Investigating formation of ‘place attachment’ at pasar lama communities, Kota Tangerang
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Abstract. Place attachment as bonding between people-meaningful places) has been researched quite broadly. Part of this interest stems from the awareness that people-place bonds have become fragile as urbanization, increased mobility, and encroaching environmental problems threaten the existence of and the connections to, places influences sense of attachment in Pasar Lama, Kota Tangerang. Despite its status as a Chinatown, the amount of Chinese inhabitant in Pasar Lama is only 1/5 compared to then total number of Native. Therefore an investigation is needed whether the advances of Kota Tangerang and increasing number of people affecting the formation of place attachment at Pasar Lama Communities. The analysis were conducted through eight factors, such as: physical, social, cultural, personal, memories and experiences, place satisfaction, interaction and activity features, and time factor. Qualitative method (ethnography approach) participatory observation and in-depth interview used as the method of research. The informant of this research are the local figure, local citizen, and local authority. Research concludes that the rapid development of Kota Tangerang and the number of citizens do not significantly affect the formation of place attachment, since both communities in Pasar Lama are considered having high attachment. The other factor is, Place Attachment is valued in contribution, a qualitative value instead sheer number of population. These contributions can be seen in the social, cultural and religious aspect based on factors on Place Attachment.

1. Introduction
Pasar Lama is both Chinatown and Cultural Heritage area which exist in Kota Tangerang [1]. Pasar Lama is also known for its Chinese community, as Cina Benteng. The naming of Cina Benteng itself occurs because the community lives in Tangerang which was a fort complex that belongs to The Dutch East Indies Government. Most of Cina Benteng’s people hold Buddhism as religion and other religions include Khonghucu, Taoism, Christian, and Islam. Even so, not all people in Pasar Lama are Chinese descendants, because there is a Native community who mostly holds Islam as religion. Both ethnic have lived side by side for centuries with respect for each other. Located in the center of Kota Tangerang, although formally announced as an autonomic city in 1993 [2], Pasar Lama was a part of Kabupaten Tangerang. As of 1993, the development of Kota Tangerang has grown significantly. Nowadays Kota Tangerang has become the third largest Urban Center in Jabodetabek, following Jakarta and Bekasi in second place. Kota Tangerang has 164.54 km² with population of 2,001,925 in 2014 [3]. This number also comes along with the high population growth ratio, which is 2.7% with national average: 1.4%) [3];
due to growth in the economic sector in Tangerang especially in trading, housing/real estate and industry.

Becoming one of the cities which has the power to penetrate into commerce could help the city grows especially economically and physically [4]. However, it is affect citizen view about meaning of the city and comes up with the question of Is Kota Tangerang reduced to just simply a place for the economic transaction? Or the meaning is much deeper than that? If we reflect Pasar Lama who has unique communities, is the development of Kota Tangerang (urbanization, citizen’s increasing mobility, etc.) would influence the formation of place attachment? Or are there other factors affecting the formation of place attachment in Pasar Lama? Research regarding citizen’s place of attachment could be used as an indicator to analyze the city, whether it has a deep meaning to its citizen. It can be seen not only the way individuals create bonding/connection with place, but also on how communities deal with the larger scale. People’s feeling regarding a place is a sign of the emotional dimension, beliefs regarding a place is a sign from cognitive dimension, and function inside a place is a symbol coming from behavioral dimension of the spoken place [5]. Forming elements of a place consisting form, function and meaning [6] are corresponding to cognitive, behavioral, and emotional dimension as shown in figure 1.

![Figure 1. Dimension of Creating Place](image)

Place attachment is a symbolic relationship with the place which is created by giving the emotional meanings/sense and how they relate to them [7]. The place also reflected unique personification and character of people; In other words the place are recognizable by the people, because they are integrated with it. The people also satisfied and they have an active role in the place such as they would like to invest their own time, money, or even talent in the activities in the place [8]. Based on previous research, there is eight factors which influenced on creation of place attachment: Physical factors, social factors, cultural factors, personal factors, memories and experience, place satisfactions, interactions and activity features, and time factor.

**Physical factors:** Physical factors has direct and indirect role on creating form of place. Pointed to direct role of it on place satisfaction and its indirect role on place attachment. But at the same time, it deviate from place symbolic meaning. Other features that have been indicated includes: place setting, facility and services, place status in urban setting, and other features [9]. **Social factors:** Relationship between physical place and personal satisfaction related to social communications. Some researchers believe that place attachment based on social factors (people participation, social network engagement and cultural interactions), there are equal or even more important than physical place. Place attachment develops with people positive interaction and social compatibility in place and place attachment power has direct relationship with these communication power and rate [10]. **Cultural factors:** Place attachment was build due to individuals’ interest, understanding and experience to place based on personal, group, cultural features, and social communication among them [1]. Place attachment related to those activities that people do in their cultural requirement setting (group, families, society member, and people in similar cultures) [10]. **Personal factors:** People has their own tendancies based on their personal characteristic and factors such as gender, class, race, ethnic, culture, religion, political tendencies, power, liberty, interest, social system and common interests in consumption motives) to develop connection and intimacy of place [10]. **Memories and experiences:** Based on previous study about place attachment found that place attachment deviated from development period memories and communication took place in areas not just a simple mere place. The way people remember a place that they experience is part of their experiences and might be a symbol of that experience [11].
another studies about place memories which explained that mature remember their childhood and elders from their residential memories. Memories from their childhood will build sense of embodiment and their form their dream, because everyone experienced differently about the place [12]. Place attachment might have permanent effect on children life, due to child life quality [13]. **Place satisfactions:** Relationship between person and place depends on a person perception of place satisfaction in quality and security (physical, social, and emotional). The perception showed by expression of conscious/unconscious, objective/subjective, personal/social, and others. There is so many factors to build a place satisfaction, like facilities, place adaptation, economic value of the place, social setting, background features, and visual characteristic [10]. **Interaction and activity features:** Interaction and activity feature is the factor that play important role to promote place attachment. Two kind of interaction, they are interaction between human-place and human-human. Interaction will create meaning, behavioral, emotional, and cognitive in place attachment. Certain activities will create place meaning. Interaction and activity promoting periodical celebration, events, festival or permanent activities dominated on places [10]. **Time factor:** Time factor can develop connection between human and place [10]. Residency in long time increased the attachment rate, because when somebody has connection/attach to place, they will care more about it [14].

2. Method
Method used in this research is qualitative method with ethnographic approach. Qualitative method was chosen because the study involved is more focused on the meaning inside certain context as opposed to variables which can be measured quantitatively. Instead, ethnographic is a study about social interaction, behavior, and perception regarding a group, organization or community. The main purpose of ethnographic approach is to produce holistic insight concerning perspective and human behavior conducted with detailed observation and in-depth interview [15]. Within this study, data were collected through participatory observation and in-depth interview with a semi-structured questions in between time frame from April to July 2017. During the interviews, there are seven key informants which were chosen by their diverse background as shown in Table 1. In order to find these key informants, two technic were used: “Snowball effect” and independent prospecting. “Snowball effect” was started from the meeting with Mr. Budi, then he introduced Mr. Oey Tjin Eng. From Mr. Oey Tjin Eng, the researcher introduced to Mr. Rudi, Mr. Achmad Sjairodji, Mrs. Yayang and Mr. Dadang. As for Mr. Sukmana, researcher look for him herself. To be more clearly, below is the description about the key informants and the reason why they were chosen.

| Table 1. Key Informant |  |
|------------------------|----------------------|
| **Local Figure**       | Mr. Oey Tjin Eng (73) is a local figure and also an expert in local culture. He is an eighth generation of Chinese descendants in Pasar Lama. He currently works as an advisor of Khongcu Bio Litang and previously as Kelenteng Boen Tek Bio’s board of organization. |
|                        | Mr. Rudi (48) is a Head of the MATAKIN (Board of Khonghucu Religion In Indonesia) of the Banten Province. He is a seventh generation of Chinese descendants in Pasar Lama. He spent his childhood in Pasar Lama, but since he had married he moved to outside Pasar Lama. |
|                        | Mr. Achmad Sjairodji (67) is a Moslem figure in Pasar Lama, who was the head of DKM Kali Pasir for 16 years. He was born and raised in Pasar Lama. |
| **Local Citizen**      | Mr. Budi (63) is a fourth generation of Chinese descendants who was born and raised in Pasar Lama. He works daily as a food trader which was descended from his father. |
|                        | Mrs. Yayang (59) is a fourth generation Chinese descendants who was born and raised in Pasar Lama. She lives with her sister and sells accessories since 1983. |
|                        | Mr. Dadang (67) is a Chinese descendants and Head of RW 03, who was born and grown in Pasar Lama. |
Mr. Sukmana (58) is a Head of RW 04 who lives in Pasar Lama since 1981 (for 36 years).

This research were conducted in Pasar Lama, Sukasari Region, Kota Tangerang. Below are the boundaries of Pasar Lama (On the north side bordering with Pasar Baru, Jalan Syech Yusuf in the east, and Cisadane river bordering Pasar Lama in both the south and west side. Pasar Lama actually extends along Benteng Belanda until Benteng Makassar. For research the scope has been narrowed to RW 04/RW Kali Pasir (Native Community) and RW 03/Petak Sembilan (Chinese Community); each RW has four RT as shown in figure 2.

![Figure 2. Research Sites of Pasar Lama, Kota Tangerang](image)

3. Results and Discussions

Based on observation and interviews, there is a unique fact regarding the number of intercommunity member in Pasar Lama. As a once dominating community, the number of the Chinese community in Pasar Lama is only 1/5 compared to the total number of Native. It was known through the narrative coming from Mr. Dadang (67) as the Head RW 03/RW Petak Sembilan. Below is part of the interview:

"The number of citizens is 193 (in RW 03). Almost every year we collect the data (data of citizen). Almost every year, the number lessen (number of citizens)."

Opposite with Cina Benteng community, the number of Native community increased each year. This situation didn’t make the Natives took Cina benteng’s territory, instead they live one roof with three-four other families. This info was received from Mr. Sukmana (58) as Head of RW 04. "So, in total there are almost 600 (household) and for the citizen themselves (in Kali Pasir) reach 1000 people or more. As can be seen that aren’t many houses remained 300-400 house. In responses in that situation, there about 3-4 households in each house."

Regarding findings above, researcher tried to outline further about the reasons why the number of Cina Benteng community declining and why members of Native community grows each year? Then researcher analyze to find out whether these findings indicates the Cina Benteng’s lesser place of
attachment than the Native’s? Or if Cina Benteng community has a different interpretation regarding Place Attachment with Pasar Lama? This analysis would be conducted by interconnecting each findings with the factors forming Place Attachment, as below:

3.1. Physical Factors

In accordance with the rapid growth of the Kota Tangerang, the shift of land function inevitably happened. The shift of function is affected physical history of Pasar Lama. From the construction of a new building, which didn’t reflect the embodiment of Cultural Heritage Region [16] to the change of style, becoming a more modern building. These days, the number of historic buildings are incredibly few. Even if one exist, it’s a National Heritage Building which existence is protected by law. In terms of management (funding or the workforce), the articulated buildings depends on community. Such buildings are Kelenteng Boen Tek Bio, Benteng Heritage Museum, and Kali Pasir Mosque as shown in figure 3. Mr. Sjairodji (67) as a local figure (Moslem figure) that gives information regarding these matter. “Benteng Heritage Museum (still well preserved because they have their own foundation – Benteng Heritage Foundation); Masjid (Masjid Kali Pasir) and Kelenteng (Boen Tek Bio) also still had assistance from their own ‘umat’, even though they didn’t get assistance from the government”

![Figure 3. (Left to Right: Boen Tek Bio Masjid Kali Pasir, and Museum Benteng Heritage)](image)

Nearby these three buildings, there are buildings with historical value. Unfortunately, the condition of those historic buildings is heartbreaking. Plenty of them are unmanaged due to the owners left their houses, with even more of them shifting into modern buildings. The reason was managing a modern building easier and practical as shown in figure 4. The excessive number of vacant houses in Pasar Lama related with the history of Pasar Lama which once an area of rented houses (also known as Petak Sembilan). In the past, tenants could live whole their life in those houses. Now if the owners intend to take the houses, tenants have no choice but to leave them, even though not all owners will occupy the houses (some are left empty, some changed into shops). This matter was also stated by Mr. Dadang (67). “Some of the houses (in Pasar Lama) were rented, so if the owner asked the house back, the tenant should go (move out). The amount of people who moved out are increasing every year, leaving plenty of empty houses. That’s why lots of houses have switched to become shops. Both the owner and the worker are 99% outsiders. They just trade and sell here, not living in Pasar Lama. There is no more resident.”

![Figure 4. Building in Pasar Lama](image)

Building condition in Pasar Lama could indicate that communities in Pasar Lama have different interpretation regarding place setting. Buildings which had cultural and spiritual value are interpreted
higher than their houses/workplace. This could be seen how they preserve authenticity of their Temple (Kelenteng), Mosque, and Museum; even if the operational fund coming from their pocket.

3.2. Social Factors
In Pasar Lama, the social factor is interpreted from the social engagement (in this term is the family relation) between communities. This relationship applies to both interethnic members and cross ethnic members. According to Mr. Tjin Eng (73) as a local culture expert, there was once a tight relation in Cina Benteng community, due to having a close family relation and the high value of family members living in the same neighborhood. With time being, the youth is more preferred to move out after they had married. Here’s a citation from the interview with Mr. Tjin Eng (73). “In the past, a woman (in Pasar Lama) could give birth as much as 26 babies. So it wasn’t surprising each family could have family member more than usual. So, they had to live in large house. But time has changed, people don’t have children as much as they used to and their children move out when they’re married.”

The majority of Pasar Lama’s youth prefer to move out after they had married, but it doesn’t mean there is no youth who still stay at their parents’ house after they had married. For example is Mr. Dadang’s (67) family, who lives under one roof with his wife, child, child-in-law and his grandchildren. Three generations under one roof is a rarity in these ages. Even if there is one, the members of the family aren’t as much as it used to, even though the uniqueness of Chinese buildings is a large house/family house. These houses are occupied by three generations. Usually, the eldest son would live in the house, then having children and grandchildren who have had married and lived with their family [16]. A strong trait of these houses is prayer table and ash of their ancestors (hio ash) [17]. Instead, the relation in the Native community, are still healthy connected. They live with several of their family members in one roof. After they had married, they also brought their loved ones to live in Pasar Lama. One of the example coming from Mr. Sukmana’s (58) experience, who was an outsider until he had married someone from Kali Pasir to finally settle, becoming a Pasar Lama resident.

The relation between ethnic communities in Pasar Lama has been away for several centuries, as it seen from the acculturation reflected culturally and the physical appearance. Cina Benteng community has slight difference in terms of appearance compared to common ethnic Chinese communities. They have a tan skin and a rather wide eyes similar to Native people. In daily activities they use Indonesian language with a Sundanese/Betawi accent, even it’s rare to find anyone who can speak Mandarin fluently (if one exist, they learn through Mandarin Language School just like Mr. Budi (63)). This shows that social factor has a stronger impact on formation of Place Attachment than physical factor.

3.3. Cultural Factors
Since the age of Kingdoms and Sultanese, Pasar Lama has been a center of trade in Tangerang, because trading is an activity strongly tied to Chinese’s culture. Chinese people have an ability to manage money well and have a strong spirit (especially the ones who wander far away), in turn they’ll trade and usually become financially successful. The art of trading is passed down hereditarily, making most of the Chinese business a family business. In Pasar Lama, the still preserved family business is a soy sauce business. As said by Mr. Tjin Eng (73) as cultural expert in Pasar Lama: “Family business is common thing in Pasar Lama, one of them is soy sauce. There is two famous brand is SH (1920) and Teng Giok Seng (1886). While Kecap SH which currently sits on the third generation, Teng Giok Seng handled by their fourth generation. Unfortunately these days, the descendants have lived separately (the production of soy sauce still continues, but the descendants live outside Pasar Lama).”

Not all the heirs of the business stay in Pasar Lama, but some of them chose to stay, like Mr. Budi (63). Mr. Budi, who run the business, inherited it from his grandfather. Even there are changes in commodities during time, Mr. Budi stays faithful to his profession as a trader. This happens because the art of trading is a skill he acquired hereditarily. Mr. Budi also passed down the ability to his children. Here is a citation from the interview with Mr. Budi: “My Grandpa used to sell groceries, it’s just since the 1970s because of a crisis he changed (commodities) to (sell) foods, and this is what I continued (to sell) until this day.” Trading gives two interpretation to Cina Benteng community viewing a place (as
place where they earn money and as an embodiment of their family’s existence). Both have an attachment to place (place attachment), although at a different attachment rate.

3.4. Personal Factors
Mr. Sukmana (58) narrates about personal factors in Pasar Lama stemming from the multiethnic and multireligious. For Moslem Natives, Pasar Lama has a close relation spiritually. So when Eid Al-Fitr and Eid Al-Adha comes, they’re flocking their hometown (Pasar Lama). “When they have families, already settled, they’ll move there (house complex). But when it’s the end of a year or religious holiday (Eid Al-Mubarak and Eid Al-Adha), they’ll visit here (Pasar Lama), just like a homecoming. So when we have these holidays, it gets more festive, because those who live far away will come here.” Similar things occur to Cina Benteng, on each Imlek (Chinese New Year) celebration they will visit Pasar Lama. Due to their ancestors’ ash are still preserved in Pasar Lama. This personal factor have a huge impact on forming place attachment, although they no longer live in Pasar Lama.

3.5. Memories and Experiences
Childhood memories and experiences are among aspects which could make someone attach to a place. The same experience could impacted someone’s life in the future. Mr. Rudi (48) shares his unforgettable childhood experience about tolerance in Pasar Lama. Thanks to his experience, made Mr. Rudi who held tolerance high among religions. “Ever since I was little, I had a lot of interaction with Moslems and had a lot of Moslem friends. Even when a month of Ramadhan comes, I’d like to stay the night in Mosque to help (waking people) Sahur. When Eid Mubarak comes, I also celebrated, just to appreciate culturally, not religiously.”

3.6. Interaction and Activity Features
There are two interaction and activity features to form place attachment, which is interactions between human-human and human-place. Interaction between cross ethnics and religions is consider as a human-human interactions. As said as Mr. Sjairodji (67): “If we talk about ethnicity in Pasar Lama, you could say there two ethnics, Chinese and Moslems. We say so, just to be clear we have different view and understanding; regarding of faith and religion. Right? Like it or not it will have an affect the environment. At least somehow even the smallest things will create (friction between ethnic and religion). Alhamdullilah we don’t have any problem, from then till now all is safe. Truly all is safe.”

In tune with Mr. Sjairodji (67), Mr. Tjin Eng (73) also affirm that tolerance is the foundation of a good relationship between Cina Benteng-Native Communities. It clearly visible during May 1998 occurrence. Mrs. Yayang (59) as a witness herself, states that Pasar Lama is a safer place for Chinese community during that time. “It’s safe here (during the May 1998 occurrence). Instead, we were protected by the Moslems in Kali Pasir, to the point Chinese descendants from Jakarta and surroundings fled here (among the safe places is Vihara).” The embodiment of human-place interactions is the existence of a routine celebration/festival, such as Peh-Cun Festival (Boat Festival), Imlek (Chinese New Year Celebration), and Arak-arakan Toa Pe Kong (Toa Pe Kong Parade). Moslems are involved that helping that celebration. This stated by Mr. Sukmana (67): “Peh-Cun is no different. So, we do it together (celebrate the Peh-Cun Festival). Basically for religion tolerance for each other, both respect it. No, no unlike those other places where for example friction happen. We’re not, safe and sound.”

3.7. Place Satisfaction
The place satisfaction of Pasar Lama Communities are shown in culture and religious way. However, they not satisfied with the houses’ quality due to its small size proof difficult to accommodate families’ members. This fact is discovered by Mr. Dadang’s information (67): “Petak Sembilan Houses (now RW 04 Pasar Lama) are about five meter-five meter (width of each houses), with average length of 27 meters. If there are had married ones and have little houses, usually because they don’t want to live mixed up with another family members; so they move to housing complexes.”
3.8. Time Factor
The even fewer number of Cina Benteng Community in Pasar Lama affecting time factor (communities’ length of stay). Those who leave are mainly in productive age with reason concerning their work or marriage. Those who stay are usually elderly people who spent their life time in Pasar Lama. But length of stay does not necessarily influencing the formation of place attachment.

4. Conclusions
This research concludes that generally, the rapid development of Kota Tangerang and the number of citizens do not significantly affect the formation of place attachment in Pasar Lama since both communities in Pasar Lama are considered having high enough attachment to Pasar Lama. The other factor is, Place Attachment is value in contribution, a qualitative value instead sheer number of population. These contributions can be seen in the social, economic, cultural and religious aspect based on factors on Place Attachment. Researcher argues that it’s unethical to say those who left has no sense of place attachment at all, and otherwise. Since place attachment of someone/community is not interpreted solely on length of stay (time factor), because there are seven more factors impacted the formation of place attachment in Pasar Lama.
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