

Communal Sharing as the Foundation of Solidarity Action in Youth Organization

Melani Jayanti*¹, Wenty Marina Minza¹, F. A. Nurdiyanto¹
¹*Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia*

Submission 5 January 2023 Accepted 7 March 2024 Published 30 April 2024

Abstract. Solidarity is a theme frequently discussed to explain social phenomena linked to social care and cohesion. It is also a commonly discussed topic in news and research works, especially during crises. Studies about solidarity have elaborated on forms of solidarity action, but only a few discuss the process of solidarity and the dynamics of intragroup relationships. Therefore, this study aimed to explore the patterns and roles of intragroup relationships in the solidarity actions of youth organizations, using a qualitative case study approach. The study involved seven young people (4 men, 3 women) from the Kanal Muda Community, with the consideration of the representativeness of the groups elements. The data analysis employed Thematic Analysis while also considering Fiske's lens in constructing the logic of social relation findings. This study found that the communal sharing relationship is the main foundation of solidarity action and enables equal relationships and cooperation within the community. This research endeavors to contribute to the literature on the intragroup relationship and its relevance in solidarity action. Communal sharing can also influence the formation of values, norms, working methods, and decision-making in the group.

Keywords: communal sharing; equality; cooperation; intragroup relationship; solidarity

The COVID-19 pandemic triggered reactions and actions from various societal groups. Solidarity actions, for example, were performed by the youth, who took part in the effort to mitigate the COVID-19 pandemic's impacts. In this study, the researchers met Deni (22 years old) who performed solidarity actions during the pandemic with his community members. He was distraught that the pandemic caused people to lose jobs and experience difficulty in making ends meet. Deni was motivated to help those who were in need, but to optimize the quality and quantity of the solidarity action, he joined a youth community named Kanal Muda (Youth Canal). According to Deni, with communal action, solidarity actions become less burdensome (lighter). This observation aligns with previous studies, which have shown an increase in youth participation in voluntary activities, non-profit initiations, humanitarian aid, and care in the past few decades (Biorcio & Vitale, 2016;

*Address for correspondence: melaniejayanti@mail.ugm.ac.id



Copyright ©2023 The Author(s). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

Cuzzocrea & Collins, 2015). Youth volunteerism proves that the young generation is far from the stereotypical apathy toward societal problems (Luigi et al., 2018). The pandemic became a trigger in the emergence of solidarity amidst society. This study aimed to elaborate on factors that undermine the youth's collective actions in their solidarity.

Solidarity is an important action in critical situations, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, and has shown an increase in instances (Minza et al., 2022). Solidarity action in overcoming the pandemic can influence people's perspectives on morality and humanitarianism (Cappelen et al., 2021). In a collective culture, communal problems will be prioritized over personal issues. Youth also become more intolerant toward inequality, which pushes them to redistribute existing resources (Cappelen et al., 2021). This phenomenon was described by Durkheim as the decline in individualism, resulting in increased solidarity (Pope & Johnson, 1983).

An individual's response towards the pandemic in the form of a strong motivation to perform solidarity action has been discussed by past studies. Within the social psychology discourse, solidarity has been conceptualized as helping behavior (Bierhoff & Küpper, 1999; Lindenberg, 2014; Nadler, 2012). Helping behavior is described as an action designed to alleviate the burden of others (Nadler, 2012; Stukas & Clary, 2012). In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, solidarity action moved many people to be involved in humanitarian activities (West-Oram, 2021).

The positive impact is that the emergence of such solidarity can be one of the modes of solving communal problems during the COVID-19 pandemic (Sujito, 2020). Minza et al. (2022) found that solidarity is an essence of collective coping done by Indonesian society to face the pandemic. Solidarity became a communal effort to help impacted parties, and therefore it could strengthen coping on a collective level, which provided positive consequences to the society. Solidarity was urgent during the pandemic because the most resilient society during the COVID-19 era was not the one that had the best medical technology or strictest pandemic prevention measures, but instead, those who had a good public infrastructure and other solidarity organizations (Prainsack, 2020).

Ideally, solidarity action happens in the long term because inter-individual partnership and collaboration within the community are needed to mitigate the crisis caused by the pandemic (Bavel et al., 2020). However, in Indonesia, solidarity actions remain reactionary, and spontaneous, and have subsistent patterns (Sujito, 2020). Based on this finding, the sustainability issue of solidarity becomes an important topic to examine. Sujito (2020) added that solidarity can become a strength, from which the process can be cultivated into a component of community resilience for the long term.

Kanal Muda Community

The youth state, in which they did not have abundant resources, pushes them to form relations with others who have shared goals to perform solidarity. It causes youth, like Deni, to join a community like Kanal Muda. Joint actions can accumulate capacity so they feel less burdensome and also can motivate youth to continue doing solidarity actions (Verweij, 2015). However, the sustainability of group volunteerism is heavily determined by the dynamics within the group (Flache, 2002).

Kanal Muda emerged as an actor who took part in solidarity actions and assisted the community

in reducing the pandemic impacts. The majority of young people joining Kanal Muda were volunteers who actively participated in various social actions (kanalmuda.id, 2020). The social actions happened in surrounding local communities, most of them significantly affected by the pandemic, particularly the poor urban communities.

Kanal Muda's solidarity actions are categorized as sustainable action with several transformation processes. At the beginning of the pandemic, they raised donations and distributed them. Six months after that, they developed new solidarity programs that focused more on the improvement of human resources' internal capacity, but simultaneously still raised funds and conducted education assistance. They also expanded the membership by recruiting smaller-scale organizations to amplify the beneficiaries.

Literature Framework

Laitinen and Pessi (2014) explained that solidarity is a conscience toward the interests, goals, and emotions that form the sense of ownership for certain groups with shared feelings or actions among people with the same interests. Solidarity within the scope of sociology is understood as a macro-level phenomenon, while within psychology is considered a micro-level phenomenon (Laitinen & Pessi, 2014). On a macro-level, solidarity is a phenomenon derived from group cohesion and integration sustained by a commitment toward commonly respected norms and social ties (Durkheim, 1947). Then, on a micro-level, solidarity is understood as actions, emotions, and attitudes that can attribute the cohesion within the group (Lindenberg, 2014).

Social solidarity tends to refer to group cohesion, and therefore solidarity is not only considered as a prosocial behavior (Laitinen & Pessi, 2014) but more as a set of established norms that are commonly practiced to improve the group's capacity to produce collective goods (Lindenberg, 2014). Solidarity is related norms that cause individuals to be prepared to take part in producing collective goods in their group. Collective goods are produced informally, consisting of expectations toward cooperation in collective responsibilities, sharing, helping others in need, making an effort to understand and be understood by other people within the group, being reliable, and paying attention to other group members (Lindenberg, 2014).

Solidarity is formed by the presence of shared values, identity, and fates, which leads to the strengthening of group cohesion (Federico, 2020; Prainsack, 2020). It motivates group members to continue working together to achieve group objectives (Federico, 2020). Solidarity on the basis of group togetherness triggers emotions, relations and exchanges (Nadler, 2012). Solidarity does not only come from similarities, but also a sense of humanity, power, and personal interests, but the main point is that solidarity becomes power on a collective level (Komter, 2004; Lindenberg, 2014).

Then, in practice, an attitude that pushes norm-based solidarity actions within the group can create various dynamics. For example, there will be problems in interpersonal relationships, individual positions within the group, and the ingroup-outgroup relationship (Bierhoff & Küpper, 1999), which colors in intragroup dynamics. The social psychology discourse on solidarity does not only focus on individual-level analysis but also needs to take into consideration the structure within the group and

its existing social processes (Stern, 1986). This calls for a study on solidarity with an intragroup relation perspective. Additionally, (Fetchenhauer et al., 2006) explained that the nature and relationships and the context of solidarity would determine the form of products from that action as well as whether the help is voluntary, a grant, or turns into a commodity. Because of that, factors that cause the formation of solidarity in the group are influenced by the types and patterns of relationships within that group (Komter, 2004).

Study of solidarity behavior is important to see several indications about the types of relationships existing in a group. Interestingly, there is an agreement between sociology and social psychology about categorizing social relationships into four fundamental types, as proposed by (Fiske, 1992). The classification of four relationship patterns became the lense of this study to examine the relationship pattern of a group's solidarity actions: communal sharing (indistinguishable community and identity), authority ranking (statuses and differences that are formed hierarchically), market pricing (calculated exchange), and equality matching (balanced and equal exchange)

Research Objectives

The research problems and theoretical approach discussed previously lead to the following research questions: what are and how are the patterns and role of social relationships in solidarity actions? This study aimed to investigate the role and relationship patterns in the solidarity actions between individuals within the youth organization Kanal Muda which led to the formation, maintenance, and development of the solidarity actions in this organization. This study wanted to examine the solidarity dynamics in Kanal Muda by analyzing the challenges emerging during solidarity actions in a condition that involves organization members with different backgrounds and interests. The results of the present study are expected to become an alternative model for managing group dynamics to maintain the group's solidarity action.

Methods

This qualitative study employed a case study approach. Case study enabled us to retain holistic characteristics of the processes within an organization (Yin, 2009). The type of case study in the present study is the explanatory case study, which focuses on the real phenomenon happening in Kanal Muda, done through an investigation. However, the study was not conducted on the organization unit, but instead on the inter-individual relationships within the organization or group. Therefore, the analysis unit is the individuals within the group, not the organization. The organization in this study acts as a context, or the group norms and organizational structure are considered as the context. This study received an ethical clearance from the Research Ethics Committee at the Faculty of Psychology of Universitas Gadjah Mada (No. 5232/UN1/FPSi.1.3/SD/PT.01.04/2021, published on September 14, 2021).

Participants

Participants of the present study were the members of Kanal Muda. Kanal Muda is a youth organization that was formed with the objective of providing a united platform for various youth groups for social solidarity (kanalmuda.id, 2020). Kanal Muda becomes a representative group of the youth solidarity movement in the Yogyakarta Special Province because its members are grassroots organizations spread across four regencies and a city within the province.

The number of participants was seven people, consisting of three female and four male members of the organization. The analysis unit of this study was not the organization and therefore the participant selection focused on representativeness. We made an effort to recruit participants while also maintaining representativeness. The participant selection implemented the snowball sampling principle

Table 1
Research Participants

Participant	Sex	Domicile	Organizational Role
Asna	Female	Sleman	Member of social division
Ganang	Male	Yogyakarta	Social division coordinator
Sabar	Male	Bantul	Member of organization division
Hasim	Male	Yogyakarta	Initiator, member of the organization division
Deni	Male	Yogyakarta	Head of organization
Inayah	Female	Kulon Progo	Member of organization division
Yanti	Female	Gunung Kidul	Member of the education division

Research Procedures

Researchers used the term “procedure” because we were involved in the participants’ dynamics. The term “procedure” accommodates what we did on the field, compared to data collection which was commonly used to describe technical data collection. One of the characteristics of a case study is the use of multiple information sources in its data assembly to provide a detailed, in-depth overview of an event (Creswell, 2007). There were three data sources used in this study, namely: 1) transcripts of focus group discussion (FGD) and interviews; 2) research notes, based on field observations; and 3) the organization’s documents, writings on Kanal Muda’s website (kanalmuda.id), and social media posts.

Data collection began with a preliminary study in January 2021 by observing Kanal Muda. The data collection was also conducted via an online FGD session on Zoom, where six out of seven invited participants were present. Semi-structured interviews were done face-to-face two to three times for each participant, every interview between 90 to 120 minutes. One of the interview questions was: “What is your view about the solidarity actions that you do with Kanal Muda?”

The observation was done when the first author (MJ) participated in the organization’s formal

activities, such as the board of members' meetings, metal waste management workshop, and Kanal Muda olympiad, and informal activities, such as gatherings in cafes. We obtained documentation in the form of photos and field notes through observation and reflection of those events. In addition to interviews and observation, we also audio-visual and written documents obtained from Kanal Muda's social media and website posts.

Data Analysis

Collected data were analyzed using the thematic analysis method as suggested by Braun and Clarke (2006). The development of codes and themes was done with the help of the Nvivo 12 software. Generally, analysis was conducted in two levels, namely "inductive", during the code labeling, and "deductive", using theoretical frameworks during the assignments of themes. We performed data triangulation by synchronizing data across participants and method triangulation by integrating three data collection techniques (interview, observation, and document search). We attempted to ensure that the case study data collection fulfilled the requirements of data credibility. We did not perform triangulation as the analysis unit was not the organization. However, we met with the beneficiaries of the activities conducted by participants, as a representation of another organization to achieve credibility.

Results

The results of this study show that the relationship patterns formed in the solidarity actions of Kanal Muda is communal sharing. How the communal sharing pattern was formed can be explained by the dynamics of Kanal Muda's establishment as an organization. It is important to understand the process of formation and establishment of an organization's foundational values that influence intragroup relationship dynamics and the sustainability of the group's solidarity actions. Then, the next discussion focuses on the conflict emerging as the consequence of member diversity and how communal sharing relationships play a role in intragroup conflicts. The result discussion ends with themes of cooperation emerging from communal sharing relationships as a resource-sharing mechanism within the group.

"Everyone's Equal": Norm of Equality in Opportunities and Access

Young people joining Kanal Muda are not only coming from the university student circle, like Ganang, but also farmers, stockmen, small-scale entrepreneurs, merchants, and freelancers. From this diversity, there are some interesting intersections. Hasim, as the initiator of Kanal Muda, proposed equality as the foundation of the organization to bridge the differences among group members and was well-received by members. As told by Inayah, that in every process in the organization, "*Kanal Muda friends make efforts to treat all members equally.*" Implicitly, we conclude that equality has become the foundation of group formation and norms within that group.

Equality in Kanal Muda is equal opportunities and access to resources within the group, namely knowledge and networks. The knowledge refers to competence in the organization, youth

movement knowledge, and the role of youth in the community. A post on kanalmuda.id explained that *“youth must possess knowledge and skills to perform their best roles as a solution for various problems within the community.”* Meanwhile, networks refer to inter-youth organization relationships with artists, academics, and donors.

Knowledge and networks become important resources for them. As a child education volunteer, Asna said *“Meeting fellow volunteers makes [me] more excited in assisting the children.”* Meanwhile, according to Inayah, *“knowledge obtained from friends can inspire to create similar activities in the village [her region].”* Based on our observation, people with more knowledge and experience in organization, youth movement, and education assistance skills, and having wider networks, are more respected by members of Kanal Muda.

In practice, equality is manifested in freedom of speech and sharing opinions in the discussion space, equal distribution of roles and tasks, and gender equality. No less important is the equal opportunities to express rejection. Equality as a norm proposed by the initiator is viewed as a form of partiality toward members. While in Kanal Muda, Ganang felt respected and it pleased him that his opinions were received and became a topic of discussion, even though it was not guaranteed that his opinions would become the group decision. Ganang said, *“It turns out that I’m considered a human, my words are used, heard, and discussed by everyone when I share my opinions”.*

Deni, as the head of Kanal Muda, during FGD said that equality is also reflected in the organizational structure, with collective leadership as the guide of Kanal Muda’s movement. In an interview, Deni added that equality is also practiced by sharing ideas and making decisions in forums (*musyawarah*). According to Deni, group decision making is done to determine strategic attitudes or to respond to a problem.

“Group decision making [is done] to form the board of members and plan activities. In those activities, all members have the right to share ideas, but to make decisions, we decide together. Group agreement is preferred, if we don’t reach an agreement, we will vote”. (Deni)

Deni’s statement implies that equality as a norm in the group happened in a top-down manner. It is because they aimed to spread the equality values so that it would become a group norm. Equality as a cultural symbol is manifested in spaces like group discussions that involve all members. We argue that relationships in Kanal Muda are communal sharing based on the conception that there are no inter-member differences within the group, with everyone being considered equal. Because of that, equality becomes a symbolic value, as the core of communal sharing relationships lies in the equality within the group.

Gender equality emerges as a strong value. Yanti said that her friends do not differentiate between men and women.

“I really feel that we’re equal, we have the same potentials, we have the same opportunities. No one makes a fuss about men and women, in important decisions we’re still considered equal”. (Yanti)

Yanti’s statement indicates that gender equality is mainstream within their group despite the majority of Kanal Muda members being men. They are often exposed to gender equality issues that

are popular among activists. These equality issues are socialized through discussion forums. Based on our observation, there are other forms of equality that intersect with gender equality. For example, the equality in sharing opinions, in which the board asked and let female members who rarely spoke to share their opinions. Then, there is an equality in task distributions, in which male members often took a role in cooking for regular gatherings (as shown in their Instagram posts).

Figure 1
Male Group Members were Preparing Food for the Gathering



Another opportunity was during the meeting for Kanal Muda Olympiad as an upcoming agenda, it was clear that the board attempted to encourage new and less vocal members to share their opinions in that forum. In task distributions, there is also no difference for members based on seniority, domicile, level of education, or experience. It can represent their effort to exercise the equality norm for all members.

In that forum, Yanti is a young woman from Gunung Kidul, who was selected to become the leader for the Kanal Muda Olympiad. It can be considered proof that all members treated each other equally, focused on the group's commonality, and did not put emphasis on individual identity. People who are within such a relationship pattern use equality in the social group to achieve goals and resolve problems that they encounter.

Conflict: Consequences of Diversity

We realize that conflict is a consequence of diversity within the group. One of the prevalent forms of conflict was related to organizational activity but did not lead to personal relationship conflicts. This conflict generally happens because of the imbalance of role distribution. Several members with high workloads considered the task distributions burdensome. It especially happened to the ones who lived far from the secretariat base camp, which is located in the center of the city, or members who were full-time workers. Working members were considered to have normal activities, compared to university students with workloads limited to academic activities. For example, Sabar, Yanti, and

Inayah considered the variety of activities and tasks in the secretariat as something that was difficult to catch up on. Moreover, the frequency and duration of the activities made the experience difficult to divide time with their main responsibility as working individuals. They chose to be temporarily inactive from the organization and focus on their jobs.

Conflicts that arise from organizational processes are related to the issues in delegations of resources, role distributions, and task responsibilities. We saw Yanti express her disagreement over the role distribution given to her as a coordinator of an event. This is an indicator that the equality voiced by the group was indeed present. The members even had equal opportunities to refuse and express their disagreements toward decisions that were probably caused by individual limitations in capacity and competence.

Oftentimes, the forum's decisions become social pressures. It happened in the meeting that afternoon, in which the forum decided that Yanti would lead the event, and she felt slightly pressured to accept the decision. It caused Yanti to develop negative emotions toward her group.

"It's like they force me to participate, like belittling others' time. Meanwhile, I live far away, I also have a job, and I have a family. Then, I experienced a point where I was really tired. Sometimes I think about quitting, but it's a shame to leave Kanal Muda. This organization offers various benefits. During the selection of leaders like earlier, it seems imposing, well, they're like that." (Yanti)

Yanti's statement shows that she felt forced and that the board did not respect her decision. Even so, Yanti continued to carry out the task and decided to stay in Kanal Muda. She considered the many benefits she had gained from the organization. We argue that this conflict has a negative impact that threatens the existence of the group and its activities. This inequality in role distribution led to dissatisfaction with the group, members becoming inactive, and furthermore members wanting to leave the organization. These attitudes would endanger the organization by threatening group cohesion. The equality that had been sought did not guarantee that the group could avoid conflict. Even so, if the group did not promote equality amid diversity, it was likely that many conflicts would arise. As Hasim has said, this equality bridged the existing diversity.

The strategy used by Kanal Muda to resolve process conflict due to inequality in the division of roles was using a cultural approach. Someone who was not active, be it a board member or a member, was contacted personally by other members. The approach taken varied, but the goal was to communicate in order to understand the reason why the friend had withdrawn from group activities. Hasim, Dika, and Galang chose to approach inactive members and invite them for casual conversations. The conversation was usually done while drinking coffee or eating together. Meanwhile, Asna preferred to invite these members to exercise and walk together so they could talk. After the tension had reduced, they then re-engaged inactive members in fairly light group activities, such as Kanal Safari.

Based on the pattern of conflict resolution that they consider to be cultural, we believe that this approach is based on equality in the form of cooperation. This study found that cooperation can inadvertently reduce conflict. It can be said that communal sharing relationships can sometimes reduce

or at least minimize conflict, and also prevent it. However, it cannot completely eliminate conflict.

Cooperation: Resource Sharing Mechanism

Another finding related to communal sharing is resource sharing, which in the context of Kanal Muda is a form of cooperation between members. Sabar was a member of Kanal Muda who was older than his peers. He was a young farmer and the driving force of Jamblang Gentong. Before joining Kanal Muda, he often felt that he was struggling alone in assisting village children to learn traditional dance and games. The presence of friends from Kanal Muda had made Sabar more enthusiastic in carrying out this volunteer activity. The process that occurred in this forum was conveyed by Sabar below:

"I view Kanal Muda solidarity as something akin to family. Whatever the problem within the community, we can share and solve it together. The problems are varied, so we can learn from other communities. I appreciate my friends [in Kanal Muda] who always support [each other]. Whatever the need, and what can be helped. We can be open to each other to provide help. The manifestation of the action, when we're doing activities, is supported by coming, encouragement, appreciation, and that makes us really happy."
(Sabar)

From Sabar's statement, it can be concluded that Kanal Safari was a place to share, coordinate, and plan cooperation for members. They provided social support for members in need. This was shown by the members continuing to attend Kanal Safari even though the location of the activity was far from the area where they lived. Sabar always tried to be present during Kanal Safari, because according to him this activity was not only for fun, but there was "something" that he could get.

The sharing of social resources such as knowledge, social support, and networks as practiced by Kanal Muda was done because people in this relationship often considered themselves to be sharing the same substance. Moreover, it was supported by the emotional bond of being part of the group so that there is more group cohesion. This made members of Kanal Muda consider social resources in the form of knowledge, social support, and networks as material objects that were owned and accessible to all members, so they must be shared with members in need.

An example of this knowledge sharing is as expressed by Inayah. She was new to volunteering in Kulon Progo, gaining knowledge about the world of child mentoring from friends at Kanal Muda. Inayah gained knowledge about developing a curriculum, designing activities, and creating strategies to get children to love learning. She also said that the activities designed by friends from other centers could be inspiring.

Furthermore, social resources in the form of networks refer to networks of friends, sources of funding, and opportunities for cooperation with various parties. This friendship network was formed because, in practice, they were not only friends as members of the organization, but they also did activities like what people do in regular friendships. Deni and Galang, for example, became friends who often hung out together. Asna and Waya also often traveled together outside of Kanal Muda affairs.

Then, the network related to funding and cooperation opportunities was also shared with the member organizations. Although the majority of these networks were carried by Hasim, all

organizations that were members of Kanal Muda could access them. Kanal Muda networked with Senthong Enterprise, a funding organization. Senthong Enterprise's program included donations of children's packages that were distributed to all Kanal Muda member organizations in Yogyakarta on a predetermined schedule.

Reflecting on the description above, it was found that a mechanism is needed to regulate access to resources under the authority of Kanal Muda. According to Hasim, this could be achieved through the norms built by Kanal Muda, which include cooperation, sharing, and helping as the main norms. Kanal Muda members worked together to realize a common goal, which was to improve the quality of life for members and assist children. In more detail, the purpose of this organization was to connect and develop potential, and the purpose of solidarity was to improve the situation or reduce the impact of the pandemic, encourage each other, and strengthen relations between member organizations within the network. Therefore, it can be said that the cooperation they do is a form of sharing.

This cooperation process is carried out by making exchanges based on needs. Through this communal sharing relationship, each member works or contributes according to their abilities, takes what is needed, and contributes what they can. It is done without anyone taking notes on how much each person contributes or receives. Members pool resources that they treat as belonging to the whole group. Therefore, this communal sharing relationship pattern can maintain solidarity in Kanal Muda.

The meaning of this cooperation for members is not only a way to achieve shared goals but also as emotional bonds, such as the feeling of belonging. According to Inayah, this cooperation between members can increase enthusiasm, make volunteering feel lighter, and allow them to reach a wider range of beneficiaries. This cooperation occurs in various spaces and forums in Kanal Muda, both formal and informal. We believe that cooperation as part of sharing is important for Kanal Muda as an organization and for individual members. If there is no cooperation, it is likely that the existence of Kanal Muda as a volunteer organization will not last long. The main impetus for the development of this solidarity action is the members' need to continue to be together. Although it cannot be denied that there are unavoidable either from the existing diversity or the division of roles due to the increasing number of activities.

Discussions

This study aimed to understand what and how the patterns and role of intragroup relationships of the youth organization focusing on solidarity actions. This study focused on intragroup relationships to answer research questions about social relationships. The study findings stress that the communal sharing relationship pattern is a foundation of solidarity actions done by the youth organization. Results of the thematic analysis show two themes critical in communal sharing relationships: 1) equality as the group norm, and 2) cooperation as the shared value in performing an action. Conflict, as discussed by (Fiske, 1992), in communal sharing relationships mainly revolves around intergroup conflict and does not touch intragroup conflicts. Meanwhile, this study found that intragroup conflict emerged and that equality as a group norm could not prevent the emergence of intragroup conflict.

(Lindenberg, 2014) positioned cooperation as the main foundation of solidarity. Meanwhile, this study adds that solidarity is not only founded on cooperation but also on equality. Solidarity that is based on equality and cooperation provides an advantage, in the form of more sustainable group solidarity. Equality among members is manifested through equal opportunities and access to group resources and also during task distributions. In an equal relationship between members of a volunteer group, conflict emerges along with the issues in task distributions (Kerwin et al., 2011). This study found that equality in task distributions also encompasses the equal right to refuse, causing friction in the process. However, cooperation plays a role in reducing conflict, as well as maintaining relationships between members and preventing new conflicts. In the context of solidarity action, cooperation is the driving factor to improve group cohesion and facilitates the effort to achieve shared goals.

Participants' backgrounds also contribute to the dynamics of their relationships in carrying out group solidarity actions. Based on interviews with members of Kanal Muda, there were at least two backgrounds that influenced participants, namely knowledge and experience. Some members of Kanal Muda were students who learned about how youth should contribute to social problems. Meanwhile, some other members had received aid during disasters and were assisted by social organizations. The participants' knowledge and experience sparked their concerns to help others. According to Nadler (2012), there are situations where people are more likely to respond to other people's difficulties by helping. Prosocial behaviors are driven by social norms and are a consequence of gratitude for their past experience (Nadler, 2012).

Communal Sharing: Equality and Appropriate Relations for Solidarity Actions

In this section, we will discuss the findings on equality in more depth by linking it to the discussion of communal sharing relationships and solidarity. This research found that relationships between members of the youth organization had a pattern that put equality as the main principle, which is in line with Fiske (1992) model of communal sharing relationship as the main relationship pattern. Similar to Fiske, equality in intragroup relationships is based on the conception that there are no differences between members in the group, everyone is considered equal in obtaining opportunities and access to resources. Fiske (1992) described that communal sharing generally occurs in the context of kinship. However, the results of this study show that communal sharing relationships can also be found in relations within a youth group. This indicates that equality in communal sharing is not limited to kinship, but also occurs in an age-based youth organization.

Communal sharing in Kanal Muda was a relationship where members felt that they were a part of the group that expected each member to share resources, such as knowledge. Fiske's theory of relations is translated as knowledge sharing by Boer et al. (2004), which explains that knowledge is treated as common property for all group members, following the idea of "*what is mine is yours*". Such a relationship is found not only among professionals with similar backgrounds, as shown by Lin et al. (2012) study, as this study also found that this pattern also occurs in a group that places knowledge as a key resource and makes equality a group norm.

Equality is also present in the division of roles within the group. They made an effort to treat each other fairly, focused on the group commonality, and did not emphasize individual identity. People in communal sharing relationships share their resources with group members willingly and do not ask for rewards (Lin et al., 2012). Lindenberg (Fetchenhauer et al., 2006; Lindenberg, 2014) did not discuss the right relationship pattern to maintain solidarity actions. Meanwhile, Bierhoff and Küpper (1999) highlighted that there are several levels of relationships that are considered as determining factors of solidarity actions. We suggest that the communal sharing relationship pattern is the appropriate relationship pattern to maintain a solidarity action, because the equality that exists in communal sharing will strengthen group cohesion so that it can be easier to achieve communal goals that focus on our welfare.

The participants of this study were a group of people with different backgrounds, but the communal sharing relationship made them equal. This is in line with Fiske (1992) statement that when people operate within a communal sharing framework, each member of the group is different. However, the differences between them are symmetrical (parallel) but not linear (comparable). This means that group members have equal positions, but there is still someone superior. In the context of this research, those who were regarded as having a higher position were individuals with more knowledge and wider networks. This opinion is supported by Boer et al. (2004) research, which shows that respected members of society are usually recognized based on their expertise.

Conflict Husk in Communal Sharing Relationships

This study found a conflict husk within an equal relationship. The conflict that emerged in intragroup relationships in the present study was related to organizational processes that could threaten group solidarity. One of the conflicts that often arises within the context of an organization is process conflict, which is an awareness of disagreement between group members about the aspects of how the next task resolution should be (de Wit et al., 2012). The cause of process conflict is the diversity of tasks among group members (Behfar et al., 2011).

In this study, participants thought that the conflicts were caused by the solidarity development that resulted in the increased load of activities and tasks for group members, when in fact the conflicts emerged as consequences of diversity, such as diversity in capacity, class, and gender within the group. In Kerwin et al. (2011) discourse, conflict may emerge because of differences in experiences, values, capabilities, and priorities. However, the conflict antecedent that was more salient for participants was the differences in priorities. It can be said that the potential for conflicts arises from individual interests. Because of that, conflicts arise from disagreements about who gets to do what or how tasks are supposed to be done (Kerwin et al., 2011).

Specifically, the differences in priorities among individuals and the group are characterized by different attentions and agendas, which continue to conflict about distributed tasks. Behfar et al. (2011) emphasized that process conflict is related to the delegation of resources, task distributions, and task responsibilities. The negative impacts of process conflict are the withdrawal of members, to the point that they desire to leave the group, and low satisfaction toward the organization (Dreu & Weingart,

2003). This individual impact also affects the group, namely disrupting its results and productivity, which can jeopardize the group work (Jehn et al., 1999).

In solidarity, goals are desired not because the individuals long for them, but because the group wants them (Kolers, 2012). Thus, solidarity has two critical features, namely developing shared goals of the members and their shared interests. However, an intense process conflict can reduce the quality of group decision making due to the emergence of personal disagreement (Behfar et al., 2011). We believe that process conflict that endangers this group can also threaten group solidarity because it impairs group cohesion and obstructs the group from reaching their shared goals. Ideally in solidarity, regardless of everything, an individual does not treat collective goals as a means to reach their individual goals but voluntarily adopts collective goals as theirs (Kolers, 2012). That way, solidarity becomes a collective achievement by individual agencies.

Cooperation: Resource Sharing and Conflict Management

In the context of communal sharing relationship, Fiske (1992) said that task distributions are done through communal mutual aid. Cooperation in this study is akin to *gotong royong* (mutual assistance). *Gotong royong* is done on the basis of maintaining good relationships and therefore results in the willingness to help others. However, there is a slight difference between cooperation and *gotong royong* in the present study. The difference lies in the fact that *gotong royong* tends to encourage individuals not to be dominant over others within the community so that harmony can be maintained (Koentjoroningrat, 1977), while in this study, cooperation is done as an effort to develop together, which is expressed by the members encouraging one another to improve personal capacity.

This study shows that equality becomes the foundation of cooperation within the group. The mechanisms to regulate access to resources are done through norms that are aligned with solidarity norms formulated by Lindenberg (2014), which encompasses cooperation, sharing, and helping as the main norms. Cooperation in this study is a form of sharing. The cooperation process is done by conducting exchanges based on needs. This aligns with Fiske (1992) statement that in communal sharing, every member is working based on their capability, takes what they need, and contributes what they can without anyone keeping count of each person's contributions and receptions.

Communal sharing in solidarity actions emerges when members manage the production of collective goods or something they fight for together, in this study that is to improve the quality of life together. Communal sharing is characterized by collective efforts by all group members, without counting individual contribution (Clark, 1984), and therefore the resulting products from this cooperation become collective resources for the group. In Durkheim's theory (Durkheim, 1947), communal sharing can be analyzed as a mechanical solidarity, with an emphasis on the fact that everyone is doing the same work and producing the same thing. However, this study found that the meaning of cooperation is not only about the effort to achieve shared goals, but also emotional ties, such as the sense of ownership, encouragement, the feeling of having fewer burdens, and the sense of being able to reach more beneficiaries.

In detail, the forms of cooperation found in this study are cooperation to resolve problems in

group networks, helping each other in inciting vigor to organize, and working together to create innovative solidarity activities. The space to express this cooperation is a collective space that emphasizes equality and encompasses efforts to share between members. The willingness to share, according to Lin et al. (2012), shows full trust toward group members and the positive impact of volunteerism, which in this study context is the solidarity action. From this perspective, researchers believe that communal sharing is suitable for the spirit of solidarity

The results of this study also show that cooperation can inadvertently muffle unavoidable conflicts due to diversity and process conflict. Conflict management that was performed by the group leaned toward the effort to maintain solidarity and cohesivity within the group by doing a cultural approach that, according to researchers, was based on equality in the form of cooperation. Aligned with Fiske's theory (Fiske, 1992), the present study also puts cooperation as a shared value that is important in communal sharing relationship and can influence conflict management. This argument is supported by Kerwin et al. (2011), who stated while there is a less intense process conflict or the lack of meaningful tensions, the sense of mutual respect between group members remains present. In this study context, conflict intensity was reduced using cultural approaches.

The social dilemma that arises with this conflict is not always negative, but it will be beneficial if all group members work on the same communal goals (Bierhoff & Küpper, 1999). This is in line with Batson's explanation (Batson, 1994) that solidarity motivation may be based on collectivism which stands for group goals. Kolers (2012) reinforced this argument, stating that solidarity can solve group membership problems, such as knowledge, motivation, and perceived fairness issues that hinder task acceptance.

This study found that cooperation can unconsciously reduce conflict. It can be said that a communal sharing relationship can sometimes reduce or at least minimize conflict and prevent it; however, it cannot completely eliminate conflict (Kolers, 2012). Solidarity groups such as the participants of this study, temporarily resolve these conflicts, depending on the ongoing negotiations. The advantage of conflict resolution using this method is the sacrifice of certain autonomy measures, because if the problem has been resolved together, then an individual does not need to resolve it alone (Singer, 2017).

Solidarity Durability: Group's Rational Reasons and Active Participation of Members

This research suggests that the communal sharing relationship pattern can sustain solidarity in youth organizations. The criterion for the durability of solidarity does not come from the group, but from what is the rational reason underlying the group's choices (Kolers, 2012). Our research participants used communal sharing by agreeing that equality is the group norm, which is shown by treating resources as belonging to the whole group and beyond individual members. This is because according to Kolers (2012), the durability of solidarity is based on what members believe, what the group chooses, and what it takes to maintain fairness. Equality and cooperation in communal sharing, which are the findings of this research, also play a role in strengthening group cohesion, so it can be concluded that the communal sharing relationship is the appropriate relationship pattern for solidarity action.

Although, according to Kolers (2012) durability of solidarity is not absolute, because there may be limits to how much disagreement exists in the group, which can be used as a reference for individuals to stay or quit the group.

Several limitations in the present study that are important to note are related to the research method, which was the explanatory single case study to examine one group. This caused the research results to be confined to the facts in the group studied. Studies on this theme will likely reveal other findings if using a case study method involving several groups to obtain more diverse results. There may be other patterns of relationships, other than communal sharing, and their underlying causes. However, we hope that the findings from this study can be considered for future research.

Conclusions

This article underlines the relevance of intragroup relations as the foundation of solidarity action that can influence values, norms, operations, and decision making within the group. This study also found communal sharing as a pattern of intragroup relations that encompasses equality and cooperation. Equality acts as the basic norm of the group and opens equal access and opportunities for group members. Equal relationship also becomes an important foundation in the distribution of responsibilities among group members.

Literature discussing communal sharing relations as an intragroup pattern in fact does not discuss the possibility of conflict between group members. This study found that fair distribution of responsibilities can improve cooperation and therefore reduce the prevalence of conflict. Our findings also contribute to the solidarity literature, in which communal sharing is considered a cornerstone in building strong solidarity through fair norm distributions. Previous studies tend to lean toward elaborating forms of solidarity, instead of explaining the process of group solidarity and relations within it. This study contributes to the literature discussion of how intragroup relationship patterns influence the good solidarity process during the formation or its maintenance. Although some literature sheds light on several levels of relations, which are considered as a determining factor of solidarity actions, the literature has yet to discuss the appropriate relationship pattern suitable patterns to maintain those actions. We suggest the appropriate communal sharing relationship pattern to maintain solidarity action. This study concludes that the combination of equality and collaboration can strengthen group cohesion and lead to more sustainable solidarity actions, and therefore it will be easier for the group to achieve its shared objective, which is focused on our welfare.

Recommendation

This study can provide information about youth involvement in Yogyakarta that can build self-sufficiency, develop their potential, and hone sensitivity to find resolutions for the societal conditions around them. It means that such activities can benefit the involved youth and the entire community. This good practice is expected to be replicated by the government and educational institutions by developing youth empowerment strategies and policies as a form of innovation. These

steps are done as an effort to increase youth involvement in community agendas, empowerment, and humanity. Additionally, these activities can also become a preventive effort against negative behavior among youth, as it provides space for self-actualization and development for them.

Declaration

Acknowledgement

We express our deepest gratitude to the members of the Kanal Muda community who have supported and were willing to participate in this research. We also thank the late Dr. Budi Andayani and the late Drs. Helly Prajitno Soetjipto, M.A. who provided constructive suggestions on the initial draft.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Authors's Contribution

First author contributed to the design of the study, acquisition of data, analysis and interpretation of the data, data collection, and of the manuscript. Second and third authors contributed to the analysis and interpretation of data, revision of the manuscript, and supervision.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest regarding the contents of this manuscript.

Orcid ID

Melani Jayanti  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3850-1391>

Wenty Marina Minza  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3805-2717>

F. A. Nurdianto  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4353-2501>

References

- Batson, C. D. (1994). Why act for the public good? four answers. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 603–610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167294205016>
- Bavel, J. J. V., Baicker, K., Boggio, P. S., Capraro, V., Cichocka, A., Cikara, M., Crockett, M. J., Crum, A. J., Douglas, K. M., Druckman, J. N., Drury, J., Dube, O., Ellemers, N., Finkel, E. J., Fowler, J. H., Gelfand, M., Han, S., Haslam, S. A., Jetten, J., ... Willer, R. (2020). Using social and behavioural science to support covid-19 pandemic response. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 4, 460–471. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0884-z>
- Behfar, K. J., Mannix, E. A., Peterson, R. S., & Trochim, W. M. (2011). Conflict in small groups: The meaning and consequences of process conflict. *Small Group Research*, 42, 127–176. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496410389194>

- Bierhoff, H. W., & Küpper, B. (1999). Social psychology of solidarity. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-015-9245-1_7
- Biorcio, R., & Vitale, T. (2016). *Italia civile: Associazionismo, partecipazione e politica*. Donzelli editore.
- Boer, N.-I., van Baalen, P. J., & Kumar, K. (2004). The implications of different models of social relations for understanding knowledge sharing. Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230524545_7
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Cappelen, A. W., Falch, R., Sørensen, E. Ø., & Tungodden, B. (2021). Solidarity and fairness in times of crisis. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 186, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2021.03.017>
- Clark, M. S. (1984). Record keeping in two types of relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 549–557. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.47.3.549>
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches, 2nd ed.* Sage Publications, Inc.
- Cuzzocrea, V., & Collins, R. (2015). Collaborative individualization? peer-to-peer action in youth transitions. *YOUNG*, 23(2), 136–153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1103308815569390>
- de Wit, F. R. C., Greer, L. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2012). The paradox of intragroup conflict: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97, 360–390. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024844>
- Dreu, C. K. W. D., & Weingart, L. R. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 741–749. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.741>
- Durkheim, É. (1947). *The division of labour in society*. The Free Press.
- Federico, V. (2020). Talking about solidarity . . . it sounds like a whisper: Solidarity in law and public policies. in citizens solidarity in europe (pp. 101119). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://www.elgaronline.com/view/edcoll/9781789909494/9781789909494.00010.xml>
- Fetchenhauer, D., Flache, A., Buunk, A. P., & Lindenberg, S. (2006). *Solidarity and prosocial behavior: An integration of sociological and psychological perspectives*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Fiske, A. P. (1992). The four elementary forms of sociality: Framework for a unified theory of social relations. *Psychological Review*, 99, 689–723. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.99.4.689>
- Flache, A. (2002). The rational weakness of strong ties: Failure of group solidarity in a highly cohesive group of rational agents. *The Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 26, 189–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222500212988>
- Jehn, K. A., Northcraft, G. B., & Neale, M. A. (1999). Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict and performance in workgroups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 741–763. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2667054>
- kanalmuda.id. (2020). Tentang kanal muda - kanal muda - mengalirkan kehidupan. <https://www.kanalmuda.id/p/tentang-kanal-muda.html>

- Kerwin, S., Doherty, A., & Harman, A. (2011). Its not conflict, its differences of opinion. *Small Group Research*, 42, 562–594. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496411398395>
- Koentjoroningrat, K. (1977). Sistem gotong royong dan jiwa gotong royong. *Antropologi Indonesia*, 4–16.
- Kolers, A. H. (2012). Dynamics of solidarity*. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 20, 365–383. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9760.2010.00391.x>
- Komter, A. E. (2004). *Social solidarity and the gift*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511614064>
- Laitinen, A., & Pessi, A. B. (2014). *Solidarity: Theory and practice*. Lexington Books.
- Lin, T.-C., Wu, S., & Lu, C.-T. (2012). Exploring the affect factors of knowledge sharing behavior: The relations model theory perspective. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 39, 751–764. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2011.07.068>
- Lindenberg, S. (2014). Solidarity: Unpacking the social brain. In A. Laitinen & A. B. Pessi (Eds.). Lexington Books.
- Luigi, N. D., Martelli, A., & Pitti, I. (2018). New forms of solidarity and young people: An ethnography of youth participation in Italy. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58250-4_14
- Minza, W. M., Faturochman, F., Muhiddin, S., & Anggoro, W. J. (2022). Adaptasi individual dan kolektif: Respons masyarakat Indonesia menghadapi pandemi covid-19. *Jurnal Psikologi Sosial*, 20, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.7454/jps.2022.03>
- Nadler, A. (2012). From help-giving to helping relations. In K. Deaux & M. Snyder (Eds.). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195398991.013.0016>
- Pope, W., & Johnson, B. D. (1983). Inside organic solidarity. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 681. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2094927>
- Prainsack, B. (2020). Solidarity in times of pandemics. *Democratic Theory*, 7, 124–133. <https://doi.org/10.3167/dt.2020.070215>
- Singer, P. (2017). *Famine, affluence, and morality*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315097176-20>
- Stern, P. C. (1986). Toward a social psychology of solidarity. *American Psychologist*, 41, 229–231. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.41.2.229>
- Stukas, A., & Clary, E. (2012). Altruism and helping behavior. Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-375000-6.00019-7>
- Sujito, A. (2020). Kerentanan, solidaritas sosial dan masyarakat tangguh. In P. S. Winanti & W. Mas'udi (Eds.). UGM Press.
- Verweij, M. (2015). How (not) to argue for the rule of rescue: Claims of individuals versus group solidarity. In G. Cohen, N. Daniels, & N. Eyal (Eds.). Oxford University Press.
- West-Oram, P. (2021). Solidarity is for other people: Identifying derelictions of solidarity in responses to covid-19. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 47, 65–68. <https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2020-106522>
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed., Vol. 5). SAGE Publications.