

Impact of Covid-19 Pandemic on the Existence of Social Solidarity: Evidence from Rural- Urban Communities in Lombok Island, Indonesia

by Rosiady H 3 S

Submission date: 29-Apr-2023 07:36AM (UTC-0500)

Submission ID: 2079138165

File name: REVISED_Version_Solidarity_Final_1.docx (717.09K)

Word count: 10721

Character count: 62074

2 Impact of Covid-19 Pandemic on the Existence of Social Solidarity: Evidence from Rural-Urban Communities in Lombok Island, Indonesia

1 Rosiady H. Sayuti^{1*}, MohTaqiuddin², Azhari Evendi³, Siti Aisyah Hidayati⁴, M. Zaenul
2 Muttaqin⁵

3 ¹Sociology Study Program, University of Mataram, Mataram City, Indonesia

4 ²Faculty of Animal Husbandry, University of Mataram, Mataram City, Indonesia

5 ³Sociology Laboratory, University of Mataram, Mataram City, Indonesia

6 ⁴Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Mataram, Mataram City, Indonesia

7 ⁵Department of Public Administration, University of Cenderawasih, Jayapura City, Indonesia.

8 * Correspondence:

9 Rosiady H. Sayuti

10 sayuti@unram.ac.id

11 **Keywords: Covid-19 Pandemic, Lombok, Rural-Urban, Social Solidarity, Quantitative**
12 **Approach.**

13 **Abstract**

14 ³The Covid-19 pandemic that has hit the entire world since the beginning of 2020 is an unimaginable
15 phenomenon. The pandemic is disastrous because it has caused loss of life and livelihood for a large
16 part of the population. People lose their jobs, spaces for social interaction are closed, and social
17 relationships are disrupted. Several studies show that social solidarity should be a major concern for
18 people to sustain the future quality of their lives. Social solidarity dimensions in this study include
19 *gotong royong* (local culture of mutual help), marriage *banjars* (local association), cooperation, and
20 sharing of information. This study aims to examine the existence of social solidarity during the
21 pandemic in rural and urban areas and to know the level of community exposure to Covid-19 in
22 Lombok Island, Indonesia.

23 This research adopted a quantitative approach to identify and analyse ²the existence of social
24 solidarity in rural and urban communities during the Covid-19 pandemic. A set of questionnaires
25 was distributed and shared by enumerators with 1,100 targeted-respondents from Lombok Island.
26 The survey was carried out from 14th October to 28th October 2021, that is, during a recovery period
27 from the pandemic while restrictions implemented by the government were still in full force. Chi
28 square statistical analysis was used to test whether there were differences in social solidarity between
29 those who lived in rural areas and those who lived in urban areas.

30 This research found ²the existence of social ⁴solidarity in both rural and urban communities during the
31 pandemic. The level of social solidarity in rural areas is higher than in urban areas. While related to
32 the number of those who were exposed and died, conditions ⁴were higher in rural areas than in urban
33 areas. However, in terms of the death rate, the level of death rate in urban areas is higher than in rural
34 areas. This condition indicates differences in the characteristics of rural and urban communities,

35 which can be considered in implementing policies during a future pandemic. This research provides
36 evidence for local governments in formulating policies with a social solidarity perspective by taking
37 into account the different characteristics of rural and urban communities.

38 **1 Introduction**

39 The Covid-19 has turned out to be an unprecedented global health and socio-economic crisis since
40 its emergence in early 2020 (Gostin and Hodge, 2020; Yu et al., 2021). However, it is more than a
41 health crisis. It is also a humanitarian crisis (Barneveld et al., 2020). People's everyday lives were
42 and continue to be drastically changed by this pandemic due to restrictions imposed by physical
43 distancing, working or learning from home, loss of work, as well as reduced socially contact with
44 family and friends (Lupton and Willis, 2021). The UN (2020) has reported that over 2.2 billion
45 people in the world unable to wash their hands regularly because of lack of access to safe water and
46 1.8 billion not able to keep physical distancing due to homelessness, low quality housing, and
47 overcrowded housing. In Indonesia, the Social Monitoring and Early Response Unit (SMERU)
48 Research Institute (2022) has traced the pandemic's socio-economic impacts on 12,216 nationally
49 representative households across all 34 Provinces (Sarker et al., 2021).

50 The Covid-19 pandemic is disastrous because it has caused loss of life and livelihood for a large part
51 of the population due to the social distancing policy. People lose their jobs, spaces for social
52 interaction are closed, and social relationships are disrupted. This pandemic continues to cause
53 problems in the economic, social, and even political fields in various parts of the world (Alam, 2021).
54 In Durkheim's view, conditions of instability can force communities to agree with each other and
55 share to lighten the burden so that they soon stabilize again. This mutual agreement and spirit of
56 sharing are known as social solidarity (Alfirdaus et al., 2015). However, social solidarity cannot be
57 activated automatically due to the complexity of the socio-cultural, economic, and political
58 structures. Several preconditions are needed for solidarity to work, especially amid the pressure of an
59 unstable situation due to a disaster. In some cases, disaster situations can strengthen community
60 social solidarity even though, in a number of communities, the social solidarity actually weakens.

61 Socially, Covid-19 has altered relationship patterns between individuals due to physical or social
62 distance implementation, isolated or suspended usual social activities (see: Hosseinzadeh et al.,
63 2022), and led many researchers to grapple with crucial issues about various aspects of social
64 cohesion, especially social capital and social solidarity (Negura et al., 2021). Social capital is
65 considered one of the principal dimensions of social cohesion (Carter and Cordero, 2022). The
66 current studies explored and examined the functioning of social capital in handling the negative
67 consequences of the Covid-19 pandemic both at the micro and macro levels (Tatarko et al., 2022;
68 Carter and Cordero, 2022; Negura et al, 2021). Social capital, which includes norms, social networks,
69 trust, and mutual respect, has facilitated rural communities in Java areas-Indonesia in preventing and
70 managing the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic (Rofieq et al, 2021; Primadata et al., 2022). In the
71 public health context, social capital can be developed and maintained by postering and enhancing
72 social solidarity or empathy between high-risk and low-risk groups (Wong and Kohler, 2020). To
73 build community resilience during the Pandemic, Baraka (2020) found that social capital has played
74 a significant role in forming social solidarity initiatives, as in Egypt cases. Referring to this series
75 explanation, our article focuses on exploring social solidarity between urban and rural communities
76 by enriching analysis using social capital's perspectives.

77

78 Stok et al., (2021) highlighted the relationship between disparities between regions and the severity
79 of Covid-19 infection. In his studies in various countries, such as the United States, Sweden, and
80 Brazil, it can be concluded that relatively poor areas have higher exposure and mortality rates than
81 regions that are somewhat more developed or rich. Even in the United States, there are differences
82 between racial groups of people, where the African-American group has a higher exposure level than
83 European-Americans (Abedi et al., 2021; Chen and Krieger, 2021).

84 **Social Solidarity**

85 In Durkheim's view, conditions of instability can force communities to agree with each other and
86 share to lighten the burden so that they soon stabilize again. This mutual agreement and spirit of
87 sharing are known as social solidarity (Alfirdaus et al., 2015). However, social solidarity cannot be
88 activated automatically due to the complexity of the socio-cultural, economic, and political
89 structures. Several preconditions are needed for solidarity to work, especially amid the pressure of an
90 unstable situation due to a disaster. In some cases, disaster situations can strengthen community
91 social solidarity even though, in a number of communities, the social solidarity actually weakens.

92 Social solidarity is believed to be synonymous with sharing, tolerance, mutual relief, and even a form
93 of exchange in disaster situations (Alfirdaus et al., 2015). In line with this explanation, the practices
94 of social solidarity in the Covid-19 pandemic situation are essential to be explained theoretically.
95 Therefore, we analyse the quantitative data to demonstrate the applicability of the concept of social
96 solidarity in the context of "vulnerability" or "disaster," namely in the Covid-19 Pandemic situation,
97 by making comparisons between rural and urban communities. Previous studies related to social
98 solidarity and the Covid-19 pandemic have not discussed much of the differences between villages
99 and cities but have focused more on issues of gender inequality (Mishra and Rath, 2020), social
100 disparities based on ethnicity, race, and socioeconomic position (Stok et al., 2021), as well as other
101 economic and social impacts (Suryahadi et al., 2020; Mustafa et al., 2021). Socio-economic impacts
102 can also be seen in research (Mustafa et al., 2021) in Malaysia, using an intergenerational perspective
103 to review the collective memory of the second wave of the pandemic. In their research, Mustafa et al.
104 (2021) explained that the younger generation, with an age range of 18-30 years, refers to a pandemic
105 more than the older generation due to significant lifestyle changes. In contrast to the older generation,
106 who tend to put lifestyle aside and prioritize the changes brought about by the pandemic. We argue
107 that the social construction of social solidarity between the two types of people is still different in
108 disaster situations.

109 The main question is how far has ³ the Covid-19 Pandemic affected the differences in ⁴ the construction
110 of social solidarity between these two types of society. ⁵ How do the two communities maintain their
111 social solidarity existence in a situation of "pressure" due to the ⁵ negative impact of the Covid-19
112 pandemic? How does social solidarity function in both societies in the context of the Covid-19
113 Pandemic? In the sociocultural context of Lombok Island, our analysis also answers the question
114 posed by Li (2012): does the context of social solidarity being discussed refer to the current situation
115 or a better situation in the future? Then does this social movement occur in society universally? Or
116 are there differences between rural and urban areas, particularly concerning policies set? On the other
117 hand, the urgency of research using a social solidarity lens was triggered to complement other studies
118 that reveal uncertainty of reference in the design of national policies (Ilham et al., 2021).

119 This research on social solidarity at the local or community-level is important because policies
120 related to the pandemic, such as restricting people from leaving their places of residence, maintaining
121 distance, and wearing masks, are factors that can reduce the sense of social solidarity among citizens

122 (Tiffany, 2020; Taylor, 2019). In addition to ⁵ the efforts made by the government to overcome the
123 impact caused by the Covid-19 pandemic, various initiatives have also emerged from the community.
124 Solidarity actions that have grown and taken root in the grassroots community are increasingly being
125 tested in the midst of the Covid-19 Pandemic. The existence of pandemic has strengthened the values
126 of social solidarity inherent in the body of the Indonesian nation (Sayuti, 2020; Sayuti, 2021). In
127 addition, various social movements, such as distributing free groceries to those affected and other
128 philanthropic movement, have sprung up in society.

129 Durkheim developed the theory of social solidarity because he believes that the function of society
130 works by itself in providing benefits to its members. This idea was developed as a response to the
131 notion that social solidarity is not found in modern society when people tend to become more
132 individualistic as stated by Spencer, Maine, and Tönnies (Durkheim, 1984). Tiryakian (1972) in
133 Alexander and Smith (2008) defines social solidarity as a form of attachment between individuals in
134 society, a source of consensual morality, and a way for society to create social order. Durkheim has
135 provided a rationale for discussions about the workings of social solidarity in chaotic situations such
136 as disaster events and extreme instability. A case of instability due to the outbreak of crime,
137 violence, and disasters or crises in various forms will be able to encourage people one to another in
138 order to normalize the situation. The extreme instability caused by the crisis triggered community
139 members to jointly create a balanced situation again through social solidarity as an act of sharing
140 responsibility. The pressure situation due to the Covid-19 Pandemic will encourage people to find
141 glue for their social interactions to share and help each other (Durkheim, 1995).

142 An explanation of the roles between villages and cities ³ in the context of this pandemic is also
143 essential. According to Malatzky et al. (2020), cities must be seen as heterogeneous, multicultural
144 places and sources of innovation. In contrast, the village is the opposite, as a location that is relatively
145 homogeneous, simpler, and tends to be more resistant to various innovations. With the Covid-19
146 pandemic, the character of cities and villages is a factor that influences the speed of the spread of
147 Covid-19, as well as efforts to prevent and cure it. The high level of population density and
148 community activity in cities makes pandemics in cities spread faster. Theoretically, social distancing
149 policies, for example, would be easier to implement in cities than in villages. As Larsen (2013)
150 argument, a sense of togetherness to seek peace and kinship and a more comfortable natural
151 atmosphere in the rural area. Included is a sense of solidarity among fellow citizens, which is very
152 much needed in dealing with this pandemic.

153 Chan (2021) in Taliep (2023) state that solidarity is marked by togetherness that occurs in thoughts,
154 emotions, or actions and activities. It goes on to say that solidarity is at the core of collective action
155 that transcends social and geographical boundaries. Social solidarity in this context is dynamic and
156 arises when some members of the community face a difficulty; after that, a desire arises to help each
157 other among members community (Cho et al., 2021; Douwes et al., 2018; Tomasini 2020)

158
159 Taliep et al. (2023) explored social behavior and community solidarity in South Africa during the
160 pandemic. The conclusion shows that, in general, it can be explained that the solidarity and social
161 behavior of the community during the pandemic has materialized, regardless of their social and
162 economic status. Other researchers (Taliep et al., 2021; Tomasini, 2020). they stated that throughout
163 the world, there had been a sense of solidarity and prosocial behavior that had never happened before
164 as a response to a pandemic with so many victims being exposed. In addition, many community
165 members are taking part in efforts to help others during this pandemic, such as volunteering at
166 existing health facilities or providing food assistance and supporting families exposed to covid19
167 (Sin et al., 2021; Taliep et al., 2021).

168

169 In their research on German society, Kaup et al. (2022) outlined the critical meaning of solidarity
170 during a pandemic. He divides solidarity into three levels, namely institutional solidarity, group
171 solidarity, and individual solidarity. They were first related to policies in dealing with a pandemic,
172 such as the existence of a welfare or social security program. Both activities are associated with
173 groups, such as using masks that impact other people. The third is someone's empathy for others who
174 are exposed and who voluntarily help with their needs.

175

176 Brown (2021) explains that there is a relationship between solidarity between individuals and the
177 level of public exposure to a pandemic. It is said that in societies where the level of solidarity is
178 higher, the number of reported cases of exposure tends to be less. Furthermore, Kaup et al. (2022)
179 further divided interpersonal solidarity, namely, solidarity received, and solidarity was shown. What
180 is meant by solidarity received is how much or how often a person gets assistance during a pandemic.
181 Meanwhile, what is meant by showing solidarity is how often someone assists those exposed during a
182 pandemic. Finally, another researcher (Angaw, 2021) in research in Ethiopia concluded that
183 institutional solidarity, in the form of social organizations that help people during a pandemic, has a
184 massive role in reducing the impact caused by the large number of people exposed to the pandemic.

185 In his view, Stok et al. (2021) examine the challenges to solidarity that arise with this pandemic. This
186 challenge then gave birth to three new types of solidarity: Intergenerational solidarity and cross-
187 generational solidarity, where there must be a mutual understanding between the older and younger
188 generations in dealing with a pandemic. Initially, the younger generation was asked to be more active
189 in keeping their distance from the older generation. Later, the younger generation asked the older
190 generation to reduce some of the policies that could harm the younger generation. Then the second is
191 Global solidarity, which is between nations, where less fortunate countries must get the attention of
192 other nations. As a clear example, there should not be a stark disparity among the world's nations in
193 terms of vaccine distribution. The last is Intergroup solidarity, namely the emergence of various
194 forms of new stigma in society, which is a challenge in building solidarity between groups. This
195 stigmatization affects mental health and well-being and makes disease control more complicated.

196 **Aim and research questions of the present study**

197 The background of this research was to find out how social solidarity exists in rural and urban
198 communities during a pandemic. By understanding the phenomenon of social solidarity in society,
199 the policies taken to address the problem will be more effective. Several researchers (Taliep et al.,
200 2021; Kaup et al., 2022; Brown, 2021; Angaw, 2021; Stok et al., 2021) who researched solidarity
201 during a pandemic, it can be concluded that solidarity during a pandemic is dynamic and perspectives
202 also vary. Both in terms of the meaning of solidarity itself and its implementation based on time and
203 place. Therefore, we hypothesize that the manifestation of social solidarity between people living in
204 rural and urban areas will differ in a pandemic situation. The objectives of the research are: (1) to
205 find out the existence of social solidarity in rural and urban communities during the pandemic; (2) to
206 know the different levels of social solidarity in rural and urban communities; and (3) to know the
207 level of community exposure to Covid-19 in rural and urban areas.

208 The structure of this manuscript is divided into several sections. The first part describes the
209 introduction and research background. Then in the next section an explanation of the method used.
210 The third part describes the characteristics of the respondents, the correlation between variables, and
211 the research units. The next section is a discussion regarding research findings and implications. The
212 last part is the conclusion. In this research, social solidarity is seen before and during the pandemic.

213 There are several instruments that become research units to answer the three research objectives.
214 First, Gotong Royong to see the characteristics of mutual aid. Second, Marriage Banjar which
215 assesses aspects of solidarity in weddings. The third part then enters during the pandemic. This
216 section discusses Attitude in working together during the pandemic. Fourth, Willingness to Help
217 Each Other. Fifth, Sharing of Information about the prevention and handling of Covid-19. The lastly,
218 Number exposed to Covid-19 on Lombok Island.

219 Materials and Methods

220 Lombok Island (Figure 1) was chosen as the research location because this island has unique
221 characteristics. *First*, the level of population density is high, but includes a mix of urban and rural
222 communities. *Second*, Lombok is inhabited by people with differing social and economic
223 backgrounds. This research adopted a quantitative approach to identify and analyse **the existence of**
224 **social solidarity in rural and urban communities** during the Covid-19 pandemic. A set of
225 questionnaires was distributed and shared by enumerators with 1,100 targeted-respondents from 5
226 (five) districts/municipalities around Lombok Island in the province of West Nusa Tenggara. The
227 survey was carried out from 14th October to 28th October 2021, that is, during a recovery period from
228 the pandemic while restrictions implemented by the government were still in full force.

229 <Figure 1>

230 In determining the sample size representing the population, the calculation procedure used a random
231 proportional sampling technique (Sugiyono, 2012). In calculating the sample size for each district,
232 adjustments were made based on the characteristics of respondents aged 17 years and over so that the
233 number of respondents for each district would be reflective of the age distribution of the district
234 itself. First, the research population was divided by regencies and municipalities on the island of
235 Lombok, which has 220 villages and towns. The total population of the island is 3,758,631, with
236 429,651 in Mataram Municipalities, 247,400 in the North Lombok Regency, 721,481 in West
237 Lombok, 1,034,859 in Central Lombok, and 1,325,240 in East Lombok. The total population was
238 determined by the total number of respondents, which was 1,100. This resulted in 126 from the
239 Mataram Municipality, 72 from North Lombok, 200 from West Lombok, 312 from Central Lombok,
240 and 391 from East Lombok. The number of respondent from rural areas was 918 (83.45%) and
241 urban area was 182 (16.54%). These sample sizes are reflective of the number of people living in
242 rural and urban areas on Lombok Island, 88.57%, and 11.43%, respectively (NTB Central Bureau of
243 Statistics, 2021).

244 One way to define solidarity is as any action that increases people's welfare at the local or community
245 level (Paskov and Dewilde, 2012). However, the concept of social solidarity does not stand alone. It
246 relates to other social concepts, such as social cohesion, social trust, social capital, and the
247 distribution of various resources to meet the needs of people. Social solidarity is also related to social
248 construction of social relations, values, and group identity (Berman and Philips, 2004). Hence, there
249 are 5 (five) indicators of social solidarity measured in this study, namely:

- 250 1. An attitude of cooperation among citizens, which in Indonesia is known as *gotong royong*;
- 251 2. Participation in preparations for the marriage *banjar*;
- 252 3. An attitude of working together or cooperating with others during the pandemic;

- 253 4. A willingness to help others in the form of donations during a pandemic, that is, of mutual
254 support; and
- 255 5. A desire to remind each other to comply with various health protocols during the pandemic,
256 that is, a willingness to share information on a variety of issues, including information that
257 would be useful for preventing the spread of COVID.

258 *Gotong royong* and *banjar* are two traditional institutions that we use as indicators of social solidarity
259 unique to the people of Lombok. *Gotong royong* is a kind of mutual assistance that reflects genuine
260 indigenous notions of moral obligations and generalized reciprocity; it is contextualized to build
261 social solidarity in handling Covid-19 and manifested by the active participation of each individual to
262 provide added or a positive value to each object, opposition, or needs of many people around them
263 (Perkasa in Shin et al., 2022; Sultan and Rapi, 2020; Artayasa, 2022; Muqsith et al. 2021). At the
264 same time, *banjar* can be defined as a form of small and limited community association or group in
265 which many social activities take place or local wisdom as well as part of the social system of society
266 which has been maintained regarding beneficial impacts for networked individuals (Jamiluddin,
267 2022; Wijayanti et al., 2022).

268 For each of those indicators, alternative answers that indicate the level of desire to participate are
269 prepared. This study employed a Likert scale of 1-5, where one is very low, two is low, three is
270 moderate, four is high, and five is very high. Likert scale is a type of scale frequently used to
271 measure perceptions, attitudes, and opinions for the purposes of statistical analysis. Thus, it is hoped
272 that an overview of the level of social solidarity in the community will be obtained, which is the unit
273 of analysis of this research. According to Sugiyono (2018), a Likert scale is appropriate to measure
274 views or perceptions of a person or group of people so that the researcher can obtain an accurate
275 picture of the social phenomena being studied.

276 Chi square was used to test whether there were differences in social solidarity between those who
277 lived in rural areas and those who lived in urban areas. The chi-square test is often used in research
278 that examines the relationship of two variables (Sharpe, 2015). Chi-square is an analytical technique
279 to determine the difference in the frequency of observations from the frequency of expectations based
280 on a random distribution of paired cases.

281 Meanwhile, to determine the number of people who were exposed to and died from Covid-19 in rural
282 and urban areas on Lombok Island, we used data released by the West Nusa Tenggara Province
283 Covid Task Force. The data we collect is data that had occurred since the outbreak of Covid in early
284 2020 until the end of 2021 when this research was conducted.

285 **2 Results**

286 **Respondent characteristics**

287 <Table 1>

288 The distribution of respondents by gender can be seen by comparing the number of male and
289 female respondents; the difference is very thin (Table 1). For example, it was recorded that the male
290 respondents were 50.9% of the 1100 respondents, while the female respondents were 49.1%. From the
291 characteristics of the respondent's area of residence, out of 1100 respondents, it was recorded that
292 83.5% of the respondents resided in rural areas and 16.5% of respondents lived in urban areas. Then,
293 there is a grouping of respondents based on age. The distribution of number of respondents based on

294 their age level was grouped into several groups. Based on data from 1100 existing respondents, from
295 the most to the least, of the 25.8% of respondents aged 35-44 years, 24.4% of respondents aged 25-34
296 years, 20.4% of respondents aged 45-54 years, 14.8% of respondents aged 17-24 years, and 10.7% of
297 respondents aged 55-64 years. Meanwhile, only 3.8% of respondents were 65 years and over, and 0.1%
298 of respondents from the age group of fewer than 17 years were married.

299 The diversity of educational levels of the 1100 respondents was mainly in the category of
300 graduating from high school/equivalent, namely 40.8% of respondents. However, few respondents
301 were included in the category of never going to school, as much as 4%. Nevertheless, the data shows
302 that the education level of respondents is still relatively low because as many as 8.1% of respondents
303 did not finish elementary school/equivalent, 14.5% of respondents graduated from elementary
304 school/equivalent, and 19.6% of respondents graduated from junior high school/equivalent. On the
305 other hand, the rest shows that some respondents can continue their education to a higher level, namely
306 Diploma (D1-D2-D3) with 1.8% of respondents, Bachelor (S1/D4) with 11% of respondents, and
307 Postgraduate (S2-S3) with 0.2 % of respondents.

308 Based on their main daily activities, out of 1100 respondents, 34% of respondents said they do
309 not work, including those who have been in school, are housewives, and are retired person. Meanwhile,
310 respondents who work as the main activity are divided into several types of work. As many as 29.2%
311 of respondents worked as small traders, 18.5% of respondents as laborers, 16.4% of respondents as
312 farmers/breeders, 12.9% of respondents as entrepreneurs, and the rest relied on a living from work such
313 as non-ASN employees, ASN, private employees, fishermen, and others.

314

315 **Correlation between variables**

316 According to Taylor (2019) and Agung (2020), there are three interrelated elements that help with an
317 understanding about how a pandemic like Covid-19 affects a society; namely, the virus itself and
318 characteristics associated with its transmission and its physical effects on people; the psychological
319 element of people who feel threatened by this pandemic; and the environment in which they live,
320 including both its physical and sociological dimensions. In terms of the environment in which they
321 live, villages and cities are important areas to study what phenomena occur in each in terms of the
322 first two elements. Is the influence of location important to the spread of the Covid-19 pandemic
323 because its influence extends not only to individuals or families but also to communities and groups
324 at various levels? Are there differing levels of concern about the effects of COVID between those
325 living in urban and rural communities, and if so, how do these concerns shape the patterns of their
326 daily living?

327 The following describes the results (Table 2) of the research we have conducted on people, divided
328 into two locations, namely rural and urban areas. Within each type of community, we look at possible
329 differences in social solidarity, which we measure with five indicators, namely: (1) *gotong royong*,
330 (2) marriages *banjar*, (3) an attitude of cooperation, (4) mutual assistance, and (5) sharing of
331 information.

332

<Table 2>

333 **2.1 Gotong Royong**

334 From a Durkheimian point of view, contextually, rural and urban areas have distinctive
335 characteristics. The findings in this study also show that during the pandemic, when this research was
336 conducted, social solidarity in the two regions with the variable gotong royong displayed differences.

337 The Table 2 shows these dynamics in terms of the enthusiasm for cooperation among respondents
338 from both rural and urban communities during the pandemic. From the chi-square, it can be
339 concluded from the p-value that there was a significant difference in *gotong royong* or cooperative
340 activities during the pandemic⁴ between rural and urban communities. Enthusiasm of people for
341 implementing *gotong royong* in rural areas was higher than in urban areas. This implies that people
342 in rural areas were less observant of prohibitions on gathering and maintaining distance during the
343 pandemic. That is why cooperative activities such as places of worship and public facilities such as
344 roads and public market, during the pandemic period, did not experience slowdowns, especially in
345 rural areas. Violation of the prohibition on social distancing shows the limitation of weak sanctions
346 and the monitoring of health protocol policies in rural areas. In a similar study, Mishra and Rath
347 (2020) advocate a contextual approach to health prevention by emphasizing the roots of social
348 solidarity at the local level to devise acceptable methods to prevent the spread of future pandemics. In
349 Indonesia, *gotong royong* is the central to the culture's collective consciousness that defines
350 solidarity and how people cooperatively act, both physically and spiritually (Hanif, 2021).

351 **2.2 Marriage Banjar**

352 The wedding reception is an event that has become a tradition in Indonesia, both those who live in
353 rural areas and urban areas. However, these events are strictly limited by the number of guests, and
354 even banned altogether, with the onset of the COVID pandemic. Therefore, making the marriage
355 *banjar* an indicator of social solidarity is essential to understanding rural-urban differences in the
356 context of this pandemic. Respondents from rural communities were more likely to believe that
357 participation in marriage *banjar* was important, even during times of COVID because it is an
358 indicator of social solidarity. *Banjar* is a traditional institution for a special purpose.

359 Meanwhile, respondents from urban communities for the marriage *banjar* variable only reached
360 45.6% ("high" or "very high"). In rural communities, respondents who answered "high" or "very
361 high" stood at 67.7%. This shows that rural communities have a higher level of attachment to
362 mingling and being involved in the marriage reception or *banjar* during the pandemic. The chi-
363 square analysis also obtained a p-value that indicates that the difference in social solidarity between
364 rural and urban areas was significant. In other words, it can be said that although there is a
365 government prohibition related to the implementation of marriage *banjar* activities, people in rural
366 areas were more likely to ignore them. They were more concerned with the social solidarity shown
367 by their participation in *banjar* than their adherence to the health protocols set by the government.

368 **2.3 Attitude in working together during the pandemic**

369 This indicator of solidarity was measured based on attitudes that encourage individual actions to help
370 others, such as borrowing money or goods and visiting sick neighbours. In general, it can be
371 concluded, based on the results in Table 2, that there were significant rural-urban differences. In rural
372 areas, people generally had a greater concern, even during the COVID pandemic about the
373 importance of working together. In rural communities, respondents who answered "high" or "very
374 high" stood at 60.2%. In contrast, the percentage from the same two categories for respondents from
375 urban communities was only 39.0%. Again, the difference in the percentage of high and very high
376 standards between people in rural areas and urban communities shows the difference in their
377 adherence to health protocols, especially in terms of maintaining recommended distances. The chi-
378 square value indicates a p-value of 0.00, which means the difference was statistically significant. For
379 people in rural areas, there was a greater need to interact with each other to meet daily needs, and in
380 terms of visiting those who are sick, they tended to ignore health protocols. In other words,

381 government policies related to health protocols for rural areas cannot be implemented as effectively
382 as in urban because of differences in social solidarity.

383 **2.4 Willingness to Help Each Other**

384 In this indicator of solidarity, the willingness to help each other is measured based on donations of
385 money or goods. Like the previous two indicators, there was again a significant difference between
386 the attitudes of respondents from rural and urban communities in the effort to set aside money and
387 goods for social donations. Based on the data in Table 2 it can be seen that those who indicated either
388 “high” or “very high” in rural communities was 46.0%, while people in urban areas added up to
389 34.6%. Although this difference is not as large as the previous two indicators, the chi-square analysis
390 was still statistically significant with a p-value of 0.00. Again, it means that the social solidarity of
391 respondents living in rural areas is higher than those from urban areas.

392 Health issues during the pandemic are not only based on physical health, but also has many social
393 issues. Research Egcas et al. (2021) shows that mental health is a topic that was quite intensely
394 discussed during the pandemic. This issue is connected with the level of community welfare during
395 the pandemic. Efforts to help each other form a type of defensive social ecology in terms of financial
396 and mental health. The impact of the pandemic on the economy also supports findings related to the
397 actuality of mutual assistance carried out by the community during the pandemic. In their research,
398 Nguyen et al. (2021) showed a significant pandemic effect on the global economy, which includes
399 manufacturing, education, finance, pharmaceuticals, aviation, tourism, and food.

400 **2.5 Sharing of Information**

401 The indicator of willingness to share information included shared knowledge on market prices for
402 agricultural products, developments in agricultural technology, and detailed information on
403 government policies related to the pandemic. For information-sharing indicators, respondents from
404 rural areas who answered “high” and “very high” was 56.8%. Meanwhile, for the same indicator, it
405 only reached 35.7% for respondents from urban communities. This is understandable considering that
406 in rural communities dominated by agricultural activities, the need for sharing information should be
407 much higher than in urban communities. The tradition of informing each other about the process and
408 means of production and marketing of agricultural products has been long-established and is not
409 easily influenced by external factors. From the results of this study, for example, the existence of a
410 pandemic did not dampen the enthusiasm and motivation of farmers and other rural residents to keep
411 sharing information. The solidarity of rural residents that has been built over the many generation is
412 also useful for sharing current information related to the pandemic and to associated government
413 policies. According to Jamal et al. (2009), other factors that influence sharing include the availability
414 of information in the form of brochures and other educational materials about health protocols and
415 the extent of publicity about the threat and impact of Covid-19 in the community.

416 **2.6 Number exposed to Covid-19 on Lombok Island**

417 The next part of this article is related to the number of those exposed to Covid-19. From the data
418 released by the West Nusa Tenggara Province Covid-19 Task Force, until the end of 2021, when this
419 research was conducted, the number of those exposed can be seen in Table 3. This is in line with the
420 data released by the National Covid-19 Task Force (Nugraheny, 2020), which are categorized as
421 rural areas (rural) are those who come from the regency area. In comparison, those from the ³
422 municipality are categorized as cities (urban). Comparison of data in rural areas and urban areas can
423 be seen in Table 3.

424

<Table 3>

425 Lombok Island is an area in Indonesia with a relatively high population exposed to Covid-19,
426 including the number who died. From the data in Table 2, it can be concluded that the number and
427 percentage exposed in rural areas are relatively higher compared to those in urban areas. From the
428 percentage level, it can be concluded that the difference between rural and urban areas is quite
429 significant (41% and 59%). However, from the fatality rate, the percentage in rural areas is lower
430 than in urban areas (3.49% and 3.79%).

431 3 Discussion

432 Durkheim viewed changes wrought by the industrial revolution in Europe as a reference for
433 understanding differences between more traditional societies and those that were industrializing
434 (Albrow, 2013; Hanifah, 2019). Durkheim (2019) explained that social solidarity is a state of the
435 relationship between individuals or groups based on shared morals and beliefs and that is
436 strengthened by shared emotional experiences. In line with changes in interaction patterns that occur
437 due to the pandemic, it will also encourage the escalation of cooperation. People living in
438 communities of different sizes will work more hand-in-hand in planning and overcoming phenomena
439 like pandemics.

440 The five indicators measured in this study (*gotong royong*, enthusiasm for marriage *banjars*,
441 cooperation, willingness to help each other, and sharing of information among residents), show that
442 social solidarity in rural and urban areas on Lombok Island is relatively different. The five indicators
443 can be divided into three types in order to clarify the discussion. The first type is related to *gotong*
444 *royong* and marriage *banjar*, which can be described as community-based social activities and events
445 (local social gatherings). Based on the analysis and description above (Table 2), we see that social
446 solidarity in terms of indicators of social solidarity is significantly different between those living in
447 villages compared to those in the city. This reality implies that various social and cultural activities
448 that provide opportunities for people to gather in rural areas were still carried out, despite advice to
449 the contrary by governmental entities (Derung 2019). On the other hand, in urban areas, cooperation
450 as an indicator of social solidarity was weaker. According to Muqsith et al. (2021), this situation is
451 because urban people's awareness and understanding of the dangers of Covid-19 was higher than
452 rural people. Weaker law enforcement against health protocol violations in rural areas was another
453 contributing factor that enables their ability to sustain cooperative activities during the pandemic.

454 The second type is mutually beneficial cooperation, a combination of a willingness to cooperate and
455 a desire to help others during a pandemic. From the analysis described previously, it can be
456 concluded that there were significant differences between rural areas and urban areas. This
457 conclusion implies that the behaviour of people in village communities in terms of working together
458 and helping others during the pandemic has not changed much, or not at all. In other words, the
459 existence of a pandemic, along with various government policies, does not dampen people's
460 enthusiasm in rural areas to work together and to help each other, maintaining the social solidarity of
461 rural communities despite the challenges of COVID and preventive measures. A campaign by fellow
462 citizens to comply with the health protocols is a form of citizen effort to jointly fight this Covid-19
463 (Szczesniak et al., 2020; Gunasekaran et al., 2020). According to research by Meinzen-Dick (2020)
464 and Valeriani et al. (2020), this social solidarity is indispensable in dealing with a pandemic. With
465 high solidarity, many community members have become very helpful in overcoming the various
466 problems they face, both in terms of their health and the economy. Even in Canada, as reported by

467 the results of a study by Smythe et al. (2021), with high social solidarity, problems in the education
468 sector that were severely affected by this pandemic can then be resolved.

469 The dilemma that has become the subject of discussion in this research is that the government hopes
470 that the public will comply with the health protocol rules to prevent the spread of the Covid-19 virus
471 quickly. Meanwhile, health protocols, such as maintaining distance and limiting direct contact cause
472 social solidarity in society to decline, as evidenced by this study, occurs more in urban areas than in
473 rural areas. In their article on social solidarity in the pandemic era, Haryadi and Malitasari (2020)
474 stated that this sense of solidarity arises because of empathy for those infected by the Covid-19
475 virus. The community also appreciates community groups who take the initiative to assist others,
476 especially those who are less fortunate. According to researchers (Mishra and Rath, 2020; Sayuti,
477 2020), the goal is to increase the community's resilience in facing this pandemic. With the high level
478 of community resilience, the level of community exposure to Covid-19 will also be lower. The
479 higher level of solidarity in rural communities compared to urban areas can be thought to be a
480 contributing factor to the lower death rate of those in rural areas compared to those in urban areas
481 (Table 3). With higher solidarity, efforts to prevent deaths from exposure to Covid-19 can be
482 reduced.

483 The third type of indicator of social solidarity is the sharing of information. This information-sharing
484 activity is a strong indicator of solidarity because it involves at least two aspects. The first aspect is
485 how people are affected by the pandemic when they have to disseminate information to others on a
486 day-to-day living. For example, farmers sharing of information about production facilities and market
487 prices is very important and affects their economic well-being. This traditional pattern of information
488 exchange was continued and even improved in order to disseminate information related to the
489 pandemic (Sayuti and Hidayati, 2021). As described previously, the information-sharing systems that
490 are part of the social fabric of agricultural communities can be utilized to monitor the spread of
491 Covid-19 and how to avoid catching COVID, and to treat COVID symptoms if it is acquired.
492 Second, how people can take advantage of existing technology to share of information during a
493 pandemic without reducing the sense of social solidarity among each other becomes a challenge for
494 health care and prevention initiatives by health care organizations and various governmental
495 agencies. According to Muqsith et al. (2021), this information technology is an alternative means that
496 is quite effective for communication between residents because of the prohibitions on leaving the
497 house. **Based on the results of this study, it can be concluded that** during the pandemic period, there
498 were significant differences between rural and urban areas. Specifically, the results show that the
499 pandemic has affected information sharing activities more so in urban areas than in rural localities.
500 Activities usually carried out directly to and from other community members are limited because
501 urban residents generally adhered to the health protocols more so than people living in rural
502 communities. This means that they keep their distance and avoid crowds as stipulated by the
503 government. According to Zahri et al. (2018), people living in urban communities use various social
504 media to stay in touch and share of information.

505 Meanwhile, information-sharing type activities still rely on direct relationships and interactions in
506 rural communities more so than in urban communities. Rural communities tend to be more
507 homogeneous than urban communities and rely on primary-type relationships (i.e., mostly face-to-
508 face) as the basis for the glue of their mechanical social solidarity. The economic needs of rural
509 communities on islands like Lombok are highly dependent on the agricultural sector, while urban
510 neighbourhoods with more diverse economies tend to be heterogeneous, with communication based
511 on the expertise of the person with whom information is exchanged. Hence, in urban areas that

512 display higher levels of organic solidarity, the pandemic more likely disrupts information-sharing
513 because of the health protocols that the government can more readily enforce in a strict manner.

514 The need for rural communities to share their resources reflects the pandemic's impact, which then
515 results in greater income inequality, a widening health crises, and ultimately causing limited access to
516 economic opportunities beyond agriculture. Physical distance restrictions on all indicators of social
517 solidarity are translations for the ways people conduct their lives on a day-to-day basis (Paskov and
518 Dewilde, 2012). The findings of this study provide important information regarding the
519 characteristics of rural social solidarity, which are relatively different from the character of social
520 solidarity in urban areas during the pandemic. Whether these findings will also occur when the
521 pandemic has passed, will require further study, shedding light not only on how to respond to
522 pandemics, but on the fundamental sociological character of rural and urban communities in
523 contemporary times.

524 **4.1. Implications for future policies**

525 The occurrence of a worldwide pandemic affecting every community on earth has shown how
526 geographical distances are becoming less relevant and the shadow of globalization shows us the
527 reflection of its impact on the daily lives of people everywhere (Mas-Coma et al., 2020; Osotimehin
528 and Popov, 2020). The pandemic also shows both communal and individual expressions of social
529 solidarity among members of both rural and urban communities. In line with Reichlin's (2011) view,
530 social solidarity has the potential to unite universal morality to the needs of humanity. Both
531 Durkheim's and Weber's reflection on social solidarity refers to the intimacy of a community group
532 with its members and vice versa (Johnson, 1994; Ritzer, 2012). The emphasis of this argument lies
533 on social cohesion, which is fostered using collective values. The findings from this study open up
534 more critical questions for future policy development in at least two main areas, namely health and
535 the economy. The health crisis has disrupted economic activities, becoming the basis for evidence of
536 how inequality is expressed in rural and urban communities.

537 From a policy-making point of view, Durkheim emphasized the importance of law as a guiding
538 compass for constructing social solidarity. Classification of law in Durkheim's view is divided into
539 repressive and restitutive. The repressive rule refers to collective sanctions, while restitutive is
540 attached to sanctions for violations. From a health perspective, preventing the spread of the epidemic
541 using both methods is still relevant for Covid-19 (Gisher and Wilder-Smith, 2020; Tiffany, 2020).
542 Various policies that insulate physical and social distance to mitigate the spread of Covid-19, such as
543 the analysis in this study, shows that normative and affective compliance have not been clearly
544 defined. Physical and social distancing based on government regulations is likely to be more
545 inconsistent with the social solidarity of rural people than urban people, that is, requires a bigger
546 adjustment to their lifestyles. Hence, social solidarity in this study plays a vital role as a scientific
547 basis for further empirically based studies on social resilience and the fine-tuning of policy agendas.
548 From this viewpoint, it can be seen that policies implemented in urban areas cannot necessarily be
549 applied to people in rural areas in the same manner. Indeed, local context will influence the
550 effectiveness of policies related to health and many other areas as well.

551 The future challenge is formulating inclusive but effective policies amidst the diversity of forms of
552 social solidarity found in rural and urban settings. Furthermore, how is the communication strategy
553 regarding the substance of the approach taken so that it can be implemented by all community
554 members, both those who live in rural and those who reside in urban areas? From this research, it can
555 be seen that not all existing policies can be implemented. The policy of social distancing, for

556 example, is more difficult to implement in rural areas. Hence, this and other restrictions where the
557 policy does not pay attention to the location of implementation will less likely be successful. Policies
558 between rural and urban areas are generally not differentiated. Therefore, a location-specific policy
559 formulation is needed so that if there is a failure in its implementation, the improvement of the
560 formulation is also location-based (Sayuti et al. 2021). This means that we should not assume the
561 conditions of one community are the same as another, whose socio-cultural patterns may be different.
562 People in rural areas with greater mechanical solidarity and urban communities with greater organic
563 social solidarity should receive locality-adjusted treatments because their needs and demands are also
564 distinctive.

565 What is needed is collective awareness from various levels of society without exception, including
566 policymakers in the government. The rural-urban differences in social solidarity require more in-
567 depth research. One way to go about this kind of research is to ask how social solidarity at different
568 kinds of places is influenced by and in turn influence things like a Covid-19 Pandemic? This
569 research provides only a glimpse at the ways the context of local places can affect the
570 implementation of various policies during a pandemic so that they can be improved. The number of
571 exposed and the rate of mortality could be minimized if the policies were more locality-oriented, and
572 not simply one-size-fits-all guidelines applied uniformly and often ineffectively to diverse places.

573 **4 Conclusion**

574 This research found that ²the existence of social solidarity in both rural and urban communities during
575 the pandemic. The level of social solidarity in rural areas is higher than in urban areas. While related
576 to the number of those who were exposed and died, from the data released by the Provincial Covid
577 Task Force, conditions were higher in rural areas compared to the number of those who were exposed
578 or who died in urban areas. However, in terms of the death rate, the level of death rate in urban areas
579 is higher than in rural areas. This condition indicates differences in the characteristics of rural and
580 urban communities, which can be considered in implementing policies during a future pandemic.
581 This research provides evidence for local governments in formulating policies with a social solidarity
582 perspective by taking into account the different characteristics of rural and urban communities.

583 The existence of the Covid-19 pandemic that has occurred in almost all countries has raised
584 awareness that their level of resilience, in terms of such sociological dynamics as social solidarity, is
585 variable. When dealing with this pandemic, attitudes or behaviours also vary according to their
586 educational, socio-cultural background, and especially the area where they live. Therefore, by the
587 findings of this study, we can suggest several things. First, public awareness must be improved that
588 social solidarity must still be maintained in the face of the Covid-19 pandemic. The second
589 suggestion is that policies related to the pandemic or other procedures in dealing with extraordinary
590 phenomena like this must pay attention to the socio-cultural character and the location of the
591 community's residents. The third suggestion is related to further research. Research on social
592 solidarity needs to be repeated in the post-pandemic period. It is necessary to know whether the
593 current study results are different or will remain the same when the research is carried out after the
594 pandemic no longer exists.

595 **4.2 Permission to reuse and Copyright**

596 Third-party figure material in this work is used in a fair way, and the copyright holders have noted, it
597 "Can be used for the creative projects." in their website Therefore, third-party figure material can be
598 used without requiring certain permissions.

599 **5 Conflict of Interest**

600 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial
601 relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

602 **6 Author Contributions**

603 "RHS, MT, and MZM contributed to conception and design of the study. SAH organized the
604 database and performed the statistical analysis. RHS wrote the first draft of the manuscript. AE wrote
605 sections of the manuscript. All authors contributed to manuscript revision, read, and approved the
606 submitted version."

607 **7 Funding**

608 There is no funding for this work.

609 **8 Data Availability Statement**

610 The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/supplementary material,
611 further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

612 **9 Acknowledgments**

613 The authors are very grateful to Prof. Joseph F. Donnermeyer of The Ohio State University who has
614 provided many valuable inputs to improve this article. Also, thanks and appreciation to Dr. Dewi
615 Satria Elminana from the English Department, who has agreed to proofread this manuscript.

616 **References**

- 617 Abedi, V., Olulana, O., Avula, V., Chaudhary, D., Khan, A., Shahjouei, S., and Zand, R. (2021).
618 Racial, economic, and health inequality and COVID-19 infection in the United States. *Journal of*
619 *racial and ethnic health disparities*, 8, 732-742.
- 620 Agung, I. M. (2020). *Memahami Pandemi COVID-19 dalam Perspektif Psikologi Sosial*
621 [Understanding COVID-19 Pandemic from Social Psychology Perspectives]. *Psikobuletin: Buletin*
622 *Ilmiah Psikologi*, 1(2), 68-84. <https://doi.org/10.24014/pib.v1i2.9616>
- 623 Alam, G. Z. (2021). Does online technology provide sustainable HE or aggravate diploma disease?
624 Evidence from Bangladesh—a comparison of conditions before and during COVID-19. *Technology*
625 *in Society*, 66 (2021) 101677 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2021.101677>
- 626 Albrow, M. (2013). *Sociology: the basics*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203449189>
- 627 Alexander, J. C., and Smith, P. (Eds.). (2008). *The Cambridge Companion to Durkheim*. Cambridge
628 University Press.
- 629 Alfirdaus, Hiariej, E., and Adeney-Risakotta, F. (2015). Theories of Social Solidarity in The
630 Situations of (Natural) Disasters. *POLITIKA*, Vol. 6, No.1, April 2015.
631 <https://ejournal.undip.ac.id/index.php/politika/article/view/9811>

- 632 Angaw, K. W. (2021). Policy responses and social solidarity imperatives to respond the COVID-19
633 pandemic socioeconomic crises in Ethiopia. *ClinicoEconomics and Outcomes Research*, 279-287.
- 634 Baraka, N. M. (2021). *The Role of Social Capital in Social Solidarity Initiatives During the Covid-
635 19 Pandemic in Egypt* (Doctoral dissertation, The American University in Cairo).
- 636 Barneveld, K. V., Quinlan, M., Kriesler, P., Junor, A., Baum, F., Chowdhury, A., Junankar, P. N.,
637 Clibborn, S., Flanagan, F., and Wright, C. F. (2020). The COVID-19 Pandemic: Lessons on building
638 more equal and sustainable societies. *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, 31(2), 133–157.
639 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1035304620927107>
- 640 Berman, Y. and Philips, D. (2004, June 10). Indicators for Social Cohesion. *Social Quality*.
641 <https://www.socialquality.org/wp-content/uploads/import/2014/10/Indicators-June-2004.pdf>
- 642 Brown, P. (2020). Interpersonal solidarity and the spread of COVID-19. *Joint Economic Committee*.
643 [https://www.jec.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/republicans/analysis?ID=AD81A492-AEDD-419A-
644 8B25-7F2AB2620BCA](https://www.jec.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/republicans/analysis?ID=AD81A492-AEDD-419A-8B25-7F2AB2620BCA).
- 645 Carter, E. D., and Cordero, M. L. (2022). Salir Adelante: Social capital and resilience during the
646 Covid-19 pandemic in Argentina. *Health & Place*, 77, 102870.
- 647 Chan, H. Y. (2021). Mental wellbeing in a pandemic: the role of solidarity and care. *Public Health
648 Ethics*, 14(1), 47-58. <https://doi.org/10.1093/phe/phab005>.
- 649 Chen, J. T., and Krieger, N. (2021). Revealing the unequal burden of COVID-19 by income,
650 race/ethnicity, and household crowding: US county versus zip code analyses. *Journal of Public
651 Health Management and Practice*, 27(1), S43-S56.
- 652 Cho, I., Daley, R. T., Cunningham, T. J., Kensinger, E. A., and Gutchess, A. (2021). Aging, empathy,
653 and prosocial behaviors during the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Journals of Gerontology:
654 Psychological Sciences*, 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbab140>
- 655 Derung, T. N. (2019). Gotong Royong and Indonesia. *SAPA-Jurnal Kateketik dan Pastoral*, 4(1), 5-
656 13. <https://doi.org/10.53544/sapa.v4i1.62>
- 657 Douwes, R., Stuttaford, M., and London, L. (2018). Social solidarity, human rights, and collective
658 action: Considerations in the implementation of the National Health Insurance in South Africa.
659 *Health and Human Rights Journal*. [https://www.hhrjournal.org/2018/10/social-
660 rights-and-collective-action-considerations-in-the-implementation-of-
661 the-national-health-insurance-
in-south-africa/#_edn15](https://www.hhrjournal.org/2018/10/social-solidarity-human-rights-and-collective-action-considerations-in-the-implementation-of-the-national-health-insurance-in-south-africa/#_edn15)
- 662 Durkheim, E. (2019). The division of labor in society. In David B. Grusky (Ed.). *Social
663 stratification* (pp. 178-183). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429306419>
- 664 Durkheim, É. (1984), *The division of labour in society*, translated by WD Halls, Macmillan,
665 Hampshire.
- 666 Durkheim, É. (1912), *The elementary forms of religious life*, The Free Press, New York.

- 667 Egcas, R. A., Oducado, R. M. F., Visperas, J., Cleofas, J. S. R., and Lausa, S. M. (2021). After Over
668 a Year of Pandemic: Mental Well-being and Life Satisfaction of Filipino College Students. *Pertanika*
669 *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 29(4). <https://doi.org/10.47836/pjssh.29.4.17>
- 670 Fisher, D., and Wilder-Smith, A. (2020). The global community needs to swiftly ramp up the
671 response to contain COVID-19. *Lancet (London, England)*, 395(10230), 1109.
672 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30679-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30679-6)
- 673 Gostin, L. O., and Hodge, J. G. (2020). US emergency legal responses to novel coronavirus:
674 balancing public health and civil liberties. *Jama*, 323(12), 1131–1132.
675 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.2025>
- 676 Gunasekaran, G. H., Gunasekaran, S. S., Gunasekaran, S. S., Zaimi, N. S. I. B., and Halim, N. A. B.
677 A. (2020). Prevalence of facemask use among general public when visiting wet market during Covid-
678 19 pandemic: An observational study. medRxiv. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.17.20105023>
- 679 Hanif, M. (2021). *Kearifan lokal masyarakat kabupaten madiun dalam menyikapi pandemi Covid-*
680 *19*. [Local wisdom of Madiun Regency Community in facing Covid-19 pandemic]. *Jurnal*
681 *Antropologi: Isu-Isu Sosial Budaya*, 23(1), 27–36. [https://doi.org/10.25077/jantro.v23.n1.p27-](https://doi.org/10.25077/jantro.v23.n1.p27-36.2021)
682 [36.2021](https://doi.org/10.25077/jantro.v23.n1.p27-36.2021)
- 683 Hanifah, U. (2019). *Transformasi Sosial Masyarakat Samin Di Bojonegoro: Analisis Perubahan*
684 *Sosial dalam Pembagian Kerja dan Solidaritas Sosial Emile Durkheim* [Social Transformation of
685 Samin Community at Bojonegoro - A social change analysis in Division of Labor and Social
686 Solidarity of Emile Durkheim]. *Jurnal Sosiologi Agama*, 13(1), 41–71.
687 <https://doi.org/10.14421/jsa.2019.131-02>
- 688 Haryadi, D., and Malitasari, D. N. (2020). Solidarity During Covid-19 Pandemic (a Case Study on
689 the Social Action of Yogyakarta Food Solidarity and the Interfaith Network for Covid-19 Response).
690 *Jurnal Partisipatoris*, 2(2), 58-74. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jp.v2i2.12849>
- 691 Hosseinzadeh, P., Zareipour, M., Baljani, E., and Moradali, M. R. (2022). Social Consequences of
692 the COVID-19 Pandemic. A Systematic Review. *Investigación y Educación en Enfermería*, 40(1).
693 <https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.iee.v40n1e10>.
- 694 Ilham, I., Renyaan, D., Sapioper, H. C. M., and Yumame, J. (2021). *Edukasi Membudayakan*
695 *Protokol Kesehatan Pada Masa Pandemi Covid-19 Di Kampung Yobeh Distrik Sentani Kabupaten*
696 *Jayapura* [Educating and socializing of health protocols during Covid-19 pandemic in Yobeh
697 Village, Sentani Distric, Jayapura Regency]. *JMM (Jurnal Masyarakat Mandiri)*, 5(1), 12–23.
698 <https://doi.org/10.31764/jmm.v5i1.3186>
- 699 Jamal, A., McKenzie, K., and Clark, M. (2009). The impact of health information technology on the
700 quality of medical and health care: a systematic review. *Health Information Management Journal*,
701 38(3), 26–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/183335830903800305>
- 702 Johnson, D. P. (1994). Teori Sosiologi Klasik Modern [Modern Classical Sociological
703 Theory]. *Jakarta: Gramedia*.

- 704 Kaup, T., Schweda, A., Krakowczyk, J., Dinse, H., Skoda, E. M., Teufel, M., and Bäuerle, A. (2022).
 705 Levels, Predictors, and Distribution of Interpersonal Solidarity during the COVID-19
 706 Pandemic. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(4), 2041.
- 707 Kittel, B., Kritzinger, S., Boomgaarden, H., Prainsack, B., Eberl, J. M., Kalleitner, F., ... and Schlogl,
 708 L. (2021). The Austrian Corona Panel Project: monitoring individual and societal dynamics amidst
 709 the COVID-19 crisis. *European Political Science*, 20(2), 318-344.
- 710 Larsen, J. R. K. (2013). Family flow: The pleasures of “being together” in a holiday home.
 711 *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 13(3), 153–174.
 712 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2013.808523>
- 713 Li, T. M. (2012). *The Will to Improve: Perencanaan, Kekuasaan, dan Pembangunan di Indonesia*
 714 [The Will to Improve: Planning, Power, and Development in Indonesia]. Marjin Kiri.
- 715 Lupton, D., and Willis, K. (2021). The COVID-19 crisis. *Social Perspectives*. Routledge.
 716 <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003111344>
- 717 Malatzky, C., Gillespie, J., Couch, D. L., and Cosgrave, C. (2020). Why place matters: A rurally-
 718 oriented analysis of COVID-19’s differential impacts. *Social Sciences and Humanities Open*, 2.
 719 <http://www.elsevier.com/locate/ssaho> <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2020.100063>
- 720 Mas-Coma, S., Jones, M. K., and Marty, A. M. (2020). COVID-19 and globalization. *One Health*, 9.
 721 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.onehlt.2020.100132>
- 722 Meinzen-Dick, R. (2020). Collective action and “social distancing” in COVID-19 responses.
 723 *Agriculture and Human Values*, 37(3), 649-650. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-020-10100-1>
- 724 Mishra, C., and Rath, N. (2020). Social solidarity during a pandemic: Through and beyond
 725 Durkheimian Lens. *Social Sciences and Humanities Open*, 2(1), 100079.
 726 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2020.100079>
- 727 Muq̄sith, M. A., Pratomo, R. R., Kuswanti, A., and Muzykant, V. L. (2021). Social solidarity
 728 movement to prevent the spread of COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia. *Masyarakat, Kebudayaan dan*
 729 *Politik*, 34(2), 147-158. <https://doi.org/10.20473/mkp.V34I22021.147-158>
- 730 Mustafa, H., Mukhiar, S. N. S., Jamaludin, S. S. S., and Jais, N. M. (2021). Covid-19 and Collective
 731 Memory Among Malaysians: Does Generation Matter? *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and*
 732 *Humanities*, 29(4). <https://doi.org/10.47836/pjssh.29.4.15>
- 733 Negură, P., Gaşper, L., and Potoroacă, M. (2021). Trust in institutions, social solidarity, and the
 734 perception of social cohesion in the Republic of Moldova in the early phase of the COVID-19
 735 pandemic. *Comparative Southeast European Studies*, 69(4), 453-481. <https://doi.org/10.1515/soeu-2021-0034>
- 737 Nguyen, V. K. L., Le, T. M. H., Tran, T. M. C., Le, T. T. H., Duong, T. N. M., Le, T. H., Nguyen, T.
 738 S., and Vo, N. H. (2021). Exploring the Impact of Pandemic on Global Economy: Perspective from
 739 Literature Review. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 2033–2087.
 740 <https://doi.org/10.47836/pjssh.29.3.29>

- 741 NTB Central Bureau of Statistics. (2020). *Update Terakhir Covid-19 31 Maret 2020* [Last update
742 COVID-19 March 31, 2020]. [https://corona.ntbprov.go.id/data/326dff40-733a-11ea-8688-
743 45943a6a7179/show](https://corona.ntbprov.go.id/data/326dff40-733a-11ea-8688-45943a6a7179/show).
- 744 Nugraheny, D. E. (2020, Agustus 27). *Tren Kasus Covid-19 di Kota, Desa, dan Perbandingannya
745 dengan Data Dunia* [Covid-19 Case Trend in Cities, Villages, and its comparation]. *Kompas.com*.
746 [https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2020/08/27/07105681/tren-kasus-Covid-19-di-kota-desa-dan-
747 perbandingannya-dengan-data-dunia?page=all](https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2020/08/27/07105681/tren-kasus-Covid-19-di-kota-desa-dan-perbandingannya-dengan-data-dunia?page=all).
- 748 Osotimehin, S., and Popov, L. (2020). *Sectoral Impact of COVID-19: Cascading Risks*. Federal
749 Reserve Bank of Minneapolis. <https://doi.org/10.21034/iwp.31>
- 750 Paskov, M., and Dewilde, C. (2012). Income inequality and solidarity in Europe. *Research in Social
751 Stratification and Mobility*, 30(4), 415–432. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2012.06.002>
- 752 Prainsack, B. (2020). Solidarity in times of pandemics. *Democratic theory*, 7(2), 124-133.
- 753 Primadata, A. P., Yamin, M., Wardhianna, S., Sutoyo, I. S., Kurniawan, A., and Permata, F. C.
754 (2023). Social Capital For Rural Community During the Covid-19 Pandemic in Banyumas
755 Regency. *KnE Social Sciences*, 456-467.
- 756 Reichlin, M. (2011). The role of solidarity in social responsibility for health. *Medicine, Health Care
757 and Philosophy*, 14(4), 365–370. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11019-011-9320-5>
- 758 Ritzer, G. (2012). *Teori Sosiologi: Dari Teori Klasik Sampai Perkembangan Mutakhir Teori Sosial
759 Postmodern* [Sociology Theory (From Classical Theories to Updated Development of Social
760 Postmodern Theories)]. Kreasi Wacana
- 761 Rofieq, A., Rahayu, S. D., Sulastri, S., Supriyatno, Y., and Kuswandi, A. (2022, January). Social
762 Capital in Dealing the COVID-19 Pandemic. In *2nd International Conference on Social Science,
763 Humanities, Education and Society Development (ICONS 2021)* (pp. 208-211). Atlantis Press.
- 764 Sarker, M., Moktadir, M., and Santibanez-Gonzalez, E. D. R. (2021). Social Sustainability
765 Challenges Towards Flexible Supply Chain Management: Post-COVID-19 Perspective. *Global
766 Journal of Flexible Systems Management*, 22(2), 199–218. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s40171-021-
767 00289-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40171-021-00289-3)
- 768 Sayuti, R. H. (2020). *Dampak Pandemi Covid-19 Terhadap Ekonomi Masyarakat di Nusa Tenggara
769 Barat* [Covid-19 Pandemic Impact on community economy in West Nusa Tenggara]. *Jurnal
770 RESIPROKAL*, 2(2), 133-150. <https://doi.org/10.29303/resiprokal.v2i2.46>
- 771 Sayuti, R., and Hidayati, S. A. (2021). Influence of Pandemic Covid-19 on Small Business Enterprise
772 in West Nusa Tenggara Province. *Proceedings of the 2nd Annual Conference on Education and
773 Social Science (ACCESS 2020)*. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*,
774 556. Atlantis Press.
- 775 Sayuti, R. H., Inderasari, O. P., and Evendi, A. (2021). The Influence of Education and Local Culture
776 on Community Preparedness in Facing Disasters. *Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengkajian Ilmu Pendidikan:
777 e-Saintika*. 5(1). <https://journal-center.litpam.com/index.php/e-Saintika/index>

- 778 Sayuti, R., and Taqiuddin, M. (2020). *Analisis Kinerja Sektor Pertanian Dalam Upaya Pengentasan*
779 *Kemiskinan Di Nusa Tenggara Barat Pada Periode 2008-2018* [Analysis of Agricultural Sector
780 Performance in Poverty Alleviation in West Nusa Tenggara Province 2008-2018]. *Jurnal Agroteksos*,
781 30(1). <https://doi.org/10.29303/agroteksos.v30i1.589>
- 782 Sharpe, D. (2015). Chi-square test is statistically significant: Now what? *Practical Assessment,*
783 *Research, and Evaluation*, 20(1), 8. <https://doi.org/10.7275/tbfa-x148>
- 784 Sin, N. L., Klaiber, P., Wen, J. H., and DeLongis, A. (2021). Helping amid the pandemic: Daily
785 affective and social implications of COVID-19-related prosocial activities. *Gerontologist*, 61(1), 59–
786 70. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnaa140>
- 787 SMERU. (2022, February 14). Socioeconomic Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Households in
788 Indonesia: Three Rounds of Monitoring Surveys. *SMERU Research Institute*.
789 <https://smeru.or.id/en/publication/socioeconomic-impact-Covid-19-pandemic-households-indonesia-three-rounds-monitoring>
- 791 Smythe, S., Wilbur, A., and Hunter, E. (2021). Inventive pedagogies and social solidarity: The work
792 of community-based adult educators during COVID-19 in British Columbia, Canada. *International*
793 *Review of Education*, 67(1), 9-29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-021-09882-1>
- 794 Stok, F.M., M. Bal, M.A Yerkes, and J.B.F de Wit. 2021. Social Inequality and Solidarity in Times
795 of COVID-19. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 2021, 18, 6339.
796 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18126339>
- 797 Sugiyono, M. (2012). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Kombinasi* [Research Methods
798 for Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mix]. Alfabeta.
- 799 Suryahadi, A., Al Izzati, R., and Suryadarma, D. (2020). Estimating the impact of Covid-19 on
800 poverty in Indonesia. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, 56(2), 175–192.
801 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00074918.2020.1779390>
- 802 Szczesniak, D., Ciulkowicz, M., Maciaszek, J., Misiak, B., Luc, D., Wieczorek, T., ... and
803 Rymaszewska, J. (2020). Psychopathological responses and face mask restrictions during the
804 COVID-19 outbreak: Results from a nationwide survey. *Brain, behavior, and immunity*, 87, 161.
805 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2020.05.027>
- 806 Taliép, N., Ismail, G., Swart, L. A., Van Niekerk, A., and Seedat, M. (2022). Socioeconomic and
807 psychosocial factors associated with solidarity and prosociality during Covid-19. *Community*
808 *Psychology in Global Perspective*, 9(1), 20-44.
- 809 Taliép, N., Ismail, G., Bulbulia, S., and Louw, S. (2021). Stimulating and building compassionate
810 and humanising networks for promoting sustainable safer and healthier communities: researcher
811 reflexivity on the local network of care (LNOC). *Community Psychology in Global Perspective*, 7(1),
812 54-70. <https://doi.org/10.1285/i24212113v7i1p54>
- 813 Tatarko, A., Jurcik, T., and Boehnke, K. (2022). Social capital and the COVID-19 pandemic threat:
814 The Russian experience. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 7. doi: 10.3389/fsoc.2022.957215

- 815 Taylor, S. (2019). *The Psychology of Pandemics: Preparing for the Next Global Outbreak of*
816 *Infectious Disease*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- 817 The UN. (2020). United Nations Launches Framework to Speed Up Progress on Water and
818 Sanitation Goal. <https://www.un.org/press/en/2020/envdev2037.doc.htm>.
- 819 Tiffany, K. (2020, March 12). *The Dos and Don'ts of 'Social Distancing'*, *The Atlantic*.
820 [https://www.theatlantic.com/family/archive/2020/03/coronavirus-what-does-social-distancing-](https://www.theatlantic.com/family/archive/2020/03/coronavirus-what-does-social-distancing-mean/607927/)
821 [mean/607927/](https://www.theatlantic.com/family/archive/2020/03/coronavirus-what-does-social-distancing-mean/607927/)
- 822 Tomasini, F. (2020). Solidarity in the time of COVID-19?. *Cambridge Quarterly Healthcare Ethics*,
823 *30*(2), 234-247. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963180120000791>
- 824 Valeriani, G., Sarajlic Vukovic, I., Lindegaard, T., Felizia, R., Mollica, R., and Andersson, G. (2020,
825 December). Addressing healthcare gaps in Sweden during the COVID-19 outbreak: on community
826 outreach and empowering ethnic minority groups in a digitalized context. In *Healthcare* (Vol. 8, No.
827 4, p. 445). Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare8040445>
- 828 West Nusa Tenggara Province Covid-19 Task Force (2022): *Press Release of Covid-19 in NTB*
829 *Province*. <https://corona.ntbprov.go.id>
- 830 Wong, A. S., & Kohler, J. C. (2020). Social capital and public health: responding to the COVID-19
831 pandemic. *Globalization and Health*, *16*, 1-4
- 832 Yu, M., Li, Z., Yu, Z., He, J., and Zhou, J. (2021). Communication related health crisis on social
833 media: a case of COVID-19 outbreak. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *24*(19), 2699–2705.
834 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2020.1752632>
- 835 Zahri, T. A., Lubis, P. H., and Ahrom, S. (2018). The relationship between Islamic youth and social
836 media in building social solidarity. *Jurnal Literasiologi*, *1*(2), 13-13.
837 <https://doi.org/10.47783/literasiologi.v1i2.30>.

Impact of Covid-19 Pandemic on the Existence of Social Solidarity: Evidence from Rural-Urban Communities in Lombok Island, Indonesia

ORIGINALITY REPORT

3%

SIMILARITY INDEX

3%

INTERNET SOURCES

2%

PUBLICATIONS

2%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	Submitted to Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpure Student Paper	1%
2	www.frontiersin.org Internet Source	1%
3	library.oapen.org Internet Source	1%
4	Qian Huang, Susan L. Cutter. "Spatial-temporal differences of COVID-19 vaccinations in the U.S.", Urban Informatics, 2022 Publication	1%
5	journal.unismuh.ac.id Internet Source	1%

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches < 1%

Exclude bibliography On