The Sunan Ampel Review of Political and Social Sciences
Volume 5, Number 2, June 2026
E-ISSN 2809-1027
https://doi.org/10.15642/sarpass.2026.5.2.277-297

BEYOND KAFA'AH: IDENTITY NEGOTIATION AND FAMILY ACCEPTANCE IN SYARIFAH–NON-SAYYID MARRIAGES IN MADURA

Ibrohim Muchils
Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Indonesia
aiem.ahmads@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Marriages between Syarifah women and non-Sayyid men are often examined through *kafa'ah*, or lineage compatibility, while the experiences of couples and their families remain underexplored. This study examines how Syarifah women's genealogical identities and non-Sayyid husbands' social identities are represented, maintained, and negotiated in marital life in Madura. Using a qualitative comparative family study design, research was conducted in Bangkalan, Sampang, and Sumenep Regencies. Data were collected through in-depth interviews with 17 informants from five families, including couples, parents, and family elders. Thematic analysis was conducted using Stuart Hall's concepts of cultural identity, *being* and *becoming*, representation, and identity and difference. The findings reveal that lineage remains the strongest social boundary, while everyday cultural differences are considered less significant. Family responses range from rejection, including a three-year breakdown in family relations, to initial resistance followed by acceptance. Couples negotiate identity through clothing, family participation, children's naming practices, and kinship relations. Syarifah women retain their genealogical identities, while their husbands maintain their Madurese identities. Family acceptance develops gradually and varies across cases. This study addresses the limited empirical understanding of identity negotiation in cross-lineage marriages and contributes comparative evidence that marital integration does not necessarily produce identity fusion.

Keywords: Ba'alawi, lineage boundary, kafa'ah, Stuart Hall, Madura.

INTRODUCTION

Marriage between a woman whose lineage (*nasab*) traces to the family of the Prophet and a man from outside that line raises questions about genealogical identity, lineage compatibility (*kafa'ah*), and family acceptance in Muslim communities that place importance on genealogical descent. In general, the term *Syarifah* refers to a woman recognized as a descendant of the Prophet Muhammad. In this study, however, the term is used specifically to refer to women belonging to the Ba'alawi lineage, whose genealogical descent is traced through the Ba'alawi family. Meanwhile, a man from outside this lineage is referred to as a non-Sayyid or *ahwal*. The genealogy of the descendants of the Prophet and the mobility of the Hadrami diaspora have become important subjects of study for understanding how this community forms its identity and religious authority (Alatas, 2021; Ho, 2006). In this frame, lineage does not function merely as a record of origins. It becomes a source of family honor, an inherited tradition,

Article History: Received 17 April 2026, Revised 29 May 2026, Accepted 30 May 2026, Available online 30 June 2026
Copyright: © 2026. The Authors.
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

and an expectation about who is regarded as a suitable partner. The issue is most often discussed through *kafa'ah*, that is, compatibility in marriage. In the Rabithah Alawiyah community, *kafa'ah* is considered important for protecting honor and lineage, although according to Yuliana and Irwan (2025) Islamic law contains no explicit prohibition. However, *kafa'ah* explains only part of the issue. Marriage takes place in everyday life that involves parents-in-law, uncles, siblings, children, neighbors, and guests at family events. In that space, identity is not merely declared but also tested, defended, and reinterpreted.

Madura offers a distinctive context for examining this issue. Ba'alawi identity was formed through the history of the Hadrami community, including the distinction between Sayyid and non-Sayyid among the Arab population of the Dutch East Indies (Mobini-Kesheh, 1999). Madurese social order, on the other hand, has been shaped among other things by networks of *pesantren* (Islamic boarding schools), Nahdlatul Ulama, and *kiai* (Islamic scholars) (Pribadi, 2013, 2018), as well as by the values of self-esteem and shame discussed by (Wiyata, 2006) and the dynamics of an insular society examined by (Van Dijk et al, 1995). The marriage of a Syarifah to a non-Sayyid Madurese man brings these two orders together in one household. This study distinguishes between them sharply. Genealogical identity, that is, Ba'alawi lineage, is not equated with local or Madurese ethnic identity. The two are understood as two registers of identity that can be present at the same time in the same person or family. In this encounter, lineage functions in two ways. It serves as an identity marker through which individuals and their families understand their genealogical origins. It also operates as a social boundary that distinguishes group membership and regulates social recognition, as suggested by Barth's (1969) concept of boundary maintenance. From Stuart Hall's perspective, this boundary is not simply fixed but is continually reproduced and negotiated through representation and social interaction. In marriage, these processes become visible in judgments about lineage compatibility and family acceptance. The question of this study is how this marker and boundary are lived by couples and families after the marriage has taken place.

Previous studies provide several footholds. (Fattah, 2013) examined the attitude of the Jam'iyyah Rabithah Alawiyyah of Yogyakarta and found that the majority of *habib* (an honorific title for Sayyid men) forbid and do not bless the marriage of a Syarifah to a non-Sayyid. Its contribution is a mapping of the normative stance of community authorities, but its viewpoint is legal and the voices heard are those of the guardians of lineage, not of the couples who live the marriage. (Yuliana and Irwan, 2025) discussed *kafa'ah* in the Rabithah Alawiyah community from the perspective of the Indonesian Ulema Council of Asahan Regency, while (Hafidz et al, 2026) examined *kafa'ah* among the Ahlul Bait of Empang, Bogor, and its impact on family stability, and reported that marriages of a *sayyidah* to a non-*sayyid* are rare because of social pressure. These two studies enrich understanding of norms, but they operate within the frame of *kafa'ah* and are located outside Madura. (Subchi and Nurhayati, 2020) are closer to the focus of this study. Starting from personal blogs on social media, they examined Syarifah women in

Jakarta who chose *ahwal* men and the reasons for that change, namely mobility, education, and heterogeneous environments. Their source is individual online narratives, not accounts from the families involved.

These earlier studies are alike in treating lineage or clan name as the central issue, and differ in three respects: their location is not Madura, their perspective tends to be normative or reliant on a single type of source, and their analytical framework is not Hall's theory of identity. Based on the author's search, which was limited and not systematic, no verified study has been found on the marriage of a Syarifah to a non-Sayyid in Bangkalan, Sampang, or Sumenep, and no explicit application of Hall's theory of identity to Syarifah marriages has been found. Studies of lineage, Syarifah, and marriage have so far addressed genealogical aspects, *kafa'ah*, and social acceptance. What is still lacking is attention to the process of negotiating genealogical and local identity in everyday married life, including the naming of children and the role of family elders.

Stuart Hall's perspective is relevant for filling this gap. (Hall,1990) distinguishes two ways of understanding cultural identity: as a shared origin and common history (*being*), and as a process marked by difference and discontinuity (*becoming*). (Hall, 1996) adds that identity is built through difference and formed within, not outside, representation, while (Hall et al, 2013) explain how meaning is produced through systems of representation. The reading of these concepts follows the interpretations of (Zhang, 2017) and (Grivijitr, 2019), as well as (Hall,1995) on ethnicity as a discursively articulated position. To sharpen the notion of negotiation for couples and families, Hall's framework is complemented by (Ting-Toomey's, 2005) identity negotiation theory.

The novelty of this study is contextual and analytical, not an absolute claim of novelty. It presents comparative data from three regencies in Madura, reads the marriage of a Syarifah to a non-Sayyid as a process of identity negotiation rather than merely a matter of *kafa'ah*, and pays attention to local Madurese concepts such as *penta oca' (the Madurese tradition of proposing through spoken words before the formal proposal)*, *todus (shame or awkwardness when good intentions receive no clear answer)*, *tengka (manners or ethics in behavior)*, and *achampor (mixing in everyday relations)* that informants raised in the initial observation. This study aims to analyze how the genealogical identity of the Syarifah and the social identity of the non-Sayyid husband are represented, maintained, and negotiated in married life in Madura. The analysis focuses on the construction and representation of identity; lineage as a social boundary in choosing a partner and accepting a marriage; identity negotiation within the household and in relations between families; strategies for maintaining one's original identity while building social relations; and the dynamics of rejection, acceptance, and family integration in Bangkalan, Sampang, and Sumenep.

METHODOLOGY

This study uses a qualitative approach to understand the experiences, meanings, and processes of identity negotiation in married life (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The design is a

comparative family study in three areas of Madura, namely Bangkalan, Sampang, and Sumenep Regencies. A multiple-family study (Yin, 2018) and a comparative approach attentive to context (Bartlett & Vavrus, 2017) are used to see similarities and differences in the experiences of couples and families across regions, not to produce statistical generalization.

The primary data are the results of in-depth interviews that were summarized descriptively. There are 17 informants in total, identified by initials because the informants objected to having their names disclosed. All informants come from five marriages, namely 10 informants who are spouses (five Syarifah women and five non-Sayyid men) and seven informants outside the couples, namely the couples' relatives. In Bangkalan, the data come from one marriage (Family 1) with five informants. In Sampang there are two marriages (Family 1 and Family 2) with six informants, and in Sumenep there are two families (Family 1 and Family 2) with six informants. The mapping of informants, which separates spouses from non-spouses, is presented in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Mapping of informants

Regency and family	Couple: non-Sayyid husband (prefix L)	Couple: Syarifah wife (prefix P)	Outside the couple (no prefix): code and relationship
Bangkalan, Family 1	L-M	P-S	HA: husband's father, AA: uncle and family elder of the husband, H: husband's nephew
Sampang, Family 1	L-MBQ	P-NV	M-Spg: husband's father, HTV: wife's paternal uncle
Sampang, Family 2	L-AS	P-FH	No informants outside the couple
Sumenep, Family 1	L-AW	P-JFA	No informants outside the couple
Sumenep, Family 2	L-IM	P-WKA	HAA: wife's grandfather, IK: husband's father
Number of informants	5 persons	5 persons	7 persons Total: 17 informants

Source: field interview transcripts, processed by the researcher.

To distinguish informants' positions in the quotations, the code for Syarifah (wife) is given the prefix P and the code for non-Sayyid men (husband) is given the prefix L, for example P-NV and L-MBQ. This prefix is given only to married couples. Informants outside the couples, that is, relatives, are not given a prefix because their position is explained through their kinship relationship in Table 1 and in the Interview List in the References. Because the code M is used for two informants, the husband in Bangkalan is written L-M, whereas the husband's father in Sampang is written M-Spg. The complete coding rules are presented in Table 2 below:

Table 2. Informant codes

Informant category	Code prefix	Code	Description
Syarifah, wife in the couple	P	P-S, P-NV, P-FH, P-JFA, P-WKA	Syarifah women in the five marriages
Non-Sayyid man, husband in the couple	L	L-M, L-MBQ, L-AS, L-AW, L-IM	Husbands of the Syarifah women in the five marriages
Outside the couple (relatives)	No prefix	HA, AA, H, M-Spg, HTV, HAA, IK	Parents, uncles, a nephew, and a grandfather of one of the spouses
Same code M	L-M and M-Spg	L-M (husband, Bangkalan), M-Spg (husband's father, Sampang)	L-M is a spouse, M-Spg is outside the couple

Source: processed by the researcher.

The status of Syarifah and non-Sayyid is used as stated by the informants; this study does not trace or verify genealogies. No *kiai* or religious scholars were interviewed as informants. The *kiai* and the teacher who acted as mediator in the AS and FH family appear only in the informants' accounts.

The interviews were conducted by the researcher and an assisting interviewer. Some interviews were held in Madurese, and the transcripts are accompanied by Indonesian translations that serve as the basis for the quotations. The available interview results contain only the informants' statements. Secondary data are academic literature. Informants' names are anonymized as initials. Quotations follow the pattern (Interview informant code, year), for example (Interview P-NV, 2026) for a Syarifah and (Interview L-MBQ, 2026) for a non-Sayyid man, whereas quotations from relatives are written without a prefix, for example (Interview HTV, 2026). Informant codes, positions and relationships, locations, and interview dates and years are detailed in the Interview List in the References.

The analysis was carried out using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Informants' statements were identified, grouped into themes consistent with the focus of the study, compared across families within one regency and across regencies, and then interpreted with Hall's concepts: cultural identity, identity as *being* and *becoming*, representation, identity and difference, and the construction and negotiation of identity. The analysis works on descriptive accounts compiled from the transcripts, while retaining differences in accounts among informants. The trustworthiness of the data was maintained by comparing the accounts of several informants on the same case and by keeping a clear trail between evidence, themes, and interpretation (Nowell et al., 2017). The limitations need to be mentioned. Each informant was interviewed once and some come from families directly involved, so recall bias and politeness bias may occur;

although the researcher recorded the interviews as audio recordings, such bias may arise when the data are described descriptively.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Genealogical Identity of the Syarifah and Lineage as a Social Boundary in Marriage

1. Genealogical Identity and the Social Construction of Syarifah Status

The informants understood Syarifah status as an inherited identity as well as a position lived within social relations. S, the Syarifah in the Bangkalan family, knew from the start that her marriage would not be simple. According to her, within the Zurriyah, or the Alawiyyin families, the marriage of a Syarifah to an *ahwal* man is highly sensitive. Her brother who married an *ahwal* woman was not much of an issue, whereas a Syarifah who marries an *ahwal* man is considered to concern the family's lineage (Interview P-S, 2026). In Sampang, NV said that her family asked not only about the personality of her prospective husband but also "what family is he from, what is his lineage" (Interview P-NV, 2026). HTV said that the family's expectation by tradition is that a Syarifah marries a Sayyid (Interview HTV, 2026), and FH felt caught in a dilemma between her father, who guards lineage as a family trust, and her wish to choose for herself (Interview P-FH, 2026).

These accounts show two ways in which genealogical identity works, as distinguished by (Hall, 1990). The first is shared origin and common history that gives a sense of continuity, visible in families that guard lineage as a trust. The second is identity marked by difference and discontinuity, visible when a Syarifah's choice shifts the family's expectations. Both are present in the same family and often in the same person. (Rose, 1996), who discusses identity together with genealogy and history, helps in reading genealogy not only as a line of descent but also as a way the past is used to judge what is appropriate in the present.

Lineage is represented through observable signs such as names, clan names, forms of address, dress, and the spatial arrangement of events. According to (Hall et al, 2013), meaning does not inhere in the sign itself but is produced through systems of representation. In Family 2 in Sumenep, IM learned that his prospective wife was a Syarifah only when her full name and the Assegaf clan name were announced at the marriage contract (*akad*): "In fact, I only really knew at the marriage contract" (Interview L-IM, 2026). The clan name, once spoken, works as a representation that changes the meaning of the event. IK described his family's shock as "Not shocked because we did not accept it, but because we did not really know beforehand" (Interview IK, 2026). The representation of lineage also does not rest on organizational registration. WKA and HAA stated that their family is not registered with the Rabithah, but both emphasized that this does not mean they are not Ba'alawi. WKA said, "registration is one thing, whereas knowledge about the family and its lineage is another" (Interview P-WKA, 2026). This study follows that distinction and does not equate genealogical status with institutional registration status.

The husband's side understands Syarifah status with a respect that is maintained so as not to belittle oneself. HA respects his daughter-in-law as a Syarifah because she is a descendant of the Prophet, but after she became his daughter-in-law the everyday relationship was treated as a family relationship (Interview HA, 2026). AA said "respecting does not mean we have to feel inferior" (Interview AA, 2026). In Sumenep, IM acknowledged that people show deep respect (*takzim*) to his wife's family, without making his own relationship stiff (Interview L-IM, 2026). These meanings differ among individuals, couples, and families. For S, the status is regarded as concerning the family's lineage; for HA and AA, it relates to respect that does not demean; and for H, it gives rise to pride because his family now has a daughter-in-law from a Syarifah family (Interview H, 2026). Syarifah identity is therefore not singular. It is formed by the way the self, the spouse, and the family position it (Hall, 1996; Zhang, 2017). In relation to the Hadrami diaspora (Ho, 2006; Hall, 2021), this identity is inherited as a history of mobility, but in Madura it is lived as a position within the extended family and the surrounding community.

2. Lineage as a Social Boundary in Marriage and Family Acceptance

Almost all informants place the most important difference in lineage, not in everyday life. M in Bangkalan said that "what differs is mainly lineage, not everyday life" (Interview L-M, 2026). MBQ's father in Sampang called it an encounter of lineages, not an encounter of two cultures, and urged that "the issue of lineage should not be turned into a cultural or personal issue" (Interview M-Spg, 2026). This affirmation by the informants is in line with the analytical distinction between genealogical identity and local identity. However, the boundary does not work in the same way in every family.

In Bangkalan, the husband's family reacted with a shock that ended in blessing. HA was shocked, did not give his blessing immediately, asked about his son's seriousness, and then gave his blessing after hearing his reasons; he did not want to be a parent who "only says no without listening to a child's reasons" (Interview HA, 2026). AA described the family's initial attitude as shocked, awkward, and deferential (Interview AA, 2026), whereas H said the family was shocked because no member of the family had ever married into a Syarifah family (Interview H, 2026). The accounts about the wife's side are divided. M judged S's parents to be "quite open," whereas S described her family's response as "not a small storm, but a big storm," with strong rejection from her father and extended family, M being ostracized, and pressure for them to separate, while her mother did not reject them (Interview L-M, 2026; Interview P-S, 2026). The marriage contract took place with a *wali hakim* (a state-appointed marriage guardian) after S's father, who was in Saudi Arabia, handed over his consent in the form of "*pasrah rida*" (yielded consent) (Interview P-S, 2026). Both accounts are deliberately retained. The difference shows that the lineage boundary is experienced differently by people standing on different sides of it.

Within the framework of *identity and difference*, identity is formed through its relation to what is different (Hall, 1996). Syarifah status becomes prominent precisely when it faces a non-Sayyid man, so this boundary is relational, not an inborn trait of a person. M acknowledged that this kind of marriage is sensitive for some families, but he "did not immediately assume that everyone would surely reject it" (Interview L-M, 2026). He reads the boundary as something that varies, not as absolute.

In Sampang, the boundary is lived through Madurese custom. In two families, the husband's side carried out *penta oca'*, and the woman's father asked for time without either rejecting or accepting. MBQ felt *todus* and his family felt offended because they feel respected in their village, but he chose to wait (Interview L-MBQ, 2026). In Family 2, *penta oca'* was carried out by AS's uncle together with a *kiai* respected by both sides. Some months later FH's father asked about AS's job, how he would treat his wife, and the matter of children. According to AS, no one said "not compatible," but that was what he sensed behind those questions (Interview L-AS, 2026), and FH described her father's attitude as cold, not furious (Interview P-FH, 2026). In Family 1, the marriage took place in Malang in March 2016 with a *wali hakim*. According to NV, none of her family attended and her father came to take her home (Interview P-NV, 2026). HTV went along to Malang but stressed that his coming was not a sign of blessing (Interview HTV, 2026), and MBQ's father distinguished the validity of the marriage contract from the family's acceptance (Interview M-Spg, 2026).

HTV also appreciated the intentions and the manner in which MBQ's family came, but in his view that respect does not automatically remove the issue of *kafa'ah*, and the family's objection does not mean regarding non-Sayyid people as inferior (Interview HTV, 2026). This account shows that *kafa'ah* in that family is framed as a tradition and a family consideration, not a hierarchy of human worth, a nuance that complements the more normative discussions of *kafa'ah* (Fattah, 2013; Hafidz et al., 2026; Yuliana & Irwan, 2025). (Hall et al, 2013) remind us that representations of difference can harden into stereotypes. HTV's statement appears to try to keep the family's objection away from such representation, although for NV the result is still experienced as rejection. NV also observed that rejection is not always equally strong, because socio-economic status, education, occupation, family, and character are also taken into consideration (Interview P-NV, 2026). The *kiai* in the AS and FH family is present only in the informants' accounts, so his role cannot be discussed further within the framework of *kiai* authority (Pribadi, 2013). The term *todus* is used by informants for shame or awkwardness when good intentions receive no clear answer. Its meaning needs to be read alongside (Wiyata's, 2006) discussion of shame and *todus* without assuming the two are the same.

In Sumenep, the lineage boundary is most visible at the moment lineage is named. AW knew from the start that JFA was a Syarifah from the Assegaf clan and did not consider it something that had to be made into a problem: "What matters is that we can understand each other and the family can accept it" (Interview L-AW, 2026). In Family 2, the process took about a week. After the clan name was mentioned at the marriage

contract, IM's uncle and close relatives immediately asked what family the bride came from, but according to IK the family did not go so far as to think of cancelling the marriage (Interview L-IM, 2026; Interview IK, 2026). The wife's side also weighed lineage together with other matters. HAA answered the extended family members who questioned it with "I could not possibly entrust my grandchild to someone I do not know" (Interview HAA, 2026). As in studies of family blessing among intercultural couples (Dewatara & Agustin, 2021), intermediaries, namely an uncle and a *kiai* in Sampang and a grandfather and a family friend in Sumenep, appear to help turn the boundary into a conversation between families.

Identity Negotiation in Household Life and Strategies for Maintaining Original Identity

1. Identity Negotiation in Household Life

After the marriage contract, identity negotiation takes place in small, repeated matters. Among the Bangkalan couple, M mentioned S's habit of burning *bukhoor* (incense), which at first felt different but became ordinary, even to the point that something felt missing when it was absent. Arab food in S's family also became ordinary for him. Each side's habits are followed by the other as long as they do not conflict and both are comfortable (Interview L-M, 2026). In Sampang, MBQ described himself as bringing the habits of a Madurese family and the view that the husband is responsible as head of the family, whereas NV brings the identity and habits of her family. They try not to let differences turn into quarrels, and not every habit is changed (Interview L-MBQ, 2026). The most concrete difference lies in the family's religious activities. *Haul* (annual death commemorations), *majelis* (religious assemblies), and *ratib* (devotional litanies) in the wife's family require greater cost and preparation than the village *tahlilan* (communal prayers for the deceased) and religious study gatherings (*pengajian*) in the husband's family (Interview L-MBQ, 2026; Interview L-AS, 2026). AS and FH divide it up: AS helps with the wife's family events according to his means, FH helps in the kitchen at AS's family events, with neither having to imitate the other (Interview L-AS, 2026). MBQ named religion as a meeting point because both families respect parents and scholars (Interview L-MBQ, 2026).

In Sumenep, adjustment is visible in dress and spatial arrangements. AW wears a *gamis* (long robe) or turban at his wife's family events and explained that this is "Not because I have to change myself into someone else, but as a form of respect for the family." He also mentioned that at extended family events "the places for men and women are separated," and accepted the way of delivering the request to marry, which is done twice, because "every family has its own tradition" (Interview L-AW, 2026). WKA said she learned to understand her husband's family's customs without leaving her own family: "I feel my family has become wider" (Interview P-WKA, 2026).

The concept of *identity as being and becoming* helps in reading this adjustment. Habits that were once foreign become part of the household; that is *becoming*, without

erasing the origins that continue to be acknowledged, that is, *being* (Hall, 1990). Hall (1996) understands identity as a temporary point of attachment to subject positions formed by discursive practices, and AW's statement about the *gamis* shows this. He wears his wife's family's dress as a practice of respect while stating that he does not become someone else. The direction of adjustment is also not uniform. In Family 1 in Sumenep, adjustment is made mostly by the husband, whereas among the Bangkalan couple and the couple AS and FH adjustment is reciprocal. This finding is in line with studies of intercultural couples that view couple identity as a relational process dependent on context (Bystydzienski, 2011; Emami Kalesar et al., 2025) and with the theory of intercultural identity negotiation (Ting-Toomey, 2005). The difference is that what is negotiated here is lineage and family tradition, not ethnic or religious difference.

2. Strategies for Maintaining Original Identity while Building Social Relations

The previous section showed that negotiation takes place in small, repeated matters. This section looks at how couples and families keep their original identity while building new relationships. The informants' accounts reveal four strategies that do not exclude one another: declaring a dual identity without choosing, showing respect without demeaning oneself, presenting two traditions in one event, and building relationships through time and presence.

The first strategy is to state that no identity has to be abandoned. L-M rejects the notion that marriage erases identity: "no one has to lose their identity." The good habits of both families are carried out together, so that, in his view, the question is not who wins or who follows whom (Interview L-M, 2026). S, when asked whether her identity as a Syarifah was lost, answered no; she remains part of her family and has also become part of her husband's family (Interview P-S, 2026). NV said she does not feel she has to choose one identity, and FH described herself as remaining a Syarifah and at the same time the wife of an ordinary Madurese man (Interview P-NV, 2026; Interview P-FH, 2026). Similar formulations appear in Sumenep. WKA said, "I have never felt I had to choose," whereas IM stated, "I cannot become an Assegaf just because I married an Assegaf woman" (Interview P-WKA, 2026; Interview L-IM, 2026). AW formulated it from the husband's side: "I have not abandoned my identity as a Madurese" (Interview L-AW, 2026). The pattern of language is similar: origins are stated with the word "remain," whereas shared life is stated with verbs such as building or living.

In Hall's (1990) terms, origins stated with the word "remain" are close to identity as *being*, whereas a family built together is close to *becoming*. The two are united in the same accounts without being set against each other. A reading of identity as a process that does not erase origins (Hall, 1990; Zhang, 2017) appears consistent with the way informants themselves talk about it. The Madurese ethnicity declared by the husbands likewise appears more as a position maintained through dress, habits, and ways of socializing than as an essence, in line with Hall's (1995) understanding of ethnicity as a discursively articulated position (see also Grivijitr, 2019).

The second strategy is to respect lineage without making it a ladder of human worth. S encouraged her husband not to feel inferior or low simply because he is not a Sayyid (Interview P-S, 2026). JFA said something similar to AW, telling him, “do not feel inferior” (Interview P-JFA, 2026). S stressed that origins are not hidden, but “lineage is known, but character and the way one treats others remain what matters most” (Interview P-S, 2026). From the Ba’alawi family on the wife’s side, HTV said that “lineage is just lineage” and that the family’s objection does not mean regarding non-Sayyid people as inferior (Interview HTV, 2026). People on both sides of the boundary thus alike separate respect for lineage from assessments of human dignity. Within the framework of *identity and difference* (Hall, 1996), the difference in lineage is still acknowledged but is not allowed to harden into a hierarchy, an effort that can be read as a refusal to let difference harden into stereotype (Hall et al., 2013). However, rejecting hierarchy in speech does not always mean the hierarchy disappears in practice. S and NV still face their choices being judged mistaken because their husbands are not Sayyid (Interview P-S, 2026; Interview P-NV, 2026), as described in the subsection on the dynamics of rejection, acceptance, and family integration.

The third strategy is to present two traditions in one event. The clearest example comes from Bangkalan. At the seven-month pregnancy celebration, or *pelet kandung (the ceremony held at the seventh month of pregnancy)*, the husband’s family held religious study gatherings (*pengajian*) and *selawatan* (devotional recitations praising the Prophet) and invited local Nahdlatul Ulama leaders and congregants. According to AA, S’s family accepted the event, and the parent-in-law who had come from Hadramaut expressed appreciation (Interview AA, 2026). H saw S’s family attend and take part in the event without awkwardness, and visits are reciprocal when there is a celebration or a family member is ill, although not every event is attended by all family members (Interview H, 2026). AA said S’s family respects local tradition while bringing the practices they usually follow, and stated, “tradition should not be lost, but it should not become an obstacle to human relationships” (Interview AA, 2026). In Sumenep, a marriage contract with a sarong and a black *kopiah* (cap) was accepted by the wife’s family without objection (Interview L-IM, 2026; Interview HAA, 2026), and in Sampang MBQ named religion as a meeting point because both families respect parents and scholars (Interview L-MBQ, 2026). In a society whose social order is largely shaped by networks of *pesantren*, Nahdlatul Ulama, and *kiai* (Pribadi, 2013, 2018), religious activities such as *pengajian* and *selawatan* appear to be a shared space available to both families. This study does not test that relationship directly; it only shows that the informants themselves name religion and religious activities as a meeting point.

The fourth strategy is to build relationships through time and presence, in forms that differ according to circumstances. Among MBQ and NV, whose family relations were for a time severed, MBQ chose not to attend extended family events too often, not to force himself, and to give time, an attitude NV considered helpful (Interview P-NV, 2026). AS appeared quiet and did not complain when some of his wife’s uncles kept their

distance (Interview P-FH, 2026), and he concluded that all one can control is one's own attitude (Interview L-AS, 2026). In Family 1 in Sumenep, by contrast, increased presence and involvement became a sign of acceptance: AW is invited in his own name and is often involved (Interview L-AW, 2026). In Bangkalan, the husband's side's feeling of deference diminished as they met more often (Interview HA, 2026; Interview AA, 2026). These differences suggest that the choice between being present more often and giving distance appears to be weighed according to how fragile the acceptance is felt to be. This interpretation is supported only by the accounts of a few informants and cannot be generalized. Within the framework of cross-boundary identity negotiation (Ting-Toomey, 2005), decisions of this kind can be read as ways of managing acceptance and social distance in interaction; this study uses that framework as a complement to Hall and does not test it.

Naming of Children, Kinship Relations, and the Dynamics of Family Acceptance

1. Naming of Children, Lineage, and the Ways of Addressing Kinship Relations

The question of children makes identity negotiation concrete because it concerns names, clan names, and forms of address. Informants from the three regencies expressed very similar understandings of the line of lineage, but gave different room for recognition of the mother's family. It should be noted that among the Bangkalan couple the child had not yet been born at the time of the interview, so what was conveyed was plans and attitudes, whereas in Family 1 in Sumenep the lineage of the couple's child was not discussed in the transcript.

In Bangkalan, L-M said that the child's position had been discussed and was simple for him: the child follows the father's lineage and receives no special treatment because the mother is a Syarifah. He does not want the child to be burdened by issues of lineage and hopes that relations with both families will not be broken, because "do not let the issue of lineage cause the relationship with either family to be cut off" (Interview L-M, 2026). S said that the child will learn about the family's origins and that they will not be hidden (Interview P-S, 2026). In Sampang, NV said the child follows the father's line and does not use her family's clan name, and that this is not a big issue; FH does not object as long as the child knows his or her grandfather and the family's history (Interview P-NV, 2026; Interview P-FH, 2026). In Sumenep, the four informants in Family 2 understand the same rule. IM called it "part of the rules and genealogical tradition of the wife's family," and WKA formulated it, "The clan name relates to the family line. But relations with the family can still be maintained" (Interview L-IM, 2026; Interview P-WKA, 2026).

The more visible space for negotiation is names and forms of address. In Family 1 in Sampang, MBQ said that the naming was discussed together and includes an element of NV's grandfather's name from the Ba'alawi family as a mark of respect for the mother's family. The child is sometimes called "Yik," a form of address commonly used in Ba'alawi families, while also growing up in a Madurese environment, and MBQ does

not want the child to feel he or she must choose one family (Interview L-MBQ, 2026). In Family 2, AS said the child's first name comes from his side and the last name from the wife's grandfather, and the child is sometimes called by a form of address typical of the wife's family; he does not object as long as the child knows both families (Interview L-AS, 2026).

This pattern shows that the rule of the line of lineage is not a matter of debate among the informants, but recognition of the mother's family is still sought through other means, namely names, forms of address, and introducing the child to the family's history. According to Hall (1996), identity is formed within representation, and Hall et al. (2013) stress that meaning is produced through such signs. A name that includes an element from the wife's grandfather, or a form of address typical of the mother's family, becomes a sign that brings two families into one child's identity without changing the line of lineage. Rose (1996) helps in reading this: genealogy is not only a line of descent that is passed on but also a way the past is made present, in this case as respect for the mother's family. The study by Gultom et al. (2022) of Batak couples who do not have to adopt a Batak clan name provides a comparison showing that clan name can be a subject of couple negotiation. In the present data, informants explain the decision about the clan name by referring to the rule of Ba'alawi lineage that follows the man (Interview L-IM, 2026), not merely as a choice of the couple.

The way kinship relations are addressed is also part of the negotiation. M-Spg said he is more comfortable viewing the relationship with *habib* families as *tretan (sibling; can also mean a close person regarded as family)* rather than as a teacher–student relationship, which in his view can feel stiff, without reducing respect. He stated that what mixes (*achampor*) is everyday social relations, not lineage (Interview M-Spg, 2026). In Bangkalan, H said that "the family becomes connected" and that the relationship between the two families runs like that of an ordinary family, with no one feeling higher or lower (Interview H, 2026). In Sumenep, IK said, "I regard her as my own daughter," and HAA said the relationship between the two families after the marriage became a family relationship (Interview IK, 2026; Interview HAA, 2026). WKA said her family has become wider (Interview P-WKA, 2026). This choice of terms shows a difference between hierarchical relationships, such as teacher and student, and more equal relationships, such as siblings. What is negotiated appears to be the form of the relationship, not the status of lineage. The meanings of *tretan* and *achampor* are used here as explained by the informants.

2. Dynamics of Rejection, Acceptance, and Family Integration

The dynamics between rejection and acceptance do not move in one direction and are not uniform. Across the five marriages a wide range appears, from rejection that cut off communication between daughter and father for three years, to distance maintained at certain events, to shock that quickly subsided. This range cannot be read as stages that all couples pass through, but as variation that appears in different families.

In Bangkalan, the strongest rejection was recounted by S. According to her, the extended family's pressure did not stop after the marriage contract but continued in the form of ridicule, pressure through social media, and talk at family gatherings, and some even urged them to separate (Interview P-S, 2026). S stated that what is hardest is not household life but pressure from outside, especially when her choice is seen as wrong because her husband is not a Sayyid. What keeps her going is her conviction about her choice, her husband's treatment of her, and the acceptance of her husband's family (Interview P-S, 2026). The husband's side describes a different direction. HA said his family has actually grown and visits one another when there are events, whereas H said the relationship runs like that of an ordinary family (Interview HA, 2026; Interview H, 2026). L-M said that relations with S's family and friends remain good, although there may be people who disagree (Interview L-M, 2026). The difference between S's and L-M's accounts of the wife's family's response is deliberately retained, and the length of the marriage that the two mention also differs, so it is not used as a basis for comparison.

NV's experience shows the longest form of rejection. She did not communicate with her father from 2016 to 2019 and her communication was monitored, while she kept limited relations with her siblings and her mother's family. NV said that what was hardest was losing the relationship with her parents, and that after her mother died in 2013 her father's position in the family became very strong so that his attitude was decisive (Interview P-NV, 2026). The turning point came in 2019 when her father fell ill, the two met and forgave each other, and her father died in the same year. Relations with her siblings gradually recovered, especially after NV became pregnant with her first child at the end of 2019, and MBQ began to be accepted by NV's siblings and her mother's family (Interview P-NV, 2026). M-Spg also said that the stiff relationship thawed after a grandchild arrived (Interview M-Spg, 2026). HTV, an informant from the Ba'alawi family on the wife's side, said that acceptance is not immediate and that the family needs time, on the condition that MBQ remains good and takes care of NV, while the family monitors his responsibility as a husband (Interview HTV, 2026). In Family 2, FH described her father's attitude as cold, not furious, and some of her uncles still keep their distance, so that at certain events her husband sits somewhat apart (Interview P-FH, 2026). AS said that acceptance proceeds slowly, not in one day (Interview L-AS, 2026).

In Sumenep, informants' accounts describe acceptance that is quicker and does not pass-through open rejection. In Family 1, AW judged that acceptance grew gradually, and JFA said her family began to see AW through his daily activities (Interview L-AW, 2026; Interview P-JFA, 2026). In Family 2, IM's family was shocked and some felt proud, while the wife's side answered the extended family's questions by referring to HAA's acquaintance with IM (Interview L-IM, 2026; Interview HAA, 2026). IK said his family did not go so far as to think of cancelling the marriage (Interview IK, 2026). Sumenep informants also described the wife's family as one that does not live apart from Madurese society (Interview L-IM, 2026; Interview P-WKA, 2026; Interview HAA, 2026). The relationship between the wife's family's closeness to the surrounding community and the

ease of acceptance can be stated only as a correspondence in these data, not as a causal explanation, because the Sumenep families also differ in other respects, for example the grandfather's role as the one who introduced the prospective husband and the very short process.

Informants named several things they associate with acceptance. First, intermediaries: the *kiai* together with the uncle in Family 2 in Sampang, FH's father's teacher who reminded them not to sever ties, and the grandfather in Sumenep (Interview L-AS, 2026; Interview P-FH, 2026; Interview HAA, 2026). Second, time and repeated meetings (Interview HA, 2026; Interview L-AS, 2026). Third, the presence of children (Interview P-NV, 2026; Interview M-Spg, 2026). Fourth, the husband's character and responsibility (Interview HTV, 2026; Interview HAA, 2026). Fifth, the husband's family's socio-economic status, education, occupation, and family, which according to NV affects how strong the rejection is (Interview P-NV, 2026). Sixth, gender: S said that her brother who married an *ahwal* woman was not made an issue, whereas a Syarifah who marries an *ahwal* man is considered to concern lineage (Interview P-S, 2026). This list reflects the informants' explanations and is not tested as causal factors. The *kiai* and the teacher who acted as mediator were not themselves interviewed, so their role is known only from the family's accounts (Pribadi, 2013).

The acceptance described is almost always partial. MBQ said he does not feel completely rejected, but there is distance (Interview L-MBQ, 2026), H said not every event is attended by all family members (Interview H, 2026); and HTV said that the family monitors (Interview HTV, 2026). Acceptance is therefore better read as a process continually marked by small signs, namely an invitation in one's own name (Interview L-AW, 2026), seating position (Interview P-FH, 2026), and presence at family events (Interview H, 2026).

This picture adds nuance to earlier studies. Fattah (2013) found that the majority of the *habib* studied forbid the marriage of a Syarifah to a non-Sayyid, and Hafidz et al. (2026) found that such marriages are rare because of social pressure. S's and NV's accounts show that this pressure is real and can last a long time. However, these data, which also include informants from the husband's family and a Ba'alawi family member on the wife's side, also show gradual acceptance, restored relationships, and an explanation that the family's objection is not always meant to demean non-Sayyid men (Interview HTV, 2026). Because the number of families is small and some are narrated by directly involved families, these data cannot be used to assess how often rejection or acceptance occurs.

Comparison of Marriages across Regencies and Their Implications

Table 3 summarizes the five marriages so that the comparison across regencies can be seen at once. The table contains only what the informants stated; matters not discussed are written as not discussed.

Table 3. Comparison of five marriages in Bangkalan, Sampang, and Sumenep

Family	Path to marriage and the wife's side's response	The husband's side's response	Relations after the marriage contract	Child and lineage
Bangkalan (L-M and P-S)	Friendship within a shared social circle without a family-arranged match; marriage contract with a *wali hakim* after the father's "*pasrah rida*." L-M: S's parents were quite open; S: very strong rejection from her father and extended family.	HA, AA, and H were shocked; blessing was given after HA asked about seriousness; H mentioned pride.	Pressure from the extended family and on social media continues (P-S); relations between the families improve on the husband's side; S's family attended the seven-month pregnancy celebration.	Child not yet born; lineage follows the father; relations with both families maintained.
Sampang Family 1 (L-MBQ and P-NV)	Long acquaintance, on and off; *penta oca'*, NV's father asked for time, marriage contract in March 2016 in Malang with a *wali hakim*, none of NV's family attended (P-NV).	MBQ's family felt offended but chose to wait; M-Spg felt no shame.	Communication between NV and her father was cut off 2016–2019, restored in 2019 and after the child was born; the stiff relationship thawed.	Name includes an element from NV's grandfather, the form of address "Yik," child follows the father's line.
Sampang Family 2 (L-AS and P-FH)	Met through an alumni study gathering of a *pesantren*, *penta oca'* by AS's uncle and a *kiai*, FH's father asked for time and asked about his job, FH's father's teacher acted as mediator.	AS asked his family to regard FH's father as still thinking it over.	Some uncles keep their distance; costs of family events are shared according to ability.	First name from AS's side, last name from the wife's grandfather, child follows the father's line.
Sumenep Family 1 (L-AW and P-JFA)	Introduced by a friend or relative, about three months, request delivered twice. The wife's family's acceptance was gradual.	The family knew about the process from the beginning (L-AW).	Invitation in AW's name, involvement in *majelis* and family activities.	Lineage of the couple's child not discussed.

Sumenep Family 2 (L-IM and P-WKA)	Introduced by the wife's grandfather, about one week, IM only learned of the Syarifah status at the marriage contract. Some of the family were shocked and asked questions (HAA).	IM's family was shocked, some proud, did not go so far as to cancel the marriage (IK).	The two families respect each other and visit each other at family events.	Child without the Assegaf clan name; lineage follows the father.

Source: field interview transcripts, processed by the researcher.

Three things appear from that comparison. First, lineage is a social boundary in all families, but its degree and form of hardness differ: from rejection that cut off communication (Sampang Family 1), a father's cold attitude and some uncles' distance (Sampang Family 2), continuing extended-family pressure (Bangkalan), to shock that quickly subsided (Sumenep). Second, the paths to marriage differ and appear to go together with the way the boundary is faced. Marriages with *penta oca'* and delayed answers in Sampang are lived through Madurese custom, marriages in Sumenep begin from an intermediary trusted by the wife's family, and the marriage in Bangkalan begins from a friendship without a family-arranged match. Third, in all five families the spouses state that their respective identities are not lost, so the differences between families lie mainly in social relations, not in the identity outcome. The relationship between the path to marriage and the family's attitude can be stated only as a correspondence across five families, not as an explanation.

For a reading informed by Hall, these data support an understanding of identity as *being* and *becoming* that are present at the same time (Hall, 1990). Origins are maintained, that is, a Syarifah remains a Syarifah and the husband remains Madurese, whereas social relations and the meanings attached to them change through invitations, forms of address, children's names, and the sharing of costs. Syarifah identity becomes prominent because it faces difference, namely a non-Sayyid man (Hall, 1996), and signs such as clan name, name, dress, and forms of address become the places where that meaning is formed and contested (Hall et al., 2013). The negotiation does not end in fusion: the couple does not become one new identity that replaces two old identities, but negotiates how the two are present together. Read with the framework of cross-boundary identity negotiation (Ting-Toomey, 2005) and studies of couple identity as a relational process (Bystydzienski, 2011; Emami Kalesar et al., 2025), this appears as negotiation on two levels, namely each partner's identity and the couple's identity before the extended family. Dewatara and Agustin (2021) show that identity negotiation is needed for couples to obtain the blessing of their social environment; in these data what is negotiated is lineage and family tradition, not religious or ethnic difference.

For studies of *kafa'ah*, these data add post-contract experience to a literature that is more normative (Fattah, 2013; Hafidz et al., 2026; Yuliana & Irwan, 2025) and to the

study by Subchi and Nurhayati (2020), which is based on individual online narratives. For some informants, *kafa'ah* is framed as a tradition and a family consideration, not a hierarchy of human worth (Interview HTV, 2026; Interview M-Spg, 2026). The Ba'alawi genealogical identity that the literature discusses through the history of the Hadrami diaspora (Ho, 2006; Mobini-Kesheh, 1999) is lived in Madura as a position within the extended family and the surrounding community.

The local terms used by informants show that Madurese social order is not only a backdrop but provides ways of managing delay and rejection. Self-esteem and shame are discussed by Wiyata (2006) and the dynamics of Madurese insular society by Van Dijk et al. (1995). The meaning of *todus* in informants' accounts, that is, shame or awkwardness when good intentions receive no clear answer, needs to be read alongside that discussion without assuming the two are the same. The same applies to *tengka*. Sampang informants understand it as manners in behavior, AA in Bangkalan uses it for a tradition whose practice adjusts to circumstances, whereas Dikuraisyin et al. (2024) discuss it as a tradition related to the economics of marriage. The meaning of *penta oca' (the Madurese tradition of proposing through spoken words before the formal proposal)*.

CONCLUSION

This study analyzed how the genealogical identity of the Syarifah and the social identity of the non-Sayyid husband are represented, maintained, and negotiated in married life in Bangkalan, Sampang, and Sumenep. First, informants understand Syarifah identity as an inheritance as well as a position that is lived. It is expressed through names, clan names, dress, forms of address, and the spatial arrangement of events, and it is not identical with institutional registration status, as WKA and HAA stated about the Rabithah. Second, lineage is the most salient social boundary, whereas most informants regarded everyday cultural differences as minor. The boundary works differently in each family, from rejection that severed the relationship between father and daughter for three years in Sampang to shock that quickly subsided in Sumenep.

Third, negotiation in the household takes place through small, repeated matters, namely dress, habits at home, involvement in family events, sharing the costs of religious activities, naming children, and the ways kinship relations are addressed. Fourth, couples maintain their original identity while building social relations by stating that no identity has to be abandoned, respecting lineage without demeaning themselves, presenting two traditions in one event, and regulating presence according to the fragility of acceptance. Fifth, family acceptance is gradual, partly partial, and uneven. Informants link it to intermediaries, time, the presence of children, the husband's character, and socio-economic background, without a causal relationship that can be established.

Overall, a Syarifah remains a Syarifah and the husband remains Madurese. What changes are social relations and the meanings attached to them. Hall's concepts of identity as *being* and *becoming*, of identity formed through difference, and of representation provide a way of reading that process without turning it into merely a question of

compatibility. This study contributes a reading of cross-lineage marriage in Madura informed by Hall and comparative data from three regencies on negotiation that does not end in fusion. This contribution is contextual and limited: the findings come from five marriages, mostly narrated by directly involved families, through transcripts with translations that have not all been checked by other native speakers, and therefore do not represent Madurese society.

AI USAGE STATEMENT

In preparing this manuscript, the author used ChatGPT to assist with mapping informant codes and preparing the informant table and the comparative table across marriages. Claude was used to assist with language editing, grammatical corrections, spelling, and writing style. The author reviewed and revised the content generated with the assistance of both tools and takes full responsibility for the integrity of the published article.

REFERENCES

Alatas, I. F. (2021). *What is religious authority? Cultivating Islamic communities in Indonesia*. Princeton University Press.

Bartlett, L., & Vavrus, F. (2017). *Rethinking case study research: A comparative approach*. Routledge.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bystydzienski, J. M. (2011). *Intercultural couples: Crossing boundaries, negotiating difference*. New York University Press.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.

Dewatara, G. W., & Agustin, S. M. (2021). Communication of intercultural couples through identity negotiation during courtship. In *Proceedings of the Asia-Pacific Research in Social Sciences and Humanities Universitas Indonesia Conference (APRISH 2019)* (pp. 140–146). Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210531.017

Dikuraisyin, B., Sumarkan, Fatwa, A. F., & Masadah. (2024). Economic underpinnings of early marriage: The tengka tradition among the Madurese. *Al-Ahwal: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Islam, 17*(1), 93–106. https://doi.org/10.14421/ahwal.2024.17106

Emami Kalesar, L., Rasouli, M., Zahrakar, K., & Gramipour, M. (2025). From differences to co-becoming: A phenomenological analysis of the lived experience of couple identity in intercultural marriages. *Applied Psychology, 19*(4), 184–212. https://ensani.ir/fa/article/download/646473

Fattah, N. (2013). Hukum pernikahan Syarifah dengan laki-laki non-Sayyid: Perspektif Jam‘iyyah Rabithah Alawiyyah Yogyakarta [The law on the marriage of a Syarifah to a non-Sayyid man: The perspective of the Jam‘iyyah Rabithah Alawiyyah of Yogyakarta]. *Al-Ahwal, 6*(2), 129–144. https://ejournal.uin-suka.ac.id/syariah/Ahwal/article/view/1093

Grivijitr, B. (2019). Stuart Hall and new ethnicities: Concept the proposal for cultural diversity. *Journal of Human Rights and Peace Studies, 5*(2), 175–195. https://so03.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/HRPS/article/view/184789

Gultom, O. H. M., Rahardjo, T., & Lukmantoro, T. (2022). Identity negotiation in mixed marriage couples between the Batak and other ethnic without having to adopt a Batak's 'marga' (clan). *Interaksi Online, 10*(4). https://ejournal3.undip.ac.id/index.php/interaksi-online/article/download/36002/27724

Hafidz, A., Yasin, Y., & Khaira, D. Z. (2026). Kafa'ah in marriage among the Ahlu al-Bait Empang, Bogor and its impact on family stability. *Dirasat: Journal of Islamic Studies, 2*(1), 72–88. https://journal.uinjkt.ac.id/index.php/djis/article/view/52444

Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, culture, difference* (pp. 222–237). Lawrence & Wishart.

Hall, S. (1995). New ethnicities. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, & H. Tiffin (Eds.), *The post-colonial studies reader* (pp. 223–227). Routledge.

Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs "identity"? In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 1–17). Sage.

Hall, S. (2021). *Selected writings on race and difference* (P. Gilroy & R. W. Gilmore, Eds.). Duke University Press.

Hall, S., Evans, J., & Nixon, S. (Eds.). (2013). *Representation* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Ho, E. (2006). *The graves of Tarim: Genealogy and mobility across the Indian Ocean*. University of California Press.

Mobini-Kesheh, N. (1999). *The Hadrami awakening: Community and identity in the Netherlands East Indies, 1900–1942*. Cornell Southeast Asia Program Publications.

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 16*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847

Pribadi, Y. (2013). Religious networks in Madura: Pesantren, Nahdlatul Ulama and kiai as the core of santri culture. *Al-Jāmiʿah: Journal of Islamic Studies, 51*(1), 1–32. https://doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2013.511.1-32

Pribadi, Y. (2018). *Islam, state and society in Indonesia: Local politics in Madura*. Routledge.

Rose, N. (1996). Identity, genealogy, history. In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 128–150). Sage.

Subchi, I., & Nurhayati. (2020). Study of the Syarifah's cultural revolt in modern Indonesia: Personal blog social media in perspective marriage between noble female Arab and ordinary male non Arab. In *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Recent Innovations (ICRI 2018)* (pp. 2014–2022). SCITEPRESS. https://doi.org/10.5220/0009938720142022

Ting-Toomey, S. (2005). Identity negotiation theory: Crossing cultural boundaries. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 211–233). Sage.

Van Dijk, K., De Jonge, H., & Touwen-Bouwsma, E. (Eds.). (1995). *Across Madura Strait: The dynamics of an insular society*. KITLV Press.

Wiyata, A. L. (2006). *Carok: Konflik kekerasan dan harga diri orang Madura* [Carok: Violent conflict and the self-esteem of the Madurese]. LKiS Pelangi Aksara.

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage.

Yuliana, F., & Irwan. (2025). Kafa'ah in the contemporary Rabithah Alawiyah community: The perspective of the Indonesian Ulema Council of Asahan Regency. *Al-Mawarid: JSYH, 7*(1). https://doi.org/10.20885/mawarid.vol7.iss1.art1

Zhang, L. (2017). How to understand Stuart Hall's "identity" properly? *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies, 18*(2), 188–196. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649373.2017.1309498

Interviews:

AA. (2026, March 28, Bangkalan). Interview with a community figure and family elder, uncle of L-M.
H. (2026, March 30, Bangkalan). Interview with L-M's nephew, who helped carry out the wedding.
HA. (2026, March 27, Bangkalan). Interview with L-M's father.
L-M. (2026, March 25, Bangkalan). Interview with the non-Sayyid husband, aged 27, a spouse in Family 1.
P-S. (2026, March 25, Bangkalan). Interview with the Syarifah, L-M's wife, Family 1.
L-MBQ. (2026, April 15, Sampang). Interview with the non-Sayyid husband, Family 1.
P-NV. (2026, April 15, Sampang). Interview with the Syarifah, L-MBQ's wife, Family 1.
M-Spg. (2026, April 20, Malang). Interview with L-MBQ's father, who lives in
HTV. (2026, April 23, Sampang). Interview with P-NV's paternal uncle, a Ba'alawi
L-AS. (2026, April 28, Sampang). Interview with the non-Sayyid husband, Family 2.
P-FH. (2026, April 28, Sampang). Interview with the Syarifah, L-AS's wife, Family 2.
L-AW. (2026, May 8, Sumenep). Interview with the non-Sayyid husband, Family 1.
P-JFA. (2026, May 8, Sumenep). Interview with the Syarifah of the Assegaf clan, L-AW's wife, Family 1.
L-IM. (2026, May 22, Sumenep). Interview with the husband, aged about 41, a spouse in Family 2.
P-WKA. (2026, May 22, Sumenep). Interview with the Syarifah of the Assegaf clan, L-IM's wife, Family 2.
HAA. (2026, May 23, Sumenep). Interview with P-WKA's grandfather, who also serves as P-WKA's companion.
IK. (2026, May 25, Sumenep). Interview with L-IM's father