JIPSI: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan dan Sains Islam Interdisipiner
Vol. 5, No. 4, November 2026, pp. 4176-4197
http://journal.amorfati.id/index.php/jipsi || ISSN 2962-9187

Interdisciplinary Scope of Science and Education, Islamic Education and Science, Integration of Science and Islam, Islamic Thought and Philosophy, Integration of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Islamic Studies, Islamic Economics and Business Studies, and Islamic Ethics in Science and Technology

The Relevance of Ibn Khaldun's Concept of 'Asabiyyah to Political Polarization in Contemporary Indonesia

Wella Ayu Apriliani [a,1,*], Otoman [b,2], Wijaya [c,3]

[*a] UIN Raden Fatah, Indonesia;
[b] UIN Raden Fatah, Indonesia;
[c] UIN Raden Fatah, Indonesia.
[1] Wellaayuapriliani_25162470001@radenfatah.ac.id; [2]Otoman_uin@radenfatah.ac.id; [3]Wijaya_uin@radenfatah.ac.id
*Correspondent Author; Wellaayuapriliani_25162470001@radenfatah.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Article history
Received:
19-07-2026
Revised:
28-09-2026
Accepted:
30-10-2026

Keywords:
Asabiyah, Ibn Khladun, Indonesian Politics

ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine the relevance of Ibn Khaldun's concept of *'asabiyyah* in understanding political polarization in contemporary Indonesia. Employing a qualitative approach with a descriptive-analytical method, this study draws on Ibn Khaldun's writings as primary theoretical sources and relevant scholarly books, journal articles, and documented analyses of Indonesian political dynamics as secondary sources. The analysis focuses on the transformation of group solidarity within democratic political contestation, identity politics, and digital public discourse. The findings indicate that political polarization in Indonesia reflects the transformation of *'asabiyyah* from traditional social solidarity into modern forms of collective identification based on religion, ideology, and political affiliation. Political elite mobilization, identity-based narratives, and social media interactions contribute to reinforcing exclusive group boundaries and intensifying social divisions. The study further demonstrates the ambivalent character of *'asabiyyah*, which strengthens internal group cohesion while potentially undermining broader societal integration. The novelty of this study lies in its reinterpretation of *'asabiyyah* as a conceptual framework for explaining the interaction between identity-based solidarity, political mobilization, and digital polarization within Indonesia's contemporary democratic system. Rather than viewing *'asabiyyah* solely as a traditional mechanism of political power formation, this study highlights its transformation into a modern socio-political force that simultaneously fosters collective solidarity and social fragmentation. The study concludes that Ibn Khaldun's concept remains analytically relevant to contemporary political polarization and emphasizes the importance of inclusive political engagement, social dialogue, and digital literacy in strengthening democratic cohesion.

This is an open-access article under the CC–BY-SA license.

Introduction

Political polarization in contemporary Indonesian society has become an increasingly complex socio-political phenomenon, particularly in the context of electoral democracy and the rapid expansion of digital communication technologies. Political polarization is no longer confined to political elites and formal institutions but has increasingly permeated broader society through the construction of collective identities, the reinforcement of group loyalties, and growing tensions between groups with divergent political orientations. Social media platforms have significantly influenced these dynamics by facilitating political communication, shaping public opinion, and reinforcing boundaries between political communities. Under such circumstances, differences in political preferences may develop into broader social divisions when political identities become the primary basis for distinguishing in-groups from out-groups (Rustandi 2025).

From the perspective of political sociology, political polarization cannot be understood merely as a divergence in ideological preferences or electoral choices. Rather, it is closely associated with the mechanisms through which collective solidarity, group loyalty, and political identification are constructed and maintained. Group solidarity plays a crucial role in establishing shared identities, organizing political interests, and sustaining collective action within competitive socio-political environments. Nevertheless, when solidarity becomes increasingly exclusive, it may intensify intergroup antagonism and undermine broader social integration (Trijono, Sujito, and Djalong 2025). These circumstances highlight the need for a theoretical approach that extends beyond identifying political differences to examining how social solidarity develops into a collective political force capable of simultaneously strengthening internal cohesion and generating external fragmentation.

Existing scholarship on political polarization in Indonesia has examined this phenomenon through several analytical perspectives, particularly identity politics, digital political communication, echo chambers, and the formation of online political communities (Muhyiddin and Rahmat 2026). Studies of identity politics have primarily emphasized the mobilization of religious, ethnic, and ideological affiliations as instruments of political competition. Research on digital political communication has highlighted the role of social media in accelerating information dissemination, reinforcing interactions among politically like-minded individuals, and facilitating increasingly segmented communication environments. Meanwhile, the concept of echo chambers explains how individuals may become embedded in relatively homogeneous information networks that reinforce pre-existing political beliefs (Hartmann et al. 2025). Studies of digital political communities further demonstrate how collective identities and social affiliations are constructed and reproduced through technologically mediated interactions (Lüders, Dinkelberg, and Quayle 2022). Collectively, these approaches have contributed significantly to understanding the structural, communicative, and identity-based dimensions of contemporary political polarization.

Despite these contributions, an important analytical question remains concerning how internal group solidarity develops into collective political power while simultaneously contributing to broader social fragmentation. Although studies of identity politics illuminate the symbolic and ideological foundations of political mobilization, research on echo chambers and digital communication tends to emphasize information environments, interaction patterns, and mechanisms of political reinforcement. These perspectives do not

necessarily provide an integrated explanation of the relationship between collective solidarity, political power formation, and the transformation of social cohesion under conditions of intensified political competition. Accordingly, there remains an opportunity to examine political polarization through a framework that conceptualizes solidarity not merely as a consequence of shared identity but also as a collective force that enables political mobilization and shapes power relations. Ibn Khaldun's concept of *'asabiyyah* offers a potentially valuable complementary perspective for addressing this analytical concern.

The concept of *'asabiyyah*, as developed by Ibn Khaldun, provides a distinctive sociological perspective by positioning group solidarity as a fundamental force in the formation, consolidation, and maintenance of political authority (Kadir 2025). In his seminal work, the *Muqaddimah*, Ibn Khaldun argues that the political strength of a group depends not exclusively on material resources or military capabilities but also on its capacity to cultivate solidarity, maintain collective loyalty, and coordinate collective action. Within the historical societies examined by Ibn Khaldun, *'asabiyyah* was closely associated with kinship-based solidarity, although its development could extend beyond genealogical relationships through alliances, shared interests, and collective commitments. Such solidarity constituted an important foundation for the emergence of political authority (*al-mulk*) and the development of socio-political organization (Khaldun 1986).

Conceptually, classical *'asabiyyah* must be distinguished from several modern concepts commonly employed in the analysis of political polarization, including political identity, partisanship, and affective polarization (Secen 2026). Political identity refers to the ways individuals and groups define themselves through particular political affiliations, values, or ideological orientations. Partisanship concerns individuals' identification with and loyalty toward political parties or political organizations (Harvey, Maxwell, and Rogue 2025). Affective polarization, by contrast, refers to the increasing emotional distance between political groups, characterized by favorable attitudes toward one's own political group and negative evaluations of opposing groups. Unlike these concepts, *'asabiyyah* emphasizes the collective solidarity through which groups develop the capacity to coordinate action, defend shared interests, and establish or contest political authority. Therefore, *'asabiyyah* should not be treated as conceptually equivalent to political identity, partisanship, or affective polarization, although it may intersect with these phenomena in explaining contemporary political dynamics.

These conceptual distinctions demonstrate the potential contribution of *'asabiyyah* to contemporary theories of political polarization. Political identity explains the foundations of group identification, while partisanship elucidates the direction and intensity of political allegiance. Affective polarization captures the emotional dimensions of intergroup relations, particularly the development of antagonistic attitudes toward political opponents. In comparison, *'asabiyyah* directs analytical attention toward the transformation of group solidarity into organized collective action and political power (Mustafa et al. 2026). From this perspective, political polarization may be understood not only as a division of political preferences, identities, or emotions but also as a socio-political process involving the consolidation of internal solidarity, the construction of group boundaries, and competition over political influence. Nevertheless, applying this classical concept to contemporary democratic societies requires careful contextual interpretation, given the substantial differences between Ibn Khaldun's historical setting and the institutional structures of modern electoral democracies.

Previous studies have examined Ibn Khaldun's concept of *'asabiyyah* from various theoretical and empirical perspectives. Saumantri and Abdillah (2020), in their study entitled "Teori Ashabiyah Ibnu Khaldun Sebagai Model Perkembangan Peradaban Manusia," investigate *'asabiyyah* as a fundamental mechanism underlying the development of human civilization. Their analysis emphasizes that social solidarity enables individuals to establish collective relationships, develop social organizations, and sustain broader civilizational processes. Accordingly, *'asabiyyah* is understood as a constructive social force that facilitates cooperation and collective advancement. Although this study provides an important foundation for understanding the relationship between solidarity and civilizational development, it does not specifically address how group solidarity may contribute to political fragmentation within contemporary democratic societies.

Another relevant study was conducted by Hasba and Farhan (2022), entitled "Ashabiyah Ibnu Khaldun dan Relevansinya terhadap Pemilihan Presiden dan Wakil Presiden di Indonesia." This research examines the relevance of *'asabiyyah* to Indonesia's presidential electoral system, particularly the relationship between collective solidarity and political power formation. The study identifies conceptual similarities between Ibn Khaldun's understanding of group solidarity and the mobilization of political support through parties and electoral coalitions. However, it also acknowledges fundamental differences between the historical mechanisms of political domination discussed by Ibn Khaldun and the institutional procedures of modern electoral democracy. Although this study establishes the relevance of *'asabiyyah* to contemporary political competition, its primary emphasis remains on formal electoral processes rather than the broader mechanisms through which political solidarity may generate social polarization beyond electoral institutions.

Mulia, in "Teori 'Asabiyyah Ibn Khaldun dalam Perspektif Hukum Islam," examines the concept of *'asabiyyah* from the normative perspective of Islamic law. The study demonstrates that group solidarity constitutes an enduring social reality that may contribute positively to collective cohesion but can also produce negative consequences when manifested through excessive fanaticism, nepotism, or intergroup hostility. From this perspective, solidarity remains socially constructive insofar as it does not undermine justice, collective welfare, or broader social harmony. While this research provides valuable insights into the normative and potentially ambivalent dimensions of *'asabiyyah*, it does not specifically investigate the socio-political mechanisms through which collective solidarity contributes to political polarization in contemporary democratic and digitally mediated environments (Mulia 2019).

Harriyani, in "Kesadaran Gen Z terhadap Dinamika Sosial-Politik di Indonesia: Perspektif Teori Ashabiyyah Ibnu Khaldun," extends the discussion of *'asabiyyah* to the socio-political experiences of Generation Z. The study suggests that collective solidarity in digital society is no longer exclusively grounded in primordial affiliations or kinship relations but may also emerge through flexible, temporary, and technologically mediated social interactions. Such developments indicate that the formation of collective solidarity can adapt to changing patterns of communication and social organization. Although this research demonstrates the potential relevance of *'asabiyyah* to digitally connected generations, its primary focus on Generation Z's socio-political awareness leaves further room to investigate the relationship between digital solidarity, identity-based political

mobilization, and broader patterns of political polarization in Indonesian society (Harriyani 2024).

Taken together, these studies demonstrate that scholarship on *'asabiyyah* has addressed several important dimensions, including civilizational development, electoral politics, Islamic legal perspectives, and digitally mediated social solidarity. Meanwhile, contemporary research on political polarization has generated substantial insights into identity-based political competition, digital communication, and the fragmentation of public discourse. However, the conceptual relationship between solidarity as a source of collective political capacity and polarization as a manifestation of social division requires further elaboration. In particular, there is a need to examine how solidarity, which initially strengthens internal group cohesion, may become increasingly exclusive when shaped by identity-based competition, political elite mobilization, and segmented digital interactions. This analytical concern constitutes the central research gap addressed in the present study.

Building upon this gap, the novelty of the present study lies in its contextual reinterpretation of Ibn Khaldun's concept of *'asabiyyah* as an analytical framework for examining the relationship between group solidarity, identity-based political mobilization, and political polarization within Indonesia's contemporary digital democracy. Rather than limiting *'asabiyyah* to its classical function in the formation and consolidation of political authority, this study explores its analytical relevance to the transformation of collective solidarity under modern democratic conditions. Specifically, it emphasizes the potentially ambivalent consequences of group solidarity, whereby stronger internal cohesion may coexist with increasing external antagonism and broader social fragmentation. Through this interpretation, the study seeks to establish a conceptual dialogue between classical Islamic political sociology and contemporary approaches to political polarization.

The theoretical foundation of this study is derived primarily from Ibn Khaldun's concept of *'asabiyyah* as articulated in the *Muqaddimah*. Within this framework, group solidarity is closely associated with the formation, consolidation, and eventual transformation of political power. Groups characterized by strong collective solidarity are generally better positioned to organize collective action, mobilize support, and defend shared political interests. However, solidarity is neither permanent nor historically static. It may weaken as a consequence of changing interests, internal conflicts, and transformations in social organization, thereby affecting the stability and continuity of political authority (Marjuan, Nur, and Sugiyono 2025). This theoretical perspective suggests that *'asabiyyah* should be understood as a dynamic socio-political force whose manifestations vary according to historical and institutional circumstances.

Within contemporary Indonesia, this framework is employed interpretatively to examine the transformation of solidarity from traditional forms of social affiliation into political solidarities constructed through religious identification, ideological commitments, partisan affiliations, and digital communication. Such a transformation does not imply that classical *'asabiyyah* is identical to modern political polarization. Instead, the concept serves as an analytical lens for investigating how collective loyalties are established, how solidarity becomes mobilized within political competition, and how stronger internal group identification may coexist with increasing social distance between opposing political communities. In this sense, *'asabiyyah* provides a complementary theoretical perspective that connects the internal dynamics of collective solidarity with the broader consequences of political contestation.

Methodologically, this study positions Ibn Khaldun's concept of *'asabiyyah* as its formal object of analysis, while political polarization in contemporary Indonesia constitutes its material object. The analysis focuses on the conceptual relationship between group solidarity, political identity formation, collective mobilization, and social fragmentation within the institutional and communicative environment of modern democracy. Accordingly, the study does not seek to establish a direct historical equivalence between Ibn Khaldun's socio-political context and contemporary Indonesian society. Rather, it critically examines the interpretative relevance and conceptual limitations of *'asabiyyah* as a theoretical framework for understanding present-day political polarization.

Based on these considerations, the central research question is formulated as follows: How does Ibn Khaldun's concept of *'asabiyyah* contribute to understanding political polarization in contemporary Indonesia, particularly in relation to group solidarity, identity-based political mobilization, and social fragmentation? This study aims to examine the relevance and limitations of *'asabiyyah* as an analytical framework for interpreting political polarization within a modern democratic society. Theoretically, it seeks to contribute to political sociology by establishing a dialogue between classical Islamic social thought and contemporary theories of political identity and polarization. Practically, the study is expected to provide insights into the importance of managing collective solidarity inclusively, strengthening intergroup dialogue, and promoting social cohesion within Indonesia's democratic political landscape.

Method

The research methodology encompasses five key components: research approach and method, types and sources of data, data collection techniques, data analysis procedures, and the temporal and geographical scope of the study.

This study employs a qualitative approach using a descriptive-analytical method (Wijaya 2024). This approach was selected to facilitate an in-depth and comprehensive examination and interpretation of Ibn Khaldun's concept of *'asabiyyah* and its relevance to the phenomenon of political polarization in contemporary Indonesia. Through this methodological framework, the study seeks to explore the conceptual foundations of *'asabiyyah* and critically analyze its applicability to contemporary socio-political dynamics.

The data employed in this study are qualitative in nature, consisting primarily of textual materials, narratives, and socio-political discourses rather than numerical measurements. The primary sources include Ibn Khaldun's works, particularly the *Muqaddimah*, alongside empirical materials concerning political polarization in Indonesia, as reflected in social media discourse, news coverage, and contemporary political developments. Secondary sources comprise scholarly books, peer-reviewed journal articles, academic publications, and previous research relevant to Ibn Khaldun's concept of *'asabiyyah* and political polarization.

Data were collected through library research and documentary analysis. Library research was conducted to examine the theoretical foundations and interpretations of *'asabiyyah* within classical and contemporary scholarly literature. Documentary analysis was employed to gather and examine relevant information concerning political polarization in Indonesia from various written and digital sources. These techniques enabled the integration of theoretical perspectives and documented socio-political phenomena within a coherent analytical framework.

Data analysis was conducted through several systematic stages, including data inventory, classification, interpretation, and descriptive analysis. Initially, relevant materials were identified and organized according to their thematic and conceptual significance. The collected data were subsequently classified based on their relevance to group solidarity, political identity, political mobilization, and social fragmentation. The interpretation stage involved examining the relationship between Ibn Khaldun's concept of *'asabiyyah* and the dynamics of contemporary political polarization. Finally, descriptive-analytical procedures were applied to synthesize the findings and develop a comprehensive understanding of the conceptual relevance and explanatory potential of *'asabiyyah* within Indonesia's contemporary socio-political context.

This study is not restricted to a specific research period or geographical fieldwork location, as it is primarily based on library research and documentary analysis. Nevertheless, its empirical context is situated within contemporary Indonesia, with particular attention to documented political developments, public discourse, and digital interactions relevant to political polarization. Accordingly, the study emphasizes the contextual interpretation of socio-political phenomena rather than direct field observation within a predetermined temporal or geographical setting.

Results and Discussion

1. Ibn Khaldun's Concept of 'Asabiyyah: Characteristics, Functions, and Political Power

The concept of 'asabiyyah constitutes one of the central foundations of Ibn Khaldun's sociological and political thought, particularly in explaining the formation of social solidarity, collective organization, and political authority. In his seminal work, the Muqaddimah, Ibn Khaldun conceptualizes 'asabiyyah as a form of collective solidarity that enables individuals to establish mutual relationships, defend shared interests, and organize collective action. Within this theoretical framework, solidarity is not merely an emotional attachment among members of a particular group but also a social force that facilitates cooperation, collective protection, and the consolidation of political power. Consequently, 'asabiyyah occupies a significant position in Ibn Khaldun's explanation of the relationship between social organization and the historical development of political authority (Khaldun 1986).

Historically, 'asabiyyah emerged within social structures characterized by kinship relationships, tribal affiliations, and collective obligations. Ibn Khaldun explains that individuals connected through common descent or close social relationships tend to develop strong feelings of mutual responsibility, which encourage them to defend one another against external threats. Nevertheless, the formation of 'asabiyyah is not exclusively restricted to biological kinship. Solidarity may also develop through alliances, shared commitments, and sustained social relationships that establish collective obligations beyond genealogical boundaries. This characteristic demonstrates that 'asabiyyah encompasses both the social foundations of group cohesion and the collective capacity to pursue common interests.

The principal characteristics of 'asabiyyah can be identified through its emphasis on collective cohesion, mutual assistance, shared loyalty, and coordinated action. Collective cohesion refers to the strength of social relationships that unite individuals within a group, while mutual assistance reflects the willingness of group members to protect and support

one another. Shared loyalty contributes to the maintenance of collective commitments, whereas coordinated action enables groups to transform solidarity into practical social and political activities. These characteristics distinguish ‘asabiyyah from a purely psychological sense of belonging because the concept emphasizes the practical consequences of solidarity in shaping collective organization and political relationships (Efendi 2024).

One of the most important dimensions of ‘asabiyyah is its relationship with political power, particularly the formation and maintenance of al-mulk, or royal authority. Ibn Khaldun argues that political domination requires collective strength, which is generated and sustained through strong group solidarity. Groups possessing effective ‘asabiyyah are better positioned to coordinate political action, overcome competing groups, and establish structures of authority. In this respect, ‘asabiyyah functions as a foundation of political mobilization because it transforms social relationships into organized collective power. The relationship between solidarity and political authority is therefore central to understanding the political significance of Ibn Khaldun’s theory (Khaldun 1986).

This relationship is particularly evident in Ibn Khaldun’s discussion of the connection between group feeling and royal authority in the Muqaddimah. His argument establishes that the acquisition of political authority depends not exclusively on individual leadership or material resources but also on the capacity of a group to sustain collective support and organized action. Consequently, political power is closely associated with the strength and effectiveness of the solidarity supporting it. This theoretical proposition provides an important foundation for examining how collective political identities may develop into organized political forces in contemporary societies.

Furthermore, Ibn Khaldun understands ‘asabiyyah as a dynamic rather than permanent social force. Strong solidarity may contribute to the emergence and consolidation of political authority, but its effectiveness can gradually diminish as political circumstances change. The consolidation of power, increasing dependence on established institutions, internal competition, and changing social relationships may weaken the collective commitments that initially supported political authority. This perspective demonstrates that the relationship between solidarity and political power is historically contingent and subject to transformation.

The functions of ‘asabiyyah also reveal its potentially ambivalent consequences. On the one hand, collective solidarity contributes to cooperation, political organization, and the maintenance of social cohesion. On the other hand, strong attachment to collective interests may contribute to antagonistic relationships when competing groups seek to establish or defend political dominance. However, it would be conceptually inaccurate to interpret ‘asabiyyah as inherently destructive or exclusively associated with hostility toward outsiders. Its primary theoretical significance lies in its capacity to explain collective strength and political organization, while conflict represents one possible consequence of competition between organized groups. As discussed by Syamsul Arif, the relationship between solidarity and political authority requires attention to the moral and social implications of collective loyalty (syamsul Arif 2025).

Accordingly, classical ‘asabiyyah must be understood within its original historical and theoretical context. Ibn Khaldun developed the concept primarily to explain the dynamics of social organization, dynastic power, and historical transformation in premodern societies. Its relevance to contemporary political polarization cannot therefore be established through superficial similarities between tribal solidarity and modern

partisan identification. Rather, a meaningful theoretical connection requires identifying comparable mechanisms of collective cohesion, political mobilization, and competition over political authority while acknowledging the substantial differences between historical contexts.

Based on this conceptual foundation, the present study employs ‘asabiyyah as an interpretative framework for examining contemporary Indonesian political polarization. The analysis focuses on three interrelated dimensions: the formation of collective solidarity, the mobilization of group interests into political action, and the relationship between collective political organization and intergroup competition. These dimensions provide a more precise theoretical basis for evaluating whether particular manifestations of contemporary political polarization can be interpreted through Ibn Khaldun’s concept without automatically equating modern political identity with classical ‘asabiyyah.

2. Political Polarization in Contemporary Indonesia: Empirical Manifestations and Group Solidarity

Political polarization in contemporary Indonesia reflects a complex interaction between electoral competition, political identity formation, ideological differentiation, and digitally mediated communication. These dynamics have become increasingly visible in political discourse, particularly during presidential elections and other major political contests. Political divisions are not confined to political elites but may extend into broader society through the formation of competing political communities, the circulation of antagonistic narratives, and the reinforcement of collective affiliations. As Khamdan (2022) observes, political polarization in Indonesia involves social divisions that extend beyond formal political institutions and influence interactions within the public sphere (Khamdan 2022). Nevertheless, political disagreement must be distinguished from polarization, as differences in political preferences constitute a normal characteristic of democratic competition.

Political polarization in Indonesia can be examined through several interconnected dimensions, including religious identification, ideological orientation, and partisan affiliation. Religious polarization may emerge when political preferences become associated with particular religious identities or when political competition is framed in terms of competing moral and religious commitments. Ideological polarization involves increasingly divergent political orientations, whereas partisan polarization concerns the strengthening of attachments to competing political parties, candidates, or political coalitions. These dimensions demonstrate that political polarization cannot be reduced to a single source of conflict but instead reflects the interaction of multiple social and political factors (Mazliana et al. 2026).

A concrete example can be identified in Indonesia's 2014 and 2019 presidential elections, particularly through the emergence and circulation of the political labels Cebong and Kampret. These expressions became widely associated with supporters of competing presidential candidates and functioned as symbolic markers of political differentiation. Tazri examines these labels as forms of political communication that contributed to the construction of antagonistic political identities (Tazri 2019). Similarly, Purboyo, Junaidi, and Amriwan identify the development of these partisan labels as part of the broader transformation of political identification in Indonesia's digital public sphere (Purboyo, Junaidi, and Amriwan 2024). Such findings demonstrate how political preferences can

become embedded in symbolic group distinctions, thereby reinforcing perceptions of political belonging and opposition.

The significance of these expressions lies not merely in their linguistic characteristics but also in their relationship with collective political identification. Political labels can provide symbolic boundaries through which individuals recognize members of their own political community and distinguish themselves from opposing groups. When reinforced through repeated political interactions, these boundaries may contribute to the consolidation of partisan loyalties and the development of negative perceptions of political opponents. Nevertheless, the presence of partisan labeling should not automatically be interpreted as evidence of ‘asabiyyah. Such labeling primarily demonstrates political identification and symbolic differentiation, whereas ‘asabiyyah requires consideration of the collective solidarity and organized political capacity associated with these identities.

The relationship between electoral competition and political polarization is further illustrated by research on media coverage during the 2019 presidential election. A study published in Cogent Social Sciences examines polarization in Indonesian television reporting of the presidential campaign and identifies divisions associated with competing political camps. This evidence suggests that polarization may also be reproduced through conventional mass media rather than exclusively through social networking platforms. Accordingly, contemporary political polarization should be understood within a broader communication environment involving political institutions, media organizations, and digital networks (Utami et al. 2025).

The 2024 presidential election provides another important context for examining political identification and digitally mediated political competition. The electoral contest involved three presidential and vice-presidential candidate pairs, namely Anies Baswedan–Muhaimin Iskandar, Prabowo Subianto–Gibran Rakabuming Raka, and Ganjar Pranowo–Mahfud MD. Political support was expressed through electoral organizations, campaign networks, public discussions, and digital political communication. These developments demonstrate the significance of collective identification and political mobilization within contemporary electoral competition. However, the existence of competing political camps does not necessarily indicate that all forms of political identification developed into antagonistic polarization. Such conclusions require specific evidence concerning intergroup attitudes, communication patterns, and collective political behavior.

Social media constitutes an important environment in which political identities are communicated, reinforced, and contested. Platforms such as TikTok, Instagram, and X facilitate the circulation of political messages, campaign narratives, and expressions of partisan support. At the same time, digitally mediated interactions may contribute to selective information exposure and the reinforcement of existing political preferences. Suhendra and Pratiwi discuss the relationship between social media, echo-chamber dynamics, and political communication actors in the context of Indonesian political polarization (Suhendra and Pratiwi 2024). Their discussion provides a foundation for examining how digital communication environments may reinforce group boundaries and contribute to the persistence of political antagonism.

More specific empirical support can be found in the study conducted by Wahyuti et al., which examines algorithms, echo chambers, polarization, and content virality on TikTok during Indonesia's 2024 presidential election (Wahyuti et al. 2025). The study discusses how algorithmically mediated content recommendations can reinforce exposure

to politically compatible information and limit the diversity of perspectives encountered by users. These findings support the argument that platform-specific communication mechanisms may contribute to conditions associated with political polarization. Nevertheless, they should not be interpreted as demonstrating that social media necessarily produces polarization in all circumstances or that algorithmic exposure independently determines political attitudes.

Additional evidence is provided by Wahid et al., who investigate political polarization and political mental health on TikTok during the 2024 Jakarta gubernatorial election (Wahid et al. 2026). Their study employs qualitative methods, including discourse analysis, interviews, and participant observation, to examine political communication surrounding competing candidate pairs. The findings identify relationships among echo-chamber dynamics, political communication, and antagonistic interactions within digital environments. This research is particularly relevant because it provides a specific Indonesian electoral context in which digital communication and political polarization are examined empirically rather than assumed theoretically.

Political elites and organized communication actors also contribute to the construction and circulation of political narratives. Political leaders, campaign organizations, and their supporters may employ religious symbolism, ideological commitments, historical narratives, and representations of collective interests to consolidate political support. In some circumstances, organized digital communication may amplify partisan narratives and reinforce perceptions of competition between political groups. However, the influence of political elites should not be treated as uniformly polarizing. Political leadership may also facilitate coalition-building, negotiation, and the reduction of political tensions, depending on the political context and the strategies employed.

From the perspective of Ibn Khaldun's concept of ‘asabiyyah, these empirical developments are relevant insofar as they reveal potential connections between collective identification, political mobilization, and the pursuit of political power. As Efendi explains, ‘asabiyyah involves the formation of social solidarity and loyalty within collective relationships (Efendi 2024). Nevertheless, political identity and group solidarity are not automatically equivalent to ‘asabiyyah. The latter becomes analytically relevant when solidarity generates the capacity for coordinated collective action and contributes to the organization or maintenance of political influence.

An important qualification concerns the dynamic character of political polarization. Research published in Media Asia on Indonesian social media users who participated in polarization during the 2014 and 2019 presidential elections demonstrates that individuals may disengage from overtly polarized political interactions while retaining forms of latent political polarization. This finding suggests that political antagonism may change in expression and intensity rather than remain permanently fixed. Consequently, contemporary political solidarity should be examined as a dynamic phenomenon shaped by electoral developments, changing political interests, and evolving communication practices (Syahputra et al. 2024).

Taken together, the available evidence indicates that political polarization in Indonesia involves interconnected processes of political identification, symbolic differentiation, communication reinforcement, and collective mobilization. These processes provide an empirical basis for exploring the analytical relevance of ‘asabiyyah, particularly

in relation to the consolidation of group solidarity and the pursuit of political influence. However, the relationship between classical ‘asabiyyah and contemporary polarization must be established through conceptual interpretation rather than assumed on the basis of partisan identity, social media participation, or political disagreement alone.

3. The Transformation of ‘Asabiyyah: From Collective Solidarity to Political Polarization

The transformation of ‘asabiyyah from its classical formulation into a contemporary analytical framework requires a careful examination of the relationship between collective solidarity, political identity, and the organization of political power. In Ibn Khaldun’s original conception, ‘asabiyyah functions as a collective force through which social groups establish mutual protection, maintain internal cohesion, and pursue political authority. Its central significance lies in the ability of solidarity to generate coordinated collective action rather than merely producing emotional identification among group members (Khaldun 1986). Within contemporary democratic societies, comparable processes of collective organization may emerge through political parties, ideological movements, religious affiliations, and digitally mediated political communities. Nevertheless, these contemporary forms of association differ considerably from the historical conditions in which Ibn Khaldun developed his theory.

The conceptual transformation examined in this study does not imply that classical ‘asabiyyah has directly evolved into modern political polarization. Rather, it refers to the contextual reinterpretation of certain functions of ‘asabiyyah, particularly the relationship between solidarity, collective mobilization, and political power, within contemporary political arrangements. Such an interpretation requires distinguishing between the theoretical properties of ‘asabiyyah and the empirical characteristics of modern political identities. Political identity primarily concerns identification with political values, organizations, or communities, whereas ‘asabiyyah emphasizes the collective capacity generated by solidarity and its implications for political organization. Consequently, the existence of a shared political identity does not necessarily demonstrate the presence of solidarity possessing the political functions associated with ‘asabiyyah.

Similarly, partisanship and affective polarization should be distinguished from ‘asabiyyah. Partisanship refers to political identification or allegiance toward particular parties or political organizations, while affective polarization concerns emotional differentiation between political groups, especially positive evaluations of political allies and negative attitudes toward political opponents. Although these phenomena may coexist with strong collective solidarity, they do not necessarily generate the mutual obligations, coordinated action, or collective political capacities emphasized in Ibn Khaldun’s theory. This distinction is particularly important because interpreting all forms of partisan identification or political hostility as ‘asabiyyah would diminish the analytical specificity of the classical concept.

To establish a more precise theoretical relationship, the present study identifies three interconnected mechanisms through which ‘asabiyyah may contribute to understanding contemporary political polarization. The first concerns the formation and reinforcement of collective solidarity. The second involves the mobilization of solidarity into organized political action. The third concerns the relationship between competing collective interests and the emergence of political fragmentation. These mechanisms

provide an analytical sequence through which solidarity may become politically consequential without assuming that every instance of group identification necessarily produces polarization.

The first mechanism, collective solidarity formation, involves the development of shared commitments, mutual identification, and perceived common interests among members of a political community. In contemporary Indonesia, such solidarity may emerge through religious identification, ideological orientation, partisan affiliation, or support for particular political leaders. As discussed by Efendi, the concept of 'asabiyyah emphasizes the importance of social bonds in sustaining collective relationships (Efendi 2024). However, the contemporary application of this concept requires examining whether shared identification develops into sustained mutual support and collective commitments. Without such evidence, political identity should remain analytically distinct from 'asabiyyah.

The second mechanism concerns political mobilization, through which collective solidarity becomes organized around shared political objectives. In Ibn Khaldun's framework, solidarity provides the collective strength necessary to pursue and maintain political authority. In contemporary democratic politics, mobilization may occur through electoral campaigns, party organizations, political coalitions, collective advocacy, and coordinated communication activities. These mechanisms differ institutionally from the formation of dynastic authority discussed in the Muqaddimah, yet they may display a comparable relationship between collective commitment and political organization. The analytical relevance of 'asabiyyah therefore lies in explaining how solidarity contributes to collective political capacity rather than treating political mobilization itself as proof of classical group feeling.

The third mechanism concerns the potential transformation of collective solidarity into intergroup competition and political fragmentation. Political groups may strengthen internal cohesion by emphasizing shared interests, collective grievances, or perceived threats from opposing groups. Under certain circumstances, these processes can reinforce political boundaries and contribute to antagonistic relationships. Nevertheless, the development of political fragmentation depends on additional conditions, including elite strategies, institutional competition, communication environments, and the interpretation of political differences. Consequently, political polarization should be understood as a possible outcome of particular configurations of collective solidarity rather than as an inevitable consequence of 'asabiyyah.

The Indonesian presidential elections of 2014 and 2019 provide an illustrative context for examining these mechanisms. The circulation of the political labels Cebong and Kampret demonstrates how electoral competition became associated with symbolic group boundaries and partisan identification. Purboyo, Junaidi, and Amriwan identify these expressions as part of the formation of partisan communities within digital political communication (Purboyo, Junaidi, and Amriwan 2024). From the perspective of 'asabiyyah, their significance extends beyond the labels themselves to the question of whether such identities contributed to sustained collective commitments, coordinated political support, and the mobilization of political interests. Thus, these phenomena offer a potential basis for conceptual comparison rather than direct empirical confirmation of transformed 'asabiyyah.

Identity-based political mobilization provides another relevant dimension. Religious, ideological, and political affiliations may become resources through which political actors consolidate support and construct narratives of collective belonging. Mazliana et al. discuss the multiple dimensions of political polarization, including religious, ideological, and partisan differentiation (Mazliana et al. 2026). These dimensions suggest that political identification can become intertwined with broader processes of collective organization. Nevertheless, the transformation of identity into political solidarity requires an additional mechanism through which shared identification produces mutual commitment and coordinated action. It is precisely this relationship that distinguishes an 'asabiyyah-informed interpretation from approaches focusing exclusively on identity categories.

The influence of political elites further illustrates the relationship between collective solidarity and political power. Political actors may employ identity-based narratives, symbolic representations, and shared political objectives to consolidate their supporters. Such strategies can strengthen political organization by connecting individual political preferences with broader collective interests. However, their consequences are not necessarily uniform. Elite mobilization may reinforce antagonistic political boundaries, but it may also facilitate political negotiation and coalition formation. Accordingly, claims that political elites accelerate polarization require evidence demonstrating how particular mobilization strategies contribute to increasingly negative intergroup attitudes or more rigid political divisions.

Digital communication introduces an additional context for the reproduction of collective solidarity. Social media platforms enable political communities to maintain interactions, circulate shared narratives, and coordinate political communication across geographical boundaries. Suhendra and Pratiwi discuss the significance of social media and political communication actors in reinforcing polarization-related processes (Suhendra and Pratiwi 2024). More specifically, Wahyuti et al. examine how algorithmic recommendation systems and echo-chamber dynamics influence political communication during Indonesia's 2024 presidential election (Wahyuti et al. 2025). These findings suggest that digital environments may facilitate repeated exposure to politically compatible narratives and reinforce existing political identifications. However, digital reinforcement should not be interpreted as equivalent to 'asabiyyah unless it is associated with collective solidarity and politically consequential mobilization.

The relationship between digital communication and 'asabiyyah is therefore conditional rather than automatic. Echo chambers concern patterns of information exposure and interaction, whereas 'asabiyyah concerns collective solidarity and political capacity. Political communities may experience highly homogeneous information environments without developing the mutual obligations or coordinated political action associated with classical 'asabiyyah. Conversely, political solidarity may exist independently of digital communication, particularly through established organizations, personal relationships, and institutional political networks. This distinction demonstrates the importance of integrating classical political sociology with contemporary communication theories rather than reducing one perspective to the other.

The transformation of 'asabiyyah must also be examined in relation to its potentially constructive and exclusionary consequences. In its constructive dimension, solidarity may encourage political participation, collective representation, and cooperation among

individuals pursuing shared interests. Such functions are consistent with the broader understanding of solidarity as a foundation of social and political organization. However, when collective loyalty becomes associated with hostility toward political opponents or the rejection of legitimate political differences, solidarity may contribute to social fragmentation. As discussed by Syamsul Arif, the political significance of 'asabiyyah must be considered alongside its broader moral and social implications (syamsul Arif 2025).

Importantly, the distinction between constructive and exclusionary solidarity should not be interpreted as a historical sequence explicitly established by Ibn Khaldun. Classical 'asabiyyah does not necessarily develop from an initially inclusive form into an exclusively antagonistic one. Instead, the distinction is employed in the present study as a contemporary analytical extension that helps explain the different consequences of collective solidarity within democratic societies. Such clarification is necessary to avoid attributing modern theoretical categories directly to Ibn Khaldun's original formulation.

The proposed transformation can therefore be understood through changes in the foundations, organizational forms, and political expressions of solidarity. Whereas classical 'asabiyyah was closely associated with kinship, alliances, and dynastic political authority, contemporary collective solidarity may develop through ideological identification, religious affiliations, political parties, and digitally mediated communities. The conceptual continuity lies in the relationship between collective cohesion and political mobilization, while the transformation concerns the social and institutional contexts in which solidarity operates.

Accordingly, contemporary Indonesian political polarization should not be described as a direct or inevitable manifestation of 'asabiyyah. Instead, Ibn Khaldun's concept provides a complementary theoretical framework for interpreting how collective identities may develop into organized political solidarities and how these solidarities may contribute to competition over political power. The significance of this interpretation lies in its ability to connect the internal organization of political groups with broader processes of political fragmentation without conflating classical group solidarity with modern political identity, partisanship, or affective polarization.

4. The Relevance and Limitations of 'Asabiyyah in Contemporary Indonesia

The relevance of Ibn Khaldun's concept of 'asabiyyah to contemporary Indonesian politics lies in its capacity to explain the relationship between collective solidarity, political mobilization, and the pursuit of political authority. Although the concept originated within the historical context of premodern social organization and dynastic politics, its central emphasis on the political consequences of group solidarity provides a potentially valuable perspective for examining contemporary democratic competition. However, its applicability requires a contextual interpretation that recognizes the institutional, technological, and cultural differences between Ibn Khaldun's historical setting and Indonesia's modern political system.

Within Indonesia's contemporary political environment, particularly during the 2024–2026 period, collective political organization has been shaped by electoral competition, changing political coalitions, identity-based mobilization, and digital communication. The 2024 presidential election provides a relevant example because political support was organized through competing candidate pairs, party coalitions, campaign networks, and various forms of public political engagement. These processes

demonstrate the significance of collective political organization within democratic competition. Nevertheless, electoral support should not automatically be equated with ‘asabiyyah, since political participation may reflect individual preferences, strategic considerations, institutional incentives, or temporary electoral affiliations rather than sustained collective solidarity.

From an ‘asabiyyah-informed perspective, the analytical question concerns how political actors transform shared interests and collective identification into coordinated political action. Ibn Khaldun’s theory emphasizes the relationship between solidarity and the capacity to establish or maintain political authority (Khaldun 1986). In contemporary Indonesia, political parties and electoral coalitions perform important organizational functions in mobilizing political support and pursuing institutional power. Although these functions may be compared with the political dimensions of ‘asabiyyah, the comparison must remain contextual because modern political parties operate through electoral regulations, constitutional arrangements, and institutional procedures that differ substantially from classical dynastic power formation.

Post-electoral political developments also demonstrate the dynamic character of political alliances and collective commitments. The reconfiguration of political coalitions following electoral competition indicates that political relationships may change according to institutional interests, leadership decisions, and strategic considerations. Such developments complicate interpretations that regard political identities as permanently fixed or inherently antagonistic. From a Khaldunian perspective, these transformations may be examined in relation to the changing foundations of political solidarity and the consolidation of authority. However, the explanation of coalition formation also requires contemporary theories of political institutions, party systems, and strategic political behavior.

The development of digital political communication further extends the potential relevance of ‘asabiyyah. Platforms such as TikTok, Instagram, and X provide environments through which political communities communicate shared interests, circulate political narratives, and organize collective engagement. Suhendra and Pratiwi identify the relevance of social media communication and political actors to contemporary polarization-related processes (Suhendra and Pratiwi 2024). Furthermore, Wahyuti et al. examine algorithmic recommendation systems, echo chambers, and political polarization during the 2024 presidential election, while Wahid et al. investigate similar issues within the context of Jakarta’s 2024 gubernatorial election. These studies provide empirical support for examining how digital communication may reinforce political identification and intergroup differentiation (Wahid et al. 2026; Wahyuti et al. 2025).

Nevertheless, the relationship between digital communication and ‘asabiyyah requires conceptual qualification. Social media platforms primarily function as communication infrastructures through which political identities and narratives are circulated. Their capacity to reinforce existing beliefs or facilitate selective information exposure does not necessarily demonstrate the emergence of the collective solidarity described by Ibn Khaldun. The concept becomes relevant only when digital political interactions contribute to mutual commitments, coordinated political action, and the organization of collective political interests. Therefore, the analytical application of ‘asabiyyah must extend beyond identifying echo chambers or partisan communities to examining their potential political functions.

The first major limitation of applying ‘asabiyyah to contemporary Indonesia concerns historical and institutional differences. Ibn Khaldun developed his theory in relation to societies characterized by tribal affiliations, dynastic competition, and the consolidation of political authority through group dominance. Contemporary Indonesia, by contrast, is a constitutional democracy in which political power is formally organized through electoral institutions, representative government, political parties, and legal procedures. Consequently, collective solidarity constitutes only one among several factors influencing political organization and competition. Institutional regulations, political leadership, economic interests, and media structures must also be considered when explaining contemporary political dynamics.

A second limitation concerns the multidimensional character of modern political identities. In contemporary societies, individuals may simultaneously identify with religious, ethnic, regional, ideological, professional, and partisan communities. These affiliations may overlap, change over time, or become politically significant under particular circumstances. Unlike the relatively enduring kinship-based relationships frequently associated with classical ‘asabiyyah, contemporary political affiliations may be more flexible and situational. Consequently, the strength of political identification cannot be assumed to correspond directly to the collective obligations and political capacities emphasized in Ibn Khaldun’s theory.

A third limitation concerns the distinction between collective solidarity and political antagonism. Strong internal solidarity does not necessarily produce hostility toward opposing groups. Political communities may maintain collective commitments while recognizing political pluralism and the legitimacy of competing perspectives. Conversely, individuals may express negative attitudes toward political opponents without participating in organized collective action. This distinction demonstrates that affective polarization and ‘asabiyyah represent different analytical dimensions, even when they coexist within particular political contexts.

The empirical literature further suggests that political polarization is dynamic rather than necessarily permanent. Research published in Media Asia on Indonesian social media users involved in the 2014 and 2019 presidential elections demonstrates that overt political polarization may decline or change form while latent political divisions persist. This finding is particularly relevant because it challenges deterministic assumptions that political identity, digital interaction, or group solidarity inevitably produces enduring political hostility. Instead, the intensity and expression of polarization may change according to electoral circumstances, political developments, and individual experiences (Syahputra et al. 2024).

Another limitation concerns the methodological scope of the present study. As a qualitative study employing library research and documentary analysis, the research primarily interprets existing theoretical literature and documented political phenomena. It does not independently measure the intensity of political polarization, the strength of group solidarity, or the causal effects of digital communication on political attitudes. Accordingly, the proposed relationship between ‘asabiyyah and contemporary Indonesian political polarization should be understood as a theoretically informed interpretation rather than direct empirical verification of a historical transformation.

Despite these limitations, ‘asabiyyah offers a valuable complementary perspective within contemporary political sociology. Modern theories of political identity help explain

how individuals identify with political groups, while partisanship and affective polarization provide insights into political allegiance and intergroup attitudes. Communication theories, including those concerning echo chambers and algorithmic information exposure, illuminate the role of digital environments in shaping political discourse. Ibn Khaldun's concept contributes an additional analytical dimension by emphasizing how collective solidarity may develop into organized political action and become associated with the pursuit and maintenance of political authority.

This theoretical contribution is particularly significant for understanding the potentially ambivalent consequences of political solidarity. Collective cohesion may strengthen political participation, facilitate collective representation, and support the articulation of shared interests. However, under certain conditions, it may also reinforce exclusionary group boundaries and contribute to political fragmentation. Such consequences depend on the interaction between collective solidarity, political leadership, institutional arrangements, and communication environments. Therefore, 'asabiyyah should not be interpreted as an inherently polarizing force but as a theoretical framework for examining the different political consequences of collective solidarity.

The present study consequently argues that the relevance of 'asabiyyah to contemporary Indonesia lies in its explanatory potential rather than its direct historical equivalence with modern political polarization. Its analytical value emerges from the possibility of connecting collective cohesion, political mobilization, and competition over political authority within a broader sociological framework. At the same time, the concept must be supplemented by contemporary theories and empirical evidence to account for the institutional complexity and technological characteristics of modern democratic politics.

Ultimately, the contextual reinterpretation of 'asabiyyah contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of political polarization by demonstrating that collective solidarity can serve both integrative and potentially divisive functions. Its constructive implications include political participation, collective representation, and social cooperation, whereas its exclusionary expressions may contribute to antagonism and weakened intergroup relationships. Recognizing these possibilities provides a theoretical foundation for encouraging inclusive political participation, strengthening intergroup dialogue, and promoting responsible digital communication. In this respect, Ibn Khaldun's concept remains relevant as a complementary analytical framework for examining the relationship between group solidarity, political power, and democratic cohesion in contemporary Indonesia.

Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion, this study concludes that political polarization in contemporary Indonesia can be understood through the dynamics of collective solidarity, which may be critically examined using Ibn Khaldun's concept of *'asabiyyah*. Political polarization extends beyond differences in electoral preferences and may involve broader social divisions shaped by religious identities, ideological orientations, and political affiliations. Within this context, *'asabiyyah* provides a complementary analytical framework for understanding how collective solidarity is constructed, reinforced, and mobilized in political competition. Nevertheless, contemporary political polarization should not be regarded as a direct manifestation of

classical *'asabiyyah*, since the two phenomena emerge from different historical, institutional, and socio-political circumstances.

The findings suggest that the contemporary relevance of *'asabiyyah* lies in the possibility of reinterpreting its classical functions within modern political structures. While Ibn Khaldun originally emphasized solidarity based on kinship, alliances, and collective obligations in relation to the formation and maintenance of political authority (*al-mulk*), contemporary political solidarity may emerge through ideological identification, religious affiliation, partisan networks, and digitally mediated communities. This study demonstrates that the analytical significance of *'asabiyyah* does not rest merely on the existence of shared identities, but rather on the relationship between collective cohesion, coordinated political mobilization, and the pursuit of political influence. Accordingly, the concept offers an additional perspective for examining the mechanisms through which group solidarity may become politically consequential in contemporary democratic societies.

The principal theoretical contribution of this study lies in advancing a contextual reinterpretation of Ibn Khaldun's *'asabiyyah* by connecting its classical emphasis on collective solidarity and political power with contemporary discussions of political identity, partisanship, affective polarization, and digital political communication. Rather than equating these modern phenomena with *'asabiyyah*, the study identifies their conceptual distinctions and examines their potential intersections. This interpretation extends the analytical application of Ibn Khaldun's thought beyond its original historical context while preserving its conceptual specificity. Furthermore, the study highlights the potentially ambivalent consequences of collective solidarity: it may strengthen political participation, collective representation, and internal group cohesion, but under certain conditions, it may also contribute to exclusionary political boundaries, intergroup antagonism, and broader social fragmentation.

However, the application of *'asabiyyah* to contemporary Indonesia involves several theoretical and methodological limitations. Ibn Khaldun developed the concept primarily within the context of premodern societies characterized by kinship-based solidarity, dynastic competition, and the establishment of political authority through collective group strength. In contrast, contemporary Indonesia operates within a constitutional democratic system characterized by electoral institutions, political parties, legal frameworks, and increasingly complex digital communication environments. Consequently, *'asabiyyah* cannot independently explain the multidimensional nature of modern political polarization without considering institutional arrangements, political strategies, media structures, and psychological processes. Furthermore, because this study employs qualitative library research and documentary analysis, its conclusions are based on theoretical interpretation and existing empirical literature rather than direct measurement of group solidarity or causal relationships between digital communication and political polarization.

In conclusion, Ibn Khaldun's concept of *'asabiyyah* remains relevant as a complementary theoretical perspective for understanding the relationship between collective solidarity, political mobilization, and social fragmentation in contemporary Indonesia. Its contribution lies not in establishing a direct equivalence between classical group solidarity and modern political polarization, but in providing a conceptual framework through which their relationships can be critically examined. By integrating classical Islamic political sociology with contemporary perspectives on political identity

and digital communication, this study contributes to a more comprehensive interpretation of political polarization within modern democratic societies. Future research should further investigate these relationships through empirical studies, including comparative political analysis, digital discourse analysis, and the examination of collective mobilization across different political communities, to assess the explanatory scope and limitations of *'asabiyyah* in contemporary socio-political contexts.

References

Efendi, Zulfan. 2024. "Ibnu Khaldun Dan Teori Peradaban: Relevansi Pemikirannya Dalam Dunia Modern." *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research* 4(6): 2198–2210.

Harriyani, Hannanda. 2024. "Kesadaran Gen Z Terhadap Dinamika Sosial-Politik Di Indonesia: Perspektif Teori Ashabiyyah Ibnu Khaldun." *Staatsrecht: Jurnal Hukum Kenegaraan dan Politik Islam* 4(1): 137–63.

Hartmann, David, Sonja Mei Wang, Lena Pohlmann, and Bettina Berendt. 2025. "A Systematic Review of Echo Chamber Research: Comparative Analysis of Conceptualizations, Operationalizations, and Varying Outcomes." *Journal of Computational Social Science* 8(2): 52.

Harvey, Jack, Maxwell Maxwell, and Frederick Rogue. 2025. "The Role of Islamic Political Thought in Responding to the Challenges of Global Populism." *Journal on Islamic Studies* 2(2): 56–66.

Kadir, Surni. 2025. "Integration of Ibn Khaldun's Thought in Contemporary Social Analysis, Perspectives of Islamic Sociology." *International Journal of Health, Economics, and Social Sciences (IJHESS)* 7(1): 432–37.

Khaldun, Ibn. 1986. *Muqaddimah*. ed. Ahmadie Thoha. Jakarta: Pustaka Firdaus.

Khamdan, Muh. 2022. *Politik Identitas Dan Perebutan Hegemoni Kuasa: Kontestasi Dalam Politik Elektoral Di Indonesia*. Penerbit A-Empat.

Lüders, Adrian, Alejandro Dinkelberg, and Michael Quayle. 2022. "Becoming 'Us' in Digital Spaces: How Online Users Creatively and Strategically Exploit Social Media Affordances to Build up Social Identity." *Acta Psychologica* 228: 103643.

Marjuan, Marjuan, Muhammad Nur, and Sugiyono Sugiyono. 2025. "ASABIYYAH DAN UMRAN: FONDASI SOSIOLOGI ISLAM DALAM PEMIKIRAN IBNU KHALDUN." *Jurnal Basataka (JBT)* 8(2): 1544–52.

Mazliana, Ananda, Nazarlin Nazarlin, Suci Amanda Putri, Rida Fijriah, and Ayerzi Oktal. 2026. "Politik Identitas Dan Polarisasi Sosial: Dinamika Dalam Demokrasi Dengan Tinjauan Sistematis Literatur Review." *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial*

dan Humaniora 2(2): 1156–69.

Muhyiddin, Luthfi, and Maulana Bagus Rahmat Rahmat. 2026. "Political Polarization and the Disruption of Digital Democracy in Indonesia: A Critical Reassessment of Political Science Perspectives." *Jurnal Tapis: Jurnal Teropong Aspirasi Politik Islam* 22(1): 25–50.

Mulia, Muji. 2019. "Teori 'Asabiyyah Ibn Khaldun Dalam Perspektif Hukum Islam (Theory of'Asabiyyah Ibn Khaldun in Islamic Law Perspective)." *Samarah: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga dan Hukum Islam* 3(2): 400–416.

Mustafa, Ilham, Firman Firman, Iqbal Yahya Utama, and Muhamad Rezi. 2026. "From 'Asabiyyah to Community Solidarity: Group Fanatism in Contemporary Indonesian Elections from the Perspective of Ibn Khaldun and Hadith." *Tanfizi: Journal of Islamic Constitutional and Political Law* 2(1): 28–39.

Purboyo, Muhammad Guntur, Junaidi Junaidi, and Azis Amriwan. 2024. "ESKALASI PARTISANSHIP POLITIK DALAM PEMBENTUKAN POLARISASI PADA MASYARAKAT DIGITAL:(Studi Pada Platform Media Sosial TikTok)." *SOSIOLOGI: Jurnal Ilmiah Kajian Ilmu Sosial dan Budaya* 26(01): 27–45.

Rustandi, Hendi. 2025. "Politik Identitas Di Indonesia: Interaksi Agama, Etnisitas, Dan Media Sosial Dalam Dinamika Kontestasi Politik." *JURNAL SYNTAX IMPERATIF: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Pendidikan* 6(5): 1351–59.

Secen, Sefa. 2026. "The Endogenous Corrosion of Political Orders: Ibn Khaldun and the Limits of International Relations Theory." *Globalizations*: 1–18.

Suhendra, Suhendra, and Feny Selly Pratiwi. 2024. "Peran Komunikasi Digital Dalam Pembentukan Opini Publik: Studi Kasus Media Sosial." In *Iapa Proceedings Conference*, , 293–315.

Syahputra, Iswandi, Waryani Fajar Riyanto, Fatma Dian Pratiwi, and Rika Lusri Virga. 2024. "Escaping Social Media: The End of Netizen's Political Polarization between Islamists and Nationalists in Indonesia?" *Media Asia* 51(1): 62–80.

syamsul Arif, M. 2025. "ETIKA POLITIK IDENTITAS DALAM PERSPEKTIF ASHABIYYAH IBN KHALDŪN." *Jurnal ISSUE* 3(1).

Tazri, Muhammad. 2019. "Cebong Dan Kampret Dalam Pespektif Komunikasi Politik Indonesia." *Perspektif Komunikasi: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi Politik dan Komunikasi Bisnis* 3(1): 1–7.

Trijono, Lambang, Arie Sujito, and Frans A Djalong. 2025. *Sosiologi Politik Perspektif Dan Pendekatan Kontemporer*. UGM PRESS.

Utami, Budi, Deddy Mulyana, Eni Maryani, and Dadang Rahmat Hidayat. 2025. "Polarization in Reporting the 2019 Presidential Election Campaign on Indonesian Television." *Cogent Social Sciences* 11(1): 2449249.

Wahid, Umaimah, Raden Wahyu Utomo Martianto, Rocky Prasetyo Jati, and Deddy Mulyana. 2026. "Polarization and Political Mental Health on TikTok in the 2024 Jakarta Gubernatorial Election." *Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication* 42(1): 114–33.

Wahyuti, Tri, Fitri Sarasati, Riski Mohamad Baskoro, Herman Paninggiran, and Bagus Sudarmanto. 2025. "Algoritma, Echo Chamber, Polarisasi, Dan Viralitas Di Tiktok Pada Pemilihan Presiden 2024." *Konvergensi: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Komunikasi* 6(2): 264–78.

Wijaya, H R. 2024. *Cara Mudah Belajar Metodologi Penelitian*. CV Saba Jaya Publisher.