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Abstract

Chinese and indigenous people in Kalipasir have lived together for centuries. Although they experienced various social changes due to changes in spatial planning, job opportunities, and cultural recognition, they still live in harmony by negotiating its identity. Applying qualitative research this study will reveal: what factors drive the negotiation of the identity of the people of Kampung Kalipasir? How did the identity negotiations in Kalipasir take place? and what impact does this identity negotiation have on people’s attitudes to social change? This study reveals that identity negotiations are driven by factors of cultural diversity, economic equality, and the presence of a common enemy. The form of identity negotiation that occurs is manifested in three behaviors, namely tolerance, prioritizing togetherness, and maintaining tradition. The consequences of this identity negotiation led to a multicultural attitude, prioritizing deliberation, and rejecting exclusivity. This finding shows that a multicultural society can develop in response to social change without having to become a hybrid society by negotiating a tolerant identity and building togetherness while still maintaining traditional values.
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Introduction

Social change is a situation where an event influences the social component in society. This social component is tiered starting from the individual at the most basic level, then social and normative structures, and culminating in cultural identity. Social change can be incremental or dramatic, depending on the rate of change that occurs as well as the impact that events have on social structures (social institutions), normative structures (group behavior), and cultural identity (group beliefs, values, and attitudes) (de la Sablonnière, Lina, and Cárdenas 2019).

Studies on social change showed that it has the potential to have an impact on all areas of life, due to human nature as social beings. These impacts can be in the form of physical impacts such as changes in the quality of health (Niccolai, Blankenship, and Keene 2019), community quality of life (Benfer et al. 2021), informal control and community collective efficacy (Kirk 2022), social desire to solve common problems (Semenza et al. 2022), to the psychological stability of children, families, and individuals (Holdener et al. 2018). Even if the social change is still in the form of discourse, it can cause social impacts such as changes in anxiety levels (Fikri and Herlily 2021), social comfort (McElroy and Werth 2019), and public awareness levels (Hyunanda et al. 2021).

Community responses that are potentially affected by social changes that are considered negative are shown by protesting, refusing and taking legal actions (Charupatanapongse and Jarvis 2018; Hyunanda et al. 2021). The existence of negative social change can create social cohesion and strong bonds between affected residents thereby increasing their resilience to the threat of change (Obaitor et al. 2021). Social cohesion is important to mitigate the negative effects of individual causes of stress in society (Kim 2020), such as stress due to social change. The existence of space for the community to negotiate identity is known to be one of the factors to encourage social cohesion (Rissanen and Sai 2018). The previous research so far has focused the discussion on the dynamics of social change and social cohesion but has not touched on the aspects of identity negotiation involved. Although social cohesion is important for understanding societal dynamics to social change, there is still little knowledge about how plural societies negotiate their identities in the face of social change, which we wish to address in this study.

Previous research on social identity negotiation shows that identity negotiation is not as simple as it was thought before. Farrell, Harrison, and Coburn (2019) for example, show that identity negotiation between researchers and practitioners in research-practice partnerships is influenced by a multitude of factors, internal and external the group.

Banerjee, Shukla, and Ashill (2022) in a series of studies from a marketing perspective show that ethnic consumers deploy “indifference” as an identity negotiation mechanism when faced with different types of host society proportions in a population.

Guillemot, Dyen, and Tamaro (2022) identify three identity negotiation mechanisms underlying 14 coping strategies performed by elderly consumers when consuming vital services that they are unwilling to but have to use it.

Khan (2020) studied foreign students that learning in the US but were labeled as ESL (English as Second Language). He found that these student experience deficits because the
linguistic hegemony and are forced to negotiate their identity. However, Sung (2022), based on the study of Burmese students learning in Hong Kong, criticizes that identity negotiation in international students is far more complex, and research generally over-simplifies the process. In sum, identity negotiation is a complex process, involving various factors, mechanisms, and outcomes, and depends heavily on the context. Hence, we need to understand identity negotiation in depth by taking into account the context using qualitative methodology.

The novelty of our research is that we study the identity negotiations that occur in a plural society against the dynamics of social change in the case of the people of Kampung Kalipasir (Kalipasir Village), Tangerang, Banten. At this time, the people of Kampung Kalipasir are faced with various social changes such as changes in spatial planning, employment opportunities, and cultural recognition. Internally, the community also has its acculturative dynamics related to religious proselytization and ethnic clarity. The Chinese population living in Kalipasir is relatively less regarded as part of the broad Chinese ethnic group because they have a low socioeconomic status and have widely adopted local culture and genetics. Society is also separated by religious identity between Islam, Tridharma, and Christianity. We argue that the dynamics of social change will encourage social cohesion that overcomes religious and cultural barriers so that it will ultimately form community resilience. The process that bridges the formation of social cohesion and resilience is identity negotiation.

This research seeks to study the mechanisms that occur internally in a pluralistic society to build social cohesion through shared identity. We achieve this goal by answering three research questions: 1) what factors drive the negotiation of the identity of the people of Kampung Kalipasir? 2) How did the identity negotiations in Kampung Kalipasir take place? and 3) what impact does this identity negotiation have on people’s attitudes to social change? As a theoretical lens, this research is guided by social identity theory (Tajfel and Turner 2004). While social identity theory has been commonly used in studies of social cohesion (Farrell et al. 2019; Hakim, Molina, and Branscombe 2018), we extend this theory and assess its applicability in the context of plural societies. In addition, we also use a cross-cultural communication approach (Ting-Toomey 1999) in analyzing the identity negotiations of the Kalipasir community. This research will also contribute practically to helping people who are faced with dynamic social changes in building togetherness through identity negotiations.

This research is qualitative research using observation, interviews, and literature study to collect data. We then interviewed three community members, consisting of an ethnic Chinese (WC), one head of the RT (RT), and one head of the RW in Kampung Kalipasir (RW). The reason for selecting these informants, apart from being considered as representative of the area, is also that the informants are considered the most knowledgeable researchers about the problems and have close relationships with this case. Literature study was also carried out by searching for related literature such as journal articles and books that discussed Cina Benteng and Kampung Kalipasir in Tangerang.

Kampung Kalipasir Community and Social Change

The historical narrative regarding the origin of Kampung Kalipasir states that this village was once a settlement called Tanah Pasir which is
located on the banks of the Cipamungkas River (the old name of the Cisadane River). This settlement is called Tanah Pasir because it has a river coast that is dominated by sand. This area can develop because the Cipamungkas River has been a transportation route for merchant ships since the VOC era (17th to 18th centuries). Gradually, the name Tanah Pasir changed to Kalipasir. Now, the Kalipasir area is an RW (Rukun Warga) with 2000 residents, spread over four RT (Rukun Tetangga). The majority of the Buddhist-majority Chinese are in RT 3 while the majority of the Muslim population is in RT 4. This segmentation has been going on for a long time, but there has never been a conflict between residents based on ethnic-religious differences. A glimpse of the Kampung Kalipasir can be seen in Figure 1 and 2.

Multiculturalism, instead of assimilationism, has become the norm in Kalipasir society. Different cultural identities stand out. There is a clear boundary between Chinese settlements and non-Chinese settlements. People of different ethnicities choose to mix, not mingle. Therefore, the younger generation is more likely to associate with their own RT.

“Ngga ini juga si ya, kata orang-orang cuek ya. Ngga berkata-kata ngga ini gitu kan. Emang banyaknya mainnya di sini aja si. Tapi ketika ada ini juga ngga ada kata-kata [rasis]seperti itu. Justru sampe sekarang pas ada dinas apa ya, jadi seperti apa itu ibaratnya toleransi. Justru itu sampe sekarang. Kalo kita mah di sini hanya menjaga hubungan baik terus saling menghormati. Udah sampe situ aja toleransinya ngga sampe kita bergaul. Kalau berbaur mah kita ngga bisa lah.” (Isn’t this the case, yes, people say it’s cool. It’s okay to say this isn’t it? There’s a lot of play here. But when there’s this, there’s also no [racist] words like that. In fact, until now, what kind of service is there, so what kind of tolerance is that? That’s precisely it until now. If we are here, we are only maintaining good relations and continuing to respect each other. Until then, tolerance won’t allow us to get along. If we mingle, we can’t.) (RT, interview, 2022).
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Front view of Kampung Kalipasir, Tangerang, appeared minaret of the Grand Mosque (Masjid Jami’) of Kalipasir (Source: Personal Documentation)
Although there is cultural and geographical segregation, socially the community has close cooperation. Religious celebration activities are celebrated exclusively, but people from other groups provide significant assistance for the success of the celebration. When there is a birthday, the Chinese people donate fruits, while when there is a Chinese religious event, the non-Chinese people donate their energy.

In addition, there are social togetherness activities between Chinese and non-Chinese groups. Two prominent social gathering activities are the Boat Carnival and community gatherings. Kalipasir Boat Carnival is a non-regular celebration aimed at showing the fertility of the land and crops of the community.

“Ya kalau harmoni memang ibaratnya kita saling menjaga. Kalau misalkan dari budaya-nya ya itu ma tradisi si ya. Tradisi kita misalkan harus dipertahankan itu, kan maulid itu, kan kita ada karnaval perahu itu. Memang kita masing-masing punya cerita, kalau kita mah dari karnaval perahu ter-sendiri ya. Ibarat kita mah memperlihatkan kesuburan tanah di sini, hasil bumi. Misalkan kita karnaval yang kemarin, tapi kalau disebut toleransi kita ngga sampe tiap tahun tidak.” (Yes, about harmony there, it’s like we take care of each other. For example, from the culture, it’s a tradition. For example, our tradition must be maintained, it’s like a birthday, and a boat carnival. Indeed, each of us has a story, if we are from a separate boat carnival, yes. It’s like we show the fertility of the soil here, the produce of the earth. Let’s say we had a carnival yesterday, but if it’s called tolerance, we don’t reach it every year) (RT, interview, 2022).

A joint meeting is held every month to review the common problems faced by the community.

“We often have meetings. For example, once a month, we don’t know what’s going on in the community, right? Sometimes we are once a month, if every night, we are at the patrol post. Sometimes we go to the village. Just like that) (RT, interview, 2022).
Economically, people tend to be equal. No one group has economical advantage over another group. Chinese people who are in other areas generally have a higher economic capacity than local people, this is not found in the Kalipasir area. Chinese people even tend to be less economically well off than non-Chinese people, so there is no economic jealousy of non-Chinese people in Chinese society.

“Iya saya dulu pimpinan kerja, ya dapat berapa tahun. Jadi ada tabungan saya bangun rumah. Rencananya tadi ya mau bangun ruko buat disewa. Tapi saja jalan ngga ngeluh, jadi saya berjualan. Jadi saya masa bodo orang nasibnya bagus tapi saya berusaha” (Yes, I used to be a workshop leader, for some years? So, I have savings to build a house. The plan was to build a shophouse for rent. But I am selling. The most important I tried hard”) (WC, interview, 2022).

On the other hand, Chinese people tend to rely on non-Chinese people to negotiate if there are problems of social change that can harm them. Politically, society tends to be conservative. The community has an RT chairman who served the life of the community members. People in RT 3 use the name “Kampung Kalipasir”, same as the name of other areas. The Chinese also refused to be called Cina Benteng (CiBen) and chose to call themselves the Kalipasir people.

“Mereka sendiri tidak mau disebut Cina Benteng. Malah Pak RW tidak mau disebut Cina Benteng. Saya orang Kalipasir. Nah kebetulan saya RT. Nah, ya, kalau saya lagi ngobrol bilangin, saya juga ngga setuju ada batur itu, ada batur petak sembilan. Nah marah besar itu pak RW. Dia ngga mau. Mungkin terkotak ya dari Cina Benteng ini gitu ya.” (They don’t want to be called Cina Benteng. Pak RW doesn’t want to be called Cina Benteng, I am from Kalipasir. I am become head of RT. I don’t want any differentiation. He doesn’t want to be classified as Cina Benteng, right?) (RT, interview, 2022).

The general public inherited from the New Order politics is the continuing support Golkar Party. Although there were also members of the community, particularly in the Chinese community, who became members of other parties.

The cohesion of the Kalipasir community has been tested several times by the dynamics of social change. The first dramatic social change that threatened the modern history of Kalipasir was the riots in 1998. At this time, there was no conflict between Chinese and non-Chinese, unlike in other areas like in the Greater Jakarta. In fact, at that time, Kalipasir became a protected area for the Regent of Ciamis who was affected by the riots.

“Ya seperti kejadian tahun 98, dari yang lalu waaaah bakar sama bakar sini, alhamdulillah engga di sini pak. Aman dan menyatu.... Itu mah mereka-mereka yang nulis [tokoko yang tertutup terus ditulis milik pribumi]. Kita-kita mah gaada. Ga-ada, akur semua.” (Yes, it’s like what happened in 98, yes, from the past, burn here and there, thank God, it was safe here, sir. Safe and unified ... Those are the people who wrote [closed shops written belong to natives]. We are not like that. Everyone in agreement here) (RW, interview, 2022).

After that, some social changes were less dramatic, but still significant for the existence of the identity of the Kalipasir residents. The community has been faced with the threat of eviction for the construction of the Heritage Fort (BH). The Heritage Fort belonging to Hudaya Halim who lives in Australia is a global cultural heritage. Hudaya Halim tried to request land acquisition several times so that BH could be expanded and be in a more strategic position. Currently, BH is in the middle of the market, and access to the location is blocked by settlements, so the land acquisition will be very beneficial for BH’s popularity. Facing this challenge of social
change, the people of Kalipasir held a joint deliberation and agreed to reject the eviction effort and will continue to consistently refuse if there are similar efforts for any development in the future.

“Ga-ada -isu penggusuran saat ini-. Memang pada dasarnya dulu ada isu bahwasanya di sini kan kita daerah cagar budaya, informasi kalau adanya cagar budaya nanti kiri kanan minimal harus ada krein berapa meter, kita pasti nolak pak. Biarkanlah mereka hidup berdampingan seperti ini. Ada yang sampai kemari juga, jadi kan kalau bisa jangan. Biarkan kita hidup seperti ini.” (No -issues related to eviction-. Indeed, in the past, there was an issue about cultural heritage. We got the information that if there is a cultural heritage, the left and right areas must at least have a screen some meters. We reject it. We prefer to be coexisted like this. Some have come here too. But we rejected them. Let’s we live in this way) (RW, interview, 2022).

The next threat of social change is the construction of Chinatown. If the construction of Chinatown is carried out, the Chinese community will benefit because there will be recognition of their identity as Chinese citizens. But the Chinese people rejected this exclusivity and together with the non-Chinese people decided to reject the development of Chinatown.

The last case is the local government’s plan to expand the existing public market. In a meeting with the local government, the community refused because they were worried that it would have a bad impact on the community cohesiveness.

“Awalnya sih kita ke Pak Wali juga kan, kan kadang-kadang tiap Wali ke sini nih, ziarah gitu kan. Di sini kan ada salah seorang mantan Bupati Tangerang, ziarah. Jadi misalkan dia minta itu kan ke sini. Suka ngajak sarapan bareng, itu saya tanya langsung pak ‘ini maksudnya apa sih?’ Ah ini mah belum, wacana wacana gitulah. Tapi kenapa sih harus ada itu gitu pak? Kemarin yang sempat rame pasar. Dia bilang kalau masalah ini si udah lima kali rapat pak. Jadi kalau ada apa-apa kita menunjukkan konsep gitu bukan menolak.” (At first, we went to Pak Wali. Sometimes Wali comes here for pilgrimage, for example, a former Tangerang Regent. At that time, we asked him about the planning of market expanding. But he stated that this is only a discourse. And related to the market issue, government discussed it intensely. So, if there is something, we must prepare and show the concept rather than reject it) (RT, interview, 2022).

The entire process is carried out through deliberation and consensus, not in the form of demonstrations or open demonstrations of force.

“Kalau di sini mah emang kita kan ributnya di dalam ngga sampe ke pemerintah aja gitu. Cuma dari RT RW rapat lagi rapat lagi gitu.” (We only discussed between us; we don't bring it to the government. The meeting is again and again in the level of RT and RW) (RT, interview, 2022).

The dynamic situation on Kampung Kalipasir between indigenous people and Cina Benteng community can be seen in Figure 3 and 4.

The Contributing Factors of the Need to Associate Identity

In general, Kalipasir society creates the need to negotiate identities because society recognizes diversity, economic equality, and common enemies. The multicultural structure of society creates ethnic and religious groups with clear boundaries. Because of these boundaries, society needs to build a common identity that transcends ethnic and religious group identities, the Chinese and non-Chinese groups.
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While the role of diversity as the prerequisite of shared identity is common sense, not all societies with high ethnic diversity can have shared identities (Schneider and Heath 2020). Shared identity should be invoked or constructed so that people can transcend their identity into a shared identity (Alcover 2018; Poitras 2020; Whitley, Gal, and Kjaergaard 2014). Hence, we move to two other factors that were revealed during the interviews: equality and common enemies.

Figure 3
People on Kampung Kalipasir road, Tangerang
(Source: Personal Documentation)

Figure 4
Kalipasir community in traditional market in Kampung Kalipasir Tangerang
(Source: Personal Documentation)
Equality, especially in economics, also allows the forming shared-identity. Without equality, one group can feel superior and the identity that is built tends to be vertical, rather than horizontal. The minority can use the identity of the majority and eventually experience the absorption of identity. For example, the Chinese who were born in 1985 until the fall of Suharto used Indonesian names. One of our interviewees has a Chinese name and an "Indonesian" name at the same time. In this case, no negotiation takes place because the minority simply imitates the majority and loses its identity (Pugh 2018).

The identity negotiations that took place in Kalipasir case were shaped by economic equality between Chinese and non-Chinese groups. Study shows that in a society with a high degree of economic equality, individuals are more likely to be involved in social participation (Wu and So 2020). In this social participation, groups tend to create a shared identity and negotiate their group identity for a larger identity. Social participation in an equal setting, especially equality in status and access to information, will diminishes identity negotiation because each member can reflect their own identity (Palukka et al. 2021). However, this is only true if social representation is important, such as in formal meetings. Without the need for social representation, groups should negotiate their identity toward shared identity or at least, create a sense of shared identity because of social participation (Satariano 2021).

The third factor that supports negotiations to occur is the existence of external pressure in the form of common challenges faced by all groups. This external pressure encourages the group to build identity negotiations so that a common unity is formed to face the "common enemy". The common enemy in this case is the construction of the Heritage Fort.

The existence of common enemies as a motivating factor for creating a shared identity is more pronounced in sports teams. The fact that the team consists of different identities (such as older and younger players) is ignored and the team worked together without any identity differentiation. The team then protects each other and fights together against common enemies (Fransen et al. 2020). The same phenomenon also occurs in vigilante mobilization, where people from different backgrounds shared a common narrative and band against common enemies (Wolff, 2020). Other researchers found that when faced with common enemies, activists from various social and environmental organizations engaged progressively in an alliance with a shared identity (Bakari 2021). Thus, the common enemy is a important factor for negotiating identity from ethnic/group identity to shared identity.

**Forms of Identity Negotiation in the Kampung Kalipasir Community**

With the recognition of diversity, equal economic structure, and external pressures, multicultural societies negotiate their identities for the sake of community survival. Based on the interviews, there are three forms of identity negotiation.

**First**, as a tolerant society. In Kampung Kalipasir, you can find "tolerant" Chinese as well as "tolerant" Muslims. Being a tolerant citizen of Kalipasir is an identity that cannot be separated from the Kalipasir community. As a result, individuals who do not adhere to tolerance cannot be considered citizens of Kalipasir.

The discourse of tolerance in society may be explained by the theory of in-group projection.
According to the theory, individuals tend to project further the characteristics of their group concerning more inclusive superordinate groups (Kaakinen et al. 2020). In this case, Chinese and non-Chinese groups, viewed the identity of their group as tolerant people and then project this belief into the community as a whole, creating a tolerant society.

Second, as a society that holds togetherness. Naturally, groups will tend to prioritize their internals to maintain cohesion. But for the residents of Kalipasir, group identity must be negotiated with a shared identity. This negotiation is realized through joint activities such as cooperation activities, festivals, and meetings. In all of these activities, residents from Chinese and non-Chinese groups work together and whenever there is an issue that affects one group, other groups will be invited to negotiate so that the resulting decision is a joint decision.

Togetherness usually being the feature of group identity. People who felt alienated from the community will form togetherness with the same group members to maintain their identity (Lin, Pang, and Liao 2020). However, togetherness and belongingness could be reintroduced and restored in a larger community as a form of identity negotiation response to collective experiences such as living together in the same place for a long time (Winkler and Kristensen 2021).

Third, as a conservative society. The presence of new problems that come too quickly and dramatically may resulted in a heavy cognitive burden on multicultural groups. For this reason, the safest position to face social change is conservatism. Only if the issue is really important can the principle of collective decision-making be adopted. For everyday problems that require quick decisions, conservatism is the most acceptable decision for all groups.

Being conservative is an identity option for people that faced with the conflicts between tradition and modernity (Pei 2021). Conservative identity could emerge based on various historical factors such as the long of struggle, deconstruction of elites, the experience of backwardness, attitudes accepting otherness, and lack of liberal tradition (Kossakowski and Besta 2018). In Kalipasir's case, the conservative turn is economic equality and the common enemy. The former is a sign of backwardness, compared to developed parts of the city. The latter is a sign of struggle against cultural heritage.

Consequences of Identity Negotiation on Attitudes to the Dynamics of Social Change

The identity resulting from the negotiations in the form of a tolerant society, upholding togetherness, and being conservative provides three important characteristics that characterize the attitude of the Kalipasir community towards the challenges of social change that arise over time. These three characteristics are multiculturalism, prioritizing deliberation, and rejecting exclusivity.

Multiculturalism is a pluralistic society situation where group identity is maintained. In the language used by the interviewees: "get along but not mingle". Being a tolerant society, upholding togetherness, and being conservative leads to the consequences of multiculturalism because the primary ethnic identity is maintained based on tolerance, togetherness, and the preservation of tradition. Social change that can be accepted by society must meet the
requirements of multiculturalism. The community's rejection of the discourse on the formation of Chinatown is an example of how society prioritizes multiculturalism rather than divisions in society. Multiculturalism is formed as the result of cultural identity negotiations performed by both ethnic groups in an equal interaction under mindful communication (Rahardjo 2004).

The second consequence is prioritizing deliberation/consensus. Social change brings challenges to conservatism and tolerant society that upholds togetherness needs to address this with an “inside commons”. They did not immediately take this issue into a form of protest or legal action but prioritized joint discussion. This deliberation activity is shown when the community faces the discourse of the formation of a people’s market and the expansion and development of the region.

Deliberation is important because it provides a resource for individuals with shared identities to support each other (Bedewi et al. 2020). It facilitates social learning to tackle various problems in the community (Lumosi, Pahl-Wostl, and Scholz 2020). Deliberation even could be done to conceive new identities within a community (Chakraborty 2018).

The final consequence is the rejection of exclusivity. Exclusivity is a challenge for togetherness and is therefore rejected by the Kalipasir community. The existence of China Town and the expansion of the Heritage Fort is a form of social change that challenges community togetherness. These two changes created exclusivity, especially for the Chinese community towards non-Chinese people. The identity negotiations that have taken place encourage exclusivity to be rejected by the Kalipasir community.

The main characteristic of exclusivity is the sharing of experiences that aren’t shared with most others (York 2020). If the experiences are critical for community survival, the existence of exclusivity could be detrimental. Hence a community with a shared identity should not be allowed to be exclusive, except outside ethnic-based exclusivity.

The Benteng Chinese community in Kalipasir has been studied from various perspectives such as the resilience of religious culture (Haryani 2020), history (Kumala 2021), and politics (Yuliyanto 2020). Previous research generally concluded that the existence of ethnic Chinese in Kalipasir was caused by the dialogical model of cultural and religious acculturation which was considered more peaceful than the Chinese social history which was colored by violence and conflict (Haryani 2020). From a historical perspective, there are strong spatial ties that build the cultural identity of Cina Benteng (Kumala 2021). Meanwhile, the study of political history places the Cina Benteng cultural identity as an ethnic group formed by national political macro forces (Yuliyanto, 2020). In this study, we show that the identity of the Cina Benteng cannot be separated from the identity of the non-Chinese people living with them in the same location. The strength of the Cina Benteng cultural identity was shaped more by identity negotiations to take advantage of the existing multiculturalism capital to fight social changes that could erode the cultural identity of the Kalipasir community as a whole, not just the Cina Benteng community.

Therefore, one of the main contributions of this research lies in the application of a cross-cultural communication perspective (Ting-Toomey 1999) in the context of social change.
The cross-cultural communication perspective emphasizes the importance of the tension between independence and dependence between groups in society. In this context, the role of communication goes on and builds identity negotiations, so that groups can form social forces in dynamic social change (Gudykunst et al. 1996).

The main contribution of these two studies is to investigate the role of recognizing the diversity and economic equality in promoting identity negotiations in society. Identity negotiation studies view that identity negotiation is directed at creating identities that go beyond binary identity models (Chinese vs non-Chinese) by acknowledging diversity in identities (Hines and Santos 2018). In line with this understanding, this study also confirms that not only is the recognition of diversity, but economic equality is also needed to shape identity negotiations. This finding confirms the argument from Zapata-Barrero (2018) that the best intercultural associations are those that follow the principles of equality and recognition, without being specific to certain groups but to all people in society (Zapata-Barrero 2018).

Associated with togetherness as a form of identity negotiation is a concept that is in line with social cohesion. Social cohesion is “the degree to which a sense of community is manifested in a collectivity of individuals, with trust being an essential component” (Delhey et al. 2018). We show that social cohesion is a feature of negotiating the identity of multicultural societies insofar as three prerequisites are met: recognition of diversity, economic equality, and the existence of a common enemy. This creates a link between social identity theory (Tajfel and Turner 2004) and cross-cultural communication (Ting-Toomey 1999).

Social identity theory emphasizes the importance of social cohesion and cross-cultural communication and asserts that social cohesion is built by communicating independence and dependencies that are in conflict in society. Independence is indicated by diversity while dependency is indicated by the presence of enemies or common goals.

Regarding the recognition of diversity in the Kalipasir community, Zapata-Barrero (2018) also emphasized that the recognition of diversity cannot be forced from above but from intercultural practices in the field built by and for the community. It is found in Kalipasir community, where the recognition of diversity was shaped by the community itself, not by past political forces such as the New Order’s policy of the "Indonesian names” or the policy of decentralization and exclusivity of specific ethnic cultural heritage. This recognition of diversity encourages inclusiveness as a result of identity negotiations in a pluralistic society.

Summarizing, this research is related to previous research in several ways. This research complements theoretical and empirical research related to the resilience of the Benteng Chinese minority group (Haryani 2020; Kumala 2021), by adding the participation of non-Chinese groups in building this resilience. This study generally supports the theory of cross-cultural communication (Ting-Toomey 1999) to consider identity negotiation as a tension between independence and dependence while elaborating this perspective with a focus on Chinese-non-Chinese pluralistic societies.

Conclusion

This study finds that community diversity can contribute to the need for identity
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negotiations by recognizing diversity, economic equality, and common enemies. The forms of identity negotiation carried out are tolerance, building togetherness, and taking a conservative position. Identity negotiations encourage people to accept social change as long as they meet the requirements of multiculturalism, can be negotiated, and reject group exclusivity. This study shows that identity negotiation is carried out by all groups and is a tension between independence and dependence between groups.

However, there is a limitedness of this research because the limited scope of this research. This study only focused in Kampung Kalipasir with the dual ethnic relations, Chinesse and non-Chinesse groups. Future research needs to do in order to explore further identity negotiation in other plural societies in Indonesia with their own context.
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