisible, as well as this life and the afterlife. The Islamic worldview is a collective one, rather than an individual one (Berghout, 2006, pp. 129–31). Likewise, this Islamic worldview is different from the self- and reason-based Western worldview. All of the elements that form a worldview, at least within a Western

perspective, are self-made elements involving the individual (Berghout, 2006, p. 128) or informed by "a personal and individual's self-empowerment orientation" (Berghout, 2006, p. 121).

5. Cultural Interpretation

Geertz is one academic who applied a cultural interpretation approach to explore worldviews, such as that behind the cockfighting in Bali. Cockfighting (*tetajen*) has greater significance than a simple sport. It is a symbolic representation of the Balinese and their skills, powers, and drive. It involves animal cruelty, male narcissism, gambling, competition, mass excitement, blood sacrifice, and a combination of anger and fear. The Balinese are thus bound to rules that allow them to compete and establish symbolic structures (Geertz, 1973, pp. 27–28).

The pattern applied by Geertz is also used by Abu-Lughod to understand societal developments and situations after the influence of television (Abu-Lughod, 1957, p. 109). Harrison also uses this paradigm to evaluate three different models for interpreting relations between religion and science: "antagonistic, non-antagonistically incommensurable, and complementary". The antagonistic model understands relations between religion and science as conflicting and contradictory (Harrison, 2006, p. 3), while the second model considers both to have their own truths that cannot be compared because religion has an evaluative paradigm while science has an objective paradigm based in value-neutral facts (Harrison, 2006, p. 8). In the complementary model, meanwhile, both religion and science complement each other. Scientific theories support religious theories, while religious theories support scientific ones. Nevertheless, these three paradigms have their own positions and their own justifications (Harrison, 2006, p. 17).

Worldviews are also applied in relation to metaphysical principles, using two approaches: contemplative and active. These two approaches are used by Kyburg (1970) and Hasan (2011, p. 337). Hasan explains, in detail, two human attitudes applicable to worldviews, namely contemplativeness and activeness. Contemplativeness is related to questions of thought, to what Socrates explicitly identified as the search for truth. This approach is commonly applied by mathematicians, who employ their own thoughts and contemplations. Activeness is related to action, such as the actions undertaken by an entrepreneur in managing staff. Individuals must take action and make decisions. In an Islamic perspective, according to Hasan, both are necessary. Humans must act on Earth while also understanding it. As such, they must be contemplative but also be willing to take action (Hasan, 2011, p. 348).

According to anthropological research, though cultures have aspects that can be readily observed, beneath the surface of words and actions can be found the beliefs and values that motor them. There is "a deeper level of culture" that directs how beliefs are shaped. These include assumptions regarding the essence of truth, categories used for thought, and logics that organize everything into a coherent understanding of reality. In brief, this deeper level of culture can be defined as "the fundamental cognitive, affective, affective, evaluative assumptions a group of people make about the nature of things, and which they use to order their lives" (Hiebert, 2002, p. 13).

6. Variable Analysis

Variables are important factors that influence a system. In any research, analytical variables are factors that influence the research object (Larsen, 2003, p. 169). Any discussion of worldviews must involve a more detailed examination of interlinked aspects.

For Jones, a worldview is "a set of very wide-range vectors in [an] individual's belief space". The configuration of these vectors influences individuals' views about the world and their belief in God, nature, and other humans. The vectors that influence a worldview can be mapped through several different explanations and aspects, including simplicity and complexity, staticity and dynamicity, immediacy and mediation, soft focus and sharp focus (W. T. Jones, 1972, p. 83). Furthermore, several factors support the rise of a system and worldview. Several academics have attempted to map this through categorization.

Conradie (2014, p. 10) examines worldviews based on observations of how different terms are used in religious and theological studies of Christianity. In his opinion, worldviews tend to

be identified as social constructions of reality that consist of structures within human societies and moral landscapes. Moral landscapes are located within a broader framework that involves scientific understandings and indications of the place of humanity within and without the cosmos.

The above discussion of various scholars' perspectives is insufficient to comprehensively portray a broader understanding of worldviews. Likewise, it is insufficient to describe the current research object. Comprehensive information on how scholars classify different dimensions of worldview is provided by Kearney in an overview article. For example, Dauglas understands worldviews as "common patterns of logico-structural integration" involving four categories: self, relationship, causality, and time. The term relationship, in this case, refers to relations between the self and society (Kearney, 1975, p. 253). Gossen, referring to concepts of the self in primitive societies, identifies four categories: self, time, interpersonal relation, and geographical environment (Kearney, 1975, p. 256). Redfield proposes several categories: the self, the other (human and nonhuman), time, space, the natural and supernatural, and the sacred and profane. Meanwhile, the views of Kant, Durkheim, and Piaget more or less contain the following categories: self, other, relationship, classification, space, time, and causality (Kearney, 1975, p. 248). Kearney also records new research into varieties of worldviews, using four categories: classification, time and space, causality, and self. Classification, for example, covers animate and inanimate, real and unreal, and natural and supernatural. Classification, in a taxonomic understanding, involves the following: spatial, attributive, grading, and contingency (Kearney, 1975, pp. 256–257).

Based on the above discussion, it may be concluded that there are diverse views of the variables and categories involved in the conceptualization of worldviews. The following section discusses different research into worldviews.

Research into Categories of Worldviews

As explained above, varied categories of worldview have been proposed by different scholars. Some aspects of worldviews differ between definitions, while others remain the same. For this research, the concept of worldview will be divided into different categories by modifying the typology of Kearney and other scholars. Kearney identifies four elements of worldview, namely: classification, time and space, causality, and self. Other elements identified by academics (as mentioned by Kearney) include, for example, the other (the other, human, and nonhuman), relationships, the natural and supranatural, and the sacred and profane. The spatial and temporal categories will be discussed here separately owing to their broad conceptual scope, as indicated by Ohnuki in his discussion of the concepts of space and time among the Ainu people. These categories will be explained below.

1. Classification

According to Butts (1946, pp. 51–52), classification refers to the distribution of things within different groups based on shared general characteristics. This can be understood as organizing items in a neat and orderly manner. Science is the definition of and classification of facts. A scientist identifies or recognizes an object and then classifies it in an orderly system. Classification is then used as the basis of a logical system for naming and identification. Meanwhile, the quality of classification is determined by two criteria, namely:

a) Classification must be able to position each object within the categories prepared so that no object lacks a category.
b) Each category must be well defined, thus allowing the proper category for each element or object to be clearly classified

One example of classification is taxonomy. Examples of classification can be found in semantics, in which categories include attributive, contingent, function, space, operative, and comparative (Perchonock & Werner, 1969, p. 239). Other examples include the classification of reality into the sacred and profane, as used in studies of art (Barolsky, 1998), sculpture (Phillips, 1962), jargon (Halpin, 1962), and mysticism (Sealigero, 1957).

2. Time

Time is difficult to define. Because it is an important part of human life, since the beginning of the 20th century many scholars have put forth a variety of explanations. One view holds that time is essentially serial in nature, a subjective yet ideal construction produced in real time through

an *a posteriori* construction. Humans construct the past, present, and future because things seem to happen at different times (Boodin, 1905, p. 366). For example, using light astronomers can distinguish between "local time" and "extended time". Others have also identified "distant time" (Bridgman, 1932, p. 98). Sufi mystics ha also gain an awareness of time in their experiences with God, existence, and eternity through their mystical experiences (Bowering, 1997, p. 61). Hartland-Swann's analysis indicates several points relating to time, including its intersection with events, experiences, processes, duration, and awareness. When someone speaks of a certain event or process, it implicitly indicates a passage of time. This is explained in the following statements:

> "[time] … is something we somehow impose on events (perhaps as a necessary condition of experience), or whether it is something 'in' the world which we cannot help but become aware." (Hartland-Swann, 1955, p. 3)

> "…. processes—looking, feeling, hearing, physically reacting, desiring, smelling—and all processes obviously have duration. There is no such thing as a 'timeless' experience or a 'timeless' state of mind which can therefore be accurately described without reference to duration." (Hartland-Swann, 1955, p. 4)

All societies have their own concepts of time, which determine the correct time for their activities and life events. For example, the Ainu people divide time as related to the age of the world, the seasons, and time of day. Religious activities are determined by various seasons. Furthermore, time is divided into two categories: light and dark or day and night. Among the Ainu, the division of time is related to their views of human and non-human beings and when humans and human and non-human beings work and rest (Ohnuki-Tierney, 1969, p. 489). The Ainu people have a concept of *mosiri* (world), which contains their entire spatial understanding of activities, including physical and mental phenomena. Temporally, the world is understood as following a life cycle, as having a beginning, middle, and end. The middle world is the one in which humanity presently lives (Ohnuki-Tierney, 1972, p. 427). This concept of binary opposition is not absolute, but relative, shaped by context. Each temporal category (world age, season, day) interacts with other temporal categories at specific times (Ohnuki-Tierney, 1969, p. 491).

3. Space

The concept of space is frequently given attention in geographic studies. However, no definition of space has explained the concept adequately. Space can be divided into two categories, namely absolute space or empty space and relative space, which is relational in nature. Space becomes meaningful in combination with other concepts, such as the environment. Within it, space is a field of force, as such it is frequently linked to "synergy" (Mazur, 1983, pp. 139–141). The concept of space can only function through an object. Space is relative, and is only created through relations between objects that are linked or organized within a space. The multitude of potential relations between objects leads to the existence of many different spaces (Wenzlhuemer, 2010, p. 29). Space is also related to direction. Direction can be categorized into two categories, namely specific direction and "fixed" direction. This becomes a "starting point" for measuring and identifying other objects (Londey, 1955, p. 601).

In Kearney's exploration, the concept of space is given examples from Hallowell and Ohnuki. Hallowell recognizes how the Ojibwa people use wind and wind directions as their main spatial reference. Ohnuki, meanwhile, explains the binary opposition between the mountains and the sea as conceived among the Ainu people (Kearney, 1975, p. 259). The Ainu people categorize space by differentiating between the mountains and the sea. The mountains are identified as the upper part of the body, while the sea is identified as the lower part of the body. Rivers are considered to flow landward, towards the mountains (Ohnuki-Tierney, 1972, p. 429). The source of the water in the mountains is likened to the head of the body, with the river itself being considered similar to the body (Ohnuki-Tierney, 1972, p. 432). Their worldview, Ohnuki writes, informs their relations with the mountains and coast.

4. Relationship

Relationships can be understood as actual interactions between two or more subjects, such as employees and employers. The good management and use of these relations determines the achievement of desired goals (Proctor, 1982, p. 431). In broader interactions between subjects, such as in public relations, good relations between institutions and society will lead to greater integration (J. J. Jones, 1985, p. 233). From these references, it can be seen that good relations lead to greater integration between components, and, consequently, eases the achievement of joint goals. In this context, relations have elements of causality.

5. Causality

Causality refers to the relations between various events and incidents. Worldviews consist of systems of cause and effect. Each system contains numerous variables that can be observed (Goodman, Ullman, & Tenenbaum, 2011, p. 2). Joffe writes that, according to philosophers and biologists, systems are unique because they do not only contain incompatible or opposing components, but also mutually beneficial ones (Joffe, 2013, p. 181). Goodman also states that each incident is connected to the conditions in which it occurs; "everything that happens must happen as determined by the conditions of its occurrence" (Goodman et al., 2011, p. 634). Kearney understands causality in relation to cosmology and the logico-structural integration of different categories of worldview. There is a mutual interdependence of causal concepts, involving space, time, material, the self, and the other (Kearney, 1975, p. 260).

6. The Self and the Other

The Self and the Other are important concepts within philosophy and social research. Discussion of individuals is insufficient if it excludes those individuals' interactions with others, because in life all people must interact with other people and objects. Humans can only define themselves in relation to others (Long, 2006, p. 2). Individuals are only recognized because they are shaped and created by their relations and interactions with others and because they become part of an institution, community, or society. In this, individuals are important factors within social structures (Perinbanayagam, 1975, p. 501). There is a reciprocal relationship between the role of the self and the role of the other, and this allows predictions to be made. In this, there is the expectation that the meaningful actions of individuals are reciprocated by meaningful actions from the persons with whom they interact (Turner, 1954, p. 249).

Different societies and communities have varied concepts of the self and the other. "The other" may be understood as human figures in social relations, but may also be understood as objects and supernatural beings in relations between the sacred and profane and between the natural and supernatural. The following is an example of relations between the Self and the Other within a society.

Quoting Hallowell, Hollan defines the self as follows: "The self is that part of consciousness that comes into play when a human being begins to take him or herself as an object". Another term for "self" is "person". Most anthropologists agree that concepts of the self may vary. For example, among non-Western societies, views of the "person" or "the self" tend to be "organic sociocentric". The self is determined culturally by social roles, patterns of interpersonal relations, and joint identity, and as such becomes a concept of "person-in-relation" that becomes a "well-bonded unit". In Hollan's comparison of the Torajan and American peoples, the Torajan people were categorized as "sociocentric", while the American people were categorized as "egocentric" (Hollan, 1992, p. 284). Hollan states that, as an ideal cultural model, the self is, at the very least, part of *others*. Others are friends with whom the self can interact, and the boundaries between the self and others are often fluid and blurred (Hollan, 1992, p. 200). Even though variations between different cultures can be categorized, in several contexts these characteristics are relative. It is possible for the Torajan people to become egocentric, or vice versa (Hollan, 1992, p. 204).

Based on the categorization of worldviews and conceptual explorations in the field, it is apparent that little exploration has been made of worldviews in society. Every community has its own worldview regarding classification, time, space, causality, and the Self and the Other. As such, research into worldviews offers great opportunities for findings.

From Theory to Reality

In practice, the theories on worldviews discussed above cannot readily be applied or utilized to reveal the real worldviews of societies. The writer has shown this through her research into the *wong pinter* of Temanggung, Central Java (Sartini & Ahimsa-Putra, 2017b). Although it is true that worldviews function to direct the community and are rooted in various sources of values, including religion and culture, when theory is applied to identify real-world phenomena it is insufficient to provide a clear picture. Furthermore, although theories of worldviews explain that different categories of worldviews cover separate concepts of time, space, causality, and the Self and the Other, in reality such a clear division is not easily realizable, nor are theoretical categories readily applicable. Every society has its own specific understandings of time, space, etc. For instance, in examining conceptualizations of time, Ohnuki shows how the Ainu people understand days and seasons (Ohnuki-Tierney, 1969, p. 491). Among the *wong pinter* in Temanggung, a different view of time was found, one that did not emphasize chronological time over a certain period.

Likewise the people of Bali believe in the axis of Kaja-Kelod, the peak of Mount Agung in the North leads to the sea in the South. Mount Agung is considered sacred for being the place of the gods (Wassmann & Dasen, 1998, p. 692). Or like the concept of a cosmological system that Yogyakarta people believe with the Yogyakarta Palace as a center surrounded by spiritual power centers at Mount Merapi in the North, Dlepih in the West, Gung Lawu in the East and Segara Kidul (South Sea) in the South (Schlehe, 1998, p. 396). Likewise, where Ohnuki exposed that spatial concepts of coast/flatlands/mountains are conceptualized among the Ainu as body parts (Ohnuki-Tierney, 1972, p. 432), examination of the *wong pinter* in Temanggung showed no sacred spaces or specific spatial frameworks. Regarding the concept of causality, considerable detail was found in the understandings of the *wong pinter* in Temanggung, detail that may not be found in other communities, or that may be expressed differently. The concepts of space and time are sometimes difficult to distinguish, such as when a *wong pinter* is perceived as being in two separate locations at the same time.

In terms of the relationship between the Self and the Other, the *wong pinter* have a very specific worldview. Their views of social life are strong, as is their dedication to assisting their communities (Sartini & Ahimsa-Putra, 2017a, p. 53). Nonetheless, their socio-centric attitude is quite different from that among the Torajan people described by Hollan (Hollan, 1992, p. 284). The relations between non-human beings and the *wong pinter*'s provision of aid (*tetulung)* may also be found in other communities, albeit within different structures of understanding. The basis of their worldviews influences how the *wong pinter* act in life, how they position God, and how they interact with both human and non-human beings.

On this basis, it can be stated that, even though specific theories and patterns of usage are numerous and diverse, when they are applied in the field adaptation is necessary to respond to the unique values and culture in the local society. This indicates that theories cannot simply be applied strictly in a real context, and that there is a wealth of worldviews intrinsic to human culture.

CONCLUSION

Worldviews have long been a concern and focus of study for scientists. Many definitions of the term "worldview" have been explored, as well as the dynamics of worldviews and their emergence in reality. According to many of these studies, a worldview can be classified and divided into several categories that make it easier for researchers to study it in reality. Worldviews can be captured from life activities and from what their proponents express in interviews and observations of society. Although available theories are quite detailed, they must be adapted when implemented in the field, given the wealth of variations in society.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, M., & Nadvi, M. J. (2011). Understanding the Principles of Islamic World-View. *The Dialogue*, *VI*(3), 268–289.

Abu-Lughod, L. (1957). The Interpretation of Culture(s) after Television. *Representations*, *59*, 109–134.

Ahimsa-Putra, H. S. (n.d.). Paradigma Ilmu Sosial-

Budaya: Sebuah Pandangan. Antropologi Budaya Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Gadjah Mada.

Amundson, R. (1982). Science, Ethnoscience, and Ethnocentrism. *Philosophy of Science*, *49*(2), 236–250.

Barolsky, P. (1998). Sacred and Profane Love. *Notes on the Story of Art*, *17*(3), 25–28.

Berghout, A. (2006). Concept of Worldview between Assumption and Truth (Observation on Selected Western and Muslim Views). *Jurnal Ushuluddin*, *Bil 23-24*, 117–138.

Boodin, J. E. (1905). The Concept of Time. *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods, 2*(14), 365–372.

Bowering, G. (1997). The Concept of Time in Islam. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, *141*(1), 55–66.

Bridgman, P. W. (1932). The Concept of Time. *The Scientific Monthly*, *35*(2), 97–100.

Butts, W. K. (1946). Classification. *Bios*, *17*(1), 51–59.

Carvalho IV, J. J. (2006). Overview on the Structure of a Scientific Worldview. *Zygon Journal of Religion and Science*, *41*(1), 113–124.

Conradie, E. (2014). Views on Wordlviews: an Overview of the Use of the Term, Worldview, in Selected Theological Discourses. *Scriptura*, *113*(1), 1–12.

Cope, A. T. (1959). Language and the World View. *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory*, *13*, 44–52.

Durbin, M. (1966). The Goals of Ethnoscience. *Anthropological Linguistics*, *8*(8), 22–41.

Gabenesch, H. (1972). Authoritarianism as World View. *American Journal of Sociology*, *77*(5), 857–875.

Geertz, C. (1973). Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight. *Daedalus*, *101*(1), 1–37.

Goodman, N. D., Ullman, T. D., & Tenenbaum, J. B. (2011). Learning a theory of causality. *Psychological Review*, *118*(1), 110–119. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021336

Gu, M. D. (2013). Sinologism, the Western Worldviews and Chineses Perspective. *CLCWeb Comparative Literature and Culture*, *15*(2), 1–9.

Halpin, A. W. (1962). Jargon... . Sacred and Profane. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, *43*(6), 237–239.

Hanapi, M. S. (2013). From Jahiliyyah to Islamic Worldview: In a Search of an Islamic Educational Philosophy. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciencies*, *3*(2), 213–221.

Harrison, V. S. (2006). Scientific and Religious Worldviews: Antagonism, Non-antagonistic Incommensurability and Complementarity. *The Heythrop Journal*, *47*, 1–21.

Hartland-Swann, J. (1955). The Cncept of Time. *The Philosophical Quarterly(1950-)*, *5*(10), 1–20.

Hasan, N. (2011). Kritik Islamic Worldview Syed Muchammad Naquib Al-Attas terhadap Western Worldview. *Maraji Jurnal Studi Islam*, *I*(1), 115–145.

Hiebert, P. G. (2002). Transforming Worldviews. *Mission Focus: Annual Review*, *10*, 7–31.

Hill, J. H., & Mannheim, B. (1992). Language and World View. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *21*, 381–406.

Hollan, D. (1992). Cross-Cultural Differences in teh Self. *Journalof Anthropological Research*, *48*(4), 283–300.

Joffe, M. (2013). The Concept of Causation in Biology. *Erkenntnis (1975-)*, *78*, 179–197.

Jones, J. J. (1985). Modern Concepts of Public Relations. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, *36*(6), 229–233.

Jones, W. T. (1969). Philosophical Disagreements and World Views. *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association*, *43*, 24–42.

Jones, W. T. (1972). World Views: Their Nature and Their Function. *Current Anthropology*, *13*(1), 79–109.

Karsten, S. G. (n.d.). Dialectics, Functionalism, and Structuralism, in Economic Thought. *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, *42*(2), 179–192.

Kearney, M. (1975). World View Theory and Study. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *4*, 247–270.

Koentjaraningrat (1994). *Kebudayaan Jawa*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.

Kyburg, H. E. (1970). Two World Views. *Nous*, *4*(4), 337–348.

Larsen, K. R. T. (2003). A Taxonomy of Antecedents of Information Systems Success: Variable Analysis Studies. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, *20*(2), 169–246.

Londey, D. (1955). The Concept of Space. *The Philosophical Review*, *64*(4), 590–603.

Long, E. T. (2006). Self and Other: An Introduction. *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion*, *60*(1/3), 1–7.

Lopreato, J. (1990). From Social Evolutionism to Biocultural Evolutionism. *Sociological Forum*, *5*(2), 187–212.

Masroer Ch. Jb. (2004). *The History of Java: Sejarah Perjumpaan Agama-agama di Jawa* (1st ed.). Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Jogjakarta.

Mazur, E. (1983). Space in Geography. *GeoJuornal*, *7*(2), 139–143.

Oesman, O., & Alfian. (1991). *Pancasila sebagai Ideologi* (2nd ed.). Jakarta: BP 7 Pusat.

Ohnuki-Tierney, E. (1969). Concept of Time among the Ainu of the Northwest Coast of Sakhalin. *American Anthropologist*, *71*(3), 488–492.

Ohnuki-Tierney, E. (1972). Spatial Concepts of the Ainu of the Northwest Coast of Shouthern Sakhalin. *American Anthropologist*, *74*(3), 426–457.

Perchonock, N., & Werner, O. (1969). Navajo System of Classification: Some Implication for Ethnoscience. *Ethnololgy*, *8*(3), 229–242.

Perinbanayagam, R. S. (1975). The Significance of Others in the Thought of Alfred Schutz, G. H. Mead and C. H. Cooley. *The Sociological Quarterly*, *16*(4), 500–521.

Peursen, C. A. V. (1992). *Strategi Kebudayaan (Stretegie van de Cultuur)* (3rd ed.). Yogyakarta: Kanisius.

Phillips, J. G. (1962). Sculpture: Sacred and Profane. *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, *20*(7), 213–220.

Pranowo, B. (2011). *Memahami Islam Jawa* (2nd ed.). Jakarta: Pustaka Alvabet.

Proctor, E. K. (1982). Defining the worker-client relationship. *Social Work*, *27*(5), 430–435.

Ridwan (2008). Mistisisme Simbolik dalam Tradisi Islam Jawa. *Ibda'*, *6*(1), 1–13.

Rieppel, O. (1990). Structuralism, Functionalism, and the Four Aristotelian Causes. *Journal of the History of Biology*, *23*(2), 291–320.

Ryan, J. M. (1978). Ethnoscience and Problems of Method in the Social Scientific Study of Religion. *Sociological Analysis*, *39*(3), 241–249.

Sartini, S., & Ahimsa-Putra, H. S. (2017a). Redifining the Term of Dukun. *Humaniora*, *29*(1), 46–60.

Sartini, S., & Ahimsa-Putra, H. S. (2017b, September 27). The Worldviews of the Wong Pinter as Javanese Dukun. Paper presented in the International Conference on South East Asia Studies (ICSEAS) UGM Yogyakarta.

Schlehe, J. (1998). Reinterpretations of Mystical Traditions. Explanations of a Volcanic Eruption in Java. *Anthropos*, *4*(6), 391–409.

Sealigero, M. (1957). Mysticism, Sacred and Profane. *East and West*, *8*(3), 316–320.

Sturtevant, W. C. (1964). Studies in Ethnoscience. *American Anthropologist*, *66*(3), 99–131.

Turner, R. H. (1954). Self and Other in Moral Judgment. *American Sociological Review*, *19*(3), 249–159.

Veeger, K. J. (1993). *Realitas Sosial: refleksi filsafat sosial atas hubungan individu-masyarakat dalam cakrawala sejarah sosiologi* (4th ed.). Jakarta.

Wassmann, J., & Dasen, P. R. (1998). Balinese Spatial Orientation: Some Empirical Evidence of Moderate Linguistic Relativity. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, *4*(4), 689. https://doi.org/10.2307/3034828

Wax, R., & Wax, M. (1962). The Magical World View. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *1*(2), 179–188.

Wenzlhuemer, R. (2010). Globalization, Communication and the Concept of Space in Global History. *Historical Social Research*, *35*(1 (131)), 19–47.

White, L. A. (1986). History, Evolutionism, and Functionalism: Three Types of Interpretation of Culture (Abridged). *Journal of Anthropological Research*, *43*(3), 225–238.

Woodhouse, M. B. (2006). *Berfilsafat Sebuah Langkah Awal* (6th ed.). Yogyakarta: Kanisius.