Household Resilience in Rural and Urban Societies: A Sociological-Anthropological Perspective
Ketahanan Rumah Tangga dalam Masyarakat Desa dan Kota: Perspektif Sosiologi-Antropologi

Opik Rozikin[1], Oyo Sunaryo Mukhlas[2], Beni Ahmad Saebani[3]
[123]Pascasarjana UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia
Email: opikrozikin@uinsgd.ac.id

Abstract
This paper examines the sociological and anthropological perspectives on household resilience in rural and urban communities. This research is grounded in significant social change, where values and social structure shifts impact how individuals and families sustain their existence. This study aims to understand how sociocultural factors influence household resilience strategies and compare the differences and similarities between rural and urban communities in this context. The methods used include literature studies. The theoretical framework for this research encompasses social structure theory, social network theory, and anthropological approaches that emphasize an in-depth understanding of cultural practices. The discussion results indicate that rural communities rely on community solidarity and tradition in building household resilience, whereas urban communities prioritize individualistic social networks. The implications of this research provide insights for policymakers and social practitioners in designing more effective intervention programs to enhance household resilience, considering each community's unique characteristics. This study is expected to contribute to the further development of research in the fields of sociology and anthropology, as well as offer a new perspective on understanding social dynamics in Indonesia.

Keywords: Household Resilience; Rural Communities; Urban Communities

Abstrak
Tulisan ini mengkaji perspektif sosiologi dan antropologi tentang ketahanan rumah tangga di masyarakat desa dan kota. Penelitian ini dilandasi oleh fenomena perubahan sosial yang signifikan, di mana pergeseran nilai dan struktur sosial berimplikasi pada cara individu dan keluarga mempertahankan eksistensinya. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk memahami bagaimana faktor-faktor sosiokultural mempengaruhi strategi pertahanan rumah tangga, serta untuk membandingkan perbedaan dan persamaan antara masyarakat desa dan kota dalam konteks tersebut. Metode yang digunakan adalah studi literatur. Teori yang menjadi pijakan dalam penelitian ini mencakup teori struktur sosial, teori jaringan sosial, serta pendekatan antropologis yang menekankan pada pemahaman mendalam terhadap praktik budaya. Hasil pembahasan menunjukkan bahwa masyarakat desa cenderung mengandalkan solidaritas komunitas dan tradisi dalam membangun pertahanan rumah tangga, sedangkan masyarakat kota lebih mengutamakan jaringan sosial yang bersifat individualistik. Implikasi dari penelitian ini memberikan wawasan bagi pembuat kebijakan dan praktisi sosial dalam merancang program intervensi yang lebih efektif untuk meningkatkan ketahanan rumah tangga, dengan mempertimbangkan karakteristik unik dari masing-masing komunitas. Penelitian ini diharapkan dapat berkontribusi pada pengembangan kajian lebih lanjut dalam bidang sosiologi dan antropologi, serta memberikan perspektif baru dalam memahami dinamika sosial di Indonesia.

Kata Kunci: Ketahanan Rumah Tangga; Masyarakat Desa; Masyarakat Kota

INTRODUCTION

In an increasingly complex Indonesian society, household resilience has become an intriguing aspect of the study. Household resilience refers to the strategies and mechanisms individuals or families use to preserve their existence against various social, economic, or cultural threats. Understanding how households adapt and sustain themselves has become crucial amid rapid globalization and urbanization. One of the most evident phenomena is the shift in lifestyle patterns from rural to urban areas. Data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) shows that the proportion of the population residing in urban areas has steadily increased, from 30% in 1990 to over 56% in 2020 (BPS, 2021). This shift has significant implications for the social structure and values upheld by society. In rural areas, household resilience tends to be more collective and rooted in tradition, while in urban areas, household resilience is often more individualistic and pragmatic. Scientific evidence indicates that this social change affects not only the mindset but also the behavioral patterns of society. Research has shown that urban communities are more vulnerable to psychological pressures and economic instability (Watif et al., 2024). This impacts household resilience, which often has to rely on personal resources and more limited social networks compared to rural communities.

On the other hand, rural communities tend to have stronger social bonds. Research by Johnson (2020) shows that community solidarity in rural areas helps households navigate crises. This is evident in mutual assistance among neighbors and involvement in social activities (Johnson, 2020). Rural communities often rely on local wisdom and traditions to build resilience, contrasting with urban communities that depend more on technology and information. However, despite these significant differences, there are also similarities in household resilience strategies across both environments. Qingmu Su et al. (2022) mention that rural and urban communities face similar challenges, such as inflation, job layoffs, and health crises. Both groups must adapt quickly to maintain their quality of life (Su et al., 2022).

In this context, sociological and anthropological perspectives are highly relevant for understanding the dynamics of household resilience. Social structure theory and social network theory provide insights into how individuals and families interact and build resilience in the face of challenges. The anthropological approach is also essential for understanding household resilience practices' values and norms (Rizal, 2022). Data from national surveys show that 70% of rural households rely on income from agriculture, while in urban areas, 60% depend on the service sector (BPS, 2021). This indicates that reliance on economic resources plays a significant role in determining household resilience strategies. This view highlights that financial sustainability is key to household resilience in rural and urban contexts.

Cultural factors also play a significant role in household resilience. According to research by Kartika (2023), rural communities preserve traditions and local values, while urban communities are more open to change and innovation. This difference creates variation in how households respond to threats and challenges. Furthermore, the phenomena of modernization and globalization have had a profound impact on household life. Information technology, for example, has transformed the way people communicate and interact, influencing the social networks of individuals and families. This presents a particular challenge in maintaining household existence, especially in urban environments (Susanto, 2021).

Therefore, more targeted interventions can be designed to enhance communities' social and economic resilience by understanding the differences and similarities in household resilience. Programs supporting social networks and fostering economic capacity in rural and urban environments can provide significant benefits (Nasution, 2022). The novelty of this study lies in its comparative approach, which combines sociological and anthropological perspectives. By examining household resilience in both settings, this research aims to contribute to existing

literature and offer more contextually relevant and practical solutions for society. This study will serve as a foundation for further research on social dynamics in Indonesia.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Several studies relevant to this research have been identified, including the following: First, a study by Sari (2019), titled Social Change and Family Resilience in Rural Areas: A Case Study in Cinta Rakyat Village, examines how social changes due to urbanization impact family resilience in rural environments. This study reveals that cultural adaptation and the strategies employed by families in rural areas are strongly influenced by traditional values that remain deeply rooted. While this research provides valuable insights into family resilience in rural areas, its focus is limited to a single environment, without comparing it to urban contexts. As a result, it lacks a holistic understanding of household resilience within a broader social context. Second, Prasetyo's research, Household Resilience Dynamics in Urban Areas: A Case Study in Jakarta (Prasetyo, 2020), investigates the factors influencing household resilience in large cities. The findings of this study reveal that urban households heavily rely on social networks and economic support. However, this research focuses on a single location, Jakarta, and does not include comparisons with rural communities. This limits the generalization of the findings and overlooks the potential interactions between both environments in understanding household resilience.

Third, Widyastuti's study titled *Sociocultural and Family Resilience: A Sociological Perspective in Rural Communities* (Widyastuti, 2021) highlights the influence of cultural and social values on family resilience in rural areas. This research emphasizes the importance of community solidarity in helping families withstand various challenges. However, its focus on rural communities only does not provide a comprehensive view compared to urban societies. Given the importance of sociological and anthropological factors in a broader context, this results in an incomplete analysis. Fourth, Haryanto's research, Family Adaptation in Urban Areas: A Study on Household Resilience Strategies (Haryanto, 2022), explores various strategies urban families employ to survive social and economic challenges. The study finds that many urban households rely on more complex social networks and diverse economic resources. While these findings are important, the research does not discuss how these strategies compare to those employed in rural areas, thus lacking a deeper comparative perspective. Fifth, Iskandar's research, Social Resilience in Rural and Urban Communities: An Anthropological Review (Iskandar, 2023), analyzes social resilience in both environments. While this research provides valuable insights, it focuses primarily on anthropological aspects and does not profoundly address the sociological factors influencing household resilience. As a result, the study does not offer a balanced comparison between rural and urban areas, which could enrich the understanding of household resilience.

From the literature review above, it is evident that while several studies touch upon household resilience in rural and urban societies, many have limitations regarding location, approach, or focus. The proposed study aims to fill this gap with a comparative approach that integrates sociological and anthropological perspectives, providing a more comprehensive understanding of household resilience in both environments. This research is expected to contribute meaningfully to developing theory and practice in sociology and anthropology.

METHODS

This study uses a qualitative method with a library research approach to explore and analyze sociological and anthropological concepts and theories from various written sources without involving field data collection. The descriptive-analytical approach is applied to outline and analyze literature sources related to household dynamics in rural and urban societies and to understand how differences in social, economic, and cultural contexts influence household

resilience patterns. This approach enables the researcher to explore patterns and theories based on existing literature without direct observation in the field (Bhandari, 2024). The research is a qualitative, comparative study to understand household resilience in rural and urban communities. A qualitative approach is chosen because it provides in-depth insights into the experiences and perspectives of individuals facing challenges in different social environments (Creswell, 2014). This research collects data through a literature review, examining books, scholarly journals, academic articles, and other relevant documents. These sources will be analyzed in-depth to construct a comprehensive theoretical understanding of household resilience phenomena. The data analysis technique used is content analysis, where the researcher will interpret key themes emerging from these sources, identify relevant social and cultural patterns, and integrate findings from various previous studies. This technique will help the researcher conclude a well-structured and comprehensive literature study (Bourdieu, 2018).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Sociological and Anthropological Perspectives on Household Resilience in Rural and Urban Societies

Household resilience is crucial in understanding how families and individuals adapt and survive amidst various social, economic, and cultural challenges. Sociologically, household resilience can be examined through social structure and relationships. In rural communities, relationships among members tend to be closer and more tightly knit, with community solidarity playing a central role in supporting households. Putnam (2000) suggests that high levels of community engagement in rural areas create social support networks that enable individuals to assist one another, an essential component of household resilience strategies.

In the context of urban societies, the social structure is more complex and diverse. Urban communities have various social classes, ethnicities, and cultures, influencing how individuals interact and construct household resilience strategies. Glaeser (2011) notes that this diversity often presents challenges regarding social cohesion. While numerous opportunities exist to build support networks, individuals in urban areas may also experience isolation and alienation. Therefore, household resilience strategies in cities often rely on broader, yet potentially less profound, networks than rural communities.

From an anthropological perspective, local culture and traditions are crucial in shaping household resilience strategies. In rural communities, long-standing cultural values influence how individuals and families interact and address challenges. Geertz (1963) argues that cultural practices such as mutual assistance, "gotong royong," and local celebrations commemorate collective labor and strengthen the social ties necessary to sustain household resilience. These traditions thus become essential mechanisms in navigating crises and ensuring the continuity of life.

Conversely, urban societies are often characterized by rapid modernization and shifts in cultural values. In cities, individuals may be more focused on personal achievement and careers, which can reduce their emotional attachment to the community. Castells (2009) argues that, although technology and information enable broader connections, these relationships are often superficial. Therefore, household resilience strategies in urban areas may require a more active approach to building deep and supportive relationships among individuals.

Moreover, sociology highlights the importance of education and skills in household resilience. In rural communities, access to education is often limited compared to urban areas, yet traditional values remain significant. Families in rural areas may rely on local wisdom and traditional practices to manage their resources. However, limited formal education can pose a constraint in building economic resilience. In contrast, urban communities have better access to education and skill training, making individuals more prepared to face changes and challenges.

Economic context and resources also play a key role in household resilience. Rural societies often depend on natural resources, such as agriculture and fishing, which must be managed sustainably to maintain resilience. On the other hand, urban societies are more reliant on access to employment in the industrial and service sectors, which can fluctuate. Fagan and Churchill (2012) note that urban families must develop more diverse strategies to maintain financial stability in response to economic challenges.

Social networks also play a crucial role in household resilience in both rural and urban societies. In rural areas, close-knit relationships facilitate direct support and collaboration in addressing problems. However, in urban areas, individuals often have to build broader networks to obtain support, which may come from professional groups or online communities. According to Putnam (2000), strong social networks can enhance household resilience in rural and urban settings. Public policy's importance in supporting household resilience cannot be overlooked. Policies that promote community development, education, and access to resources can help strengthen household resilience. Governments need to play an active role in creating environments conducive to economic and social growth, especially in more diverse urban societies. Simmel (1950) suggests that individuals in large and complex societies require more substantial institutional support to cope with challenges.

Thus, sociological and anthropological perspectives provide valuable insights into household resilience strategies in rural and urban communities. Each faces unique challenges and requires different approaches to sustain livelihoods. By understanding these dynamics, policymakers and social practitioners can design more effective and relevant interventions to strengthen household resilience in both settings.

Social and Cultural Characteristics of Rural Communities

Close social relationships and high levels of community attachment often characterize rural communities. Traditional values and social norms play a significant role in shaping individual behavior in the rural environment. Research by Putnam (2000) indicates that rural societies tend to have higher levels of community engagement, where individuals feel responsible for the well-being of their neighbors and the community. This creates a strong social support network that helps individuals navigate daily challenges.

Furthermore, rural communities generally have a more straightforward social structure than urban societies. In rural areas, roles and responsibilities are often clear and well-defined, with hierarchies based on age, gender, and social status. A study by Davis and Moore (1945) suggests that the social structure tends to be more transparent and easier to understand in smaller societies, facilitating more harmonious relationships among community members.

Rural communities' cultures are often deeply tied to centuries-old traditions and customs. Agricultural activities and traditional labor are integral to daily life. Rural societies typically celebrate festivals and ceremonies related to the agricultural cycle, such as harvest festivals, reinforcing their cultural identity (Geertz, 1963). This highlights how local culture shapes the way of life in rural communities and influences their social interactions.

From the perspective of Clifford Geertz's theory of cultural anthropology, which explores the role of local culture and symbols in maintaining households, culture can be seen as a system of symbols that imparts meaning to human actions and behaviors. In rural communities, this symbolic system is deeply rooted in traditional values, religion, and communal practices, such as cooperation (gotong royong), which shape patterns of social interaction. Social characteristics, such as close kinship ties and strong communal bonds, are foundational for sustaining households. Cultural values, including mutual assistance, customary rituals, and respect for elders, provide structure and stability to rural households, enabling them to endure various social and economic challenges (Geertz, 1973).

Geertz emphasizes the importance of local or indigenous knowledge, which shapes the community's worldview and guides everyday life. In rural communities, this local knowledge is often reflected in unwritten social norms, such as the division of family roles and collective responsibility for community welfare. This cultural strength distinguishes rural societies from urban ones, which tend to be more individualistic. Using Geertz's approach, we can understand that rural culture is not just a static collection of traditions but a dynamic and living system of meaning, continually reinforced through social interactions and recurring customary celebrations. This cultural framework plays a key role in strengthening the resilience of rural households (Geertz, 1983).

Social and Cultural Characteristics of Urban Communities

In contrast, urban societies are characterized by greater diversity in both social and cultural structures. Urban areas typically have more significant and more heterogeneous populations, creating numerous opportunities for social interaction. According to Glaeser, this diversity often results in dynamic environments where innovation and social change are more likely to occur. However, interactions in urban societies are often more superficial than those in rural areas, with stronger relationships within smaller communities (Glaeser, 2011).

Urban societies are usually more complex in terms of social structure, with a broader variety of social classes. Differences in education, employment, and resource access create sharper social stratification. Simmel (1950) further argues that living in large and diverse societies can affect how individuals interact and perceive themselves within a broader social context. With the abundance of choices available, individuals in urban societies are often more independent but less connected to their communities than in rural societies.

Urban culture tends to be heavily influenced by modernization and globalization. The fast-paced urban lifestyle is often marked by the significant role of technology and media in daily life, impacting how individuals interact, consume information, and shape their identities (Castells, 2009). Furthermore, urban areas serve as melting pots for various cultures, often resulting in new, hybrid cultures that blend diverse traditions.

Although there are significant differences between rural and urban societies, there are also important similarities. Both societies share fundamental values such as solidarity and social interconnectedness, though these are expressed differently. Rural communities may express these values through close-knit community support, while urban societies may demonstrate solidarity through broader yet more informal social networks.

In terms of social change, both rural and urban communities face similar challenges, such as globalization and technological development. Rural societies may experience erosion of traditional values due to modernization, while urban societies must contend with issues like alienation and economic uncertainty. Research by Putnam (2000) indicates that both types of societies must find ways to adapt to the changes occurring in their environments to preserve their identities and social solidarity.

As in the case of child-rearing, both rural and urban communities face similar challenges. In Islamic legal literature, the custody of children is typically granted to the mother if she is divorced and the child is still young (Mukhlas, 2015).

Overall, understanding rural and urban communities' social and cultural characteristics is essential for identifying how these communities function and interact. This knowledge can aid in designing more effective social interventions and development programs better suited to each community's needs. By gaining this understanding, policies can be crafted to promote well-being in both environments, thereby strengthening relationships between communities and individuals.

Social Structure of Rural Communities in the Context of Sociology and Anthropology

The social structure of rural communities is often characterized by close relationships among individuals and the community as a whole. In the sociological context, this structure involves norms, values, and social roles internalized by community members. Rural communities tend to have strong communal ties, where solidarity and cooperation are the foundation for social interactions. High levels of community involvement contribute to social stability and enable individuals to support one another in facing challenges. In terms of household resilience, these relationships are key in creating the support networks necessary to address economic and social issues (Putnam, 2000).

From an anthropological perspective, the social structure of rural communities is influenced by centuries-old traditions and local cultures. Cultural practices involving mutual aid (gotong royong) and social rituals strengthen bonds among community members. For instance, in many rural societies, activities such as collective harvests or customary ceremonies serve not only as a way to celebrate work achievements but also as mechanisms for building solidarity and maintaining social cohesion. This helps reinforce household resilience as community members assist one another in sustaining their livelihoods.

The hierarchical system in rural communities also plays a significant role in social structure. Typically, this hierarchy is organized based on age, gender, and social status. Older individuals are often respected and have a role in decision-making, including decisions related to household matters. In the context of household resilience, older generations tend to be sources of wisdom and experience, assisting younger families in navigating various challenges. Research by Davis and Moore (1945) suggests that roles and responsibilities in smaller societies are generally more precise, facilitating more harmonious relationships among community members.

However, rural communities also face structural challenges that can impact household resilience. Social changes, such as urbanization and globalization, have affected patterns of social interaction and the values held by community members. Many individuals leave rural areas searching for opportunities in urban centers, which can erode community solidarity. A study by Glaeser (2011) suggests that this shift may lead to uncertainty and instability for families remaining in rural areas. Maintaining a strong social structure ensures that families can survive and face challenges.

Drawing from the structural functionalism theory (Parsons, 1991) proposed by Talcott Parsons, the function of each element in society plays a crucial role in contributing to the stability and continuity of the social system. In the context of household resilience, this theory can help understand how households function as social units that preserve social stability within the larger community. In rural societies, kinship roles and communal solidarity are vital in maintaining household well-being. Functionalism can examine the role of formal economic systems and more organized social support structures in urban areas.

Finally, it is important to consider how the social structure in rural communities can adapt to changes occurring within society. Rural communities are not static; they can develop new ways to interact and build household resilience, even in the face of external pressures. Research by Castells (2009) indicates that social innovation can emerge from challenges, and societies that can adapt effectively can find new ways to maintain solidarity and strengthen household resilience. By understanding the dynamics of the social structure in rural communities, we can better design interventions that support household resilience and overall social well-being.

Social Structure of Urban Communities in the Context of Sociology and Anthropology

The social structure of urban communities differs significantly from that of rural communities, which influences how household resilience is constructed and maintained. In the sociological context, urban societies tend to have more layers and complexity in their social

relationships. According to Glaeser, urban communities comprise various social classes, ethnic groups, and cultures, creating dynamic and diverse interaction patterns. In terms of household resilience, this complexity often leads to the need for broader social networks to support families, which may include friends, colleagues, and community groups (Glaeser, 2011).

From an anthropological perspective, urban societies also exhibit shifts in values and norms that differ from those in rural communities. Modernization and globalization have influenced how individuals interact and construct their identities. Castells argues that urban communities are often characterized by more individualistic interactions, where people focus more on personal achievement than community solidarity. This can affect household resilience, as individuals may feel alienated and less connected to those around them, reducing the emotional support needed to navigate challenges (Castells, 2009).

The hierarchical structure in urban communities is also more complex. In this context, power and influence are not solely determined by age or social status but also by factors such as education, occupation, and wealth. This creates sharper social stratification, where not everyone has equal access to resources and support. Simmel asserts that in more extensive and diverse societies, individuals tend to experience alienation, which can disrupt their ability to build and maintain healthy relationships with family members and the community (Simmel, 1950).

When facing social challenges, urban communities often rely on various forms of support that may not always be traditional. For example, support can come from professional groups or online networks, which replace more localized community support. However, this approach also has drawbacks, as more virtual interactions may reduce emotional closeness. Putnam suggests that a decline in involvement in local communities can negatively impact individuals' mental and social health, affecting household resilience.

Finally, it is important to consider how urban societies can adapt to maintain strong household resilience amidst their challenges. Developing community-based support programs that strengthen relationships among individuals and families is crucial. By facilitating positive social interactions and educating the public on the importance of emotional support, urban communities can create a more supportive environment for families. Research by Fagan and Churchill indicates that interventions to increase community involvement can help restore solidarity and strengthen household resilience in urban societies (Fagan & Churchill, 2012).

Household Resilience Strategies

Material rights are inherently linked to spiritual rights within the household, which affect relationships and treatment within the family. Notably, the husband must treat his wife fairly, not endanger her, and protect the family and its members, which is essential for every family head to internalize and preserve the integrity of the household (Saebeni, 2013).

The strategy of household resilience is the effort made by individuals and families to protect their livelihood and well-being amidst various social and economic challenges. These strategies are often rooted in collectivist values and community solidarity in rural communities. In this context, rural families tend to rely more on support from fellow community members. For instance, activities like *gotong royong* (cooperation) in agriculture or infrastructure development serve as tangible expressions of social solidarity, strengthening household resilience. This suggests that involvement in community activities can enhance a sense of attachment and social support, which is crucial for the survival and continuity of families amidst difficulties.

In contrast, household resilience strategies in urban communities are often more individualistic and focus on broader social networks. Families in urban areas may not have the same strong community support as those in rural areas, but they can access various resources

through networks of friends, colleagues, and organizations. Glaeser notes that urban societies tend to be more dynamic, where individuals can seek new opportunities and support through broader connections. Families living in cities often rely on cooperation within professional or social organizations to bolster their resilience (Glaeser, 2011).

Economic factors are also key in the context of household resilience. In rural communities, families typically rely on local resources, such as agricultural products or handmade crafts, to meet their needs. On the other hand, urban communities have access to a wider variety of economic opportunities, such as jobs in industrial or service sectors. Research by Fagan and Churchill suggests that the diversity of income sources in urban areas can enhance household resilience but also presents challenges, such as job uncertainty and economic fluctuations (Fagan & Churchill, 2012).

Moreover, education and skill development are important in strengthening household resilience. Urban families often have better access to formal education and skill training, which enables them to adapt to changes in the labor market. In contrast, rural communities may rely more on local wisdom and traditions, but limited access to education can restrict their ability to adapt to modern demands. Castells emphasizes the importance of education in building the capacity of individuals and families to face societal challenges.

From the perspective of Islamic Legal Sociology, using the theory of *maqashid al-shariah* (the objectives of Islamic law), Islamic law plays a significant role in preserving the household. *Maqashid al-shariah* protects five primary objectives: religion, life, intellect, lineage, and wealth. This theory can help understand how Islamic law applies to household resilience in rural and urban settings while considering contextual differences (Fazlur Rahman, 1964).

Finally, it is important to recognize that effective household resilience strategies require a deeper understanding of each society's social and cultural context. Every community, whether rural or urban, has unique strengths and challenges. Therefore, interventions designed to strengthen household resilience must consider local characteristics and involve community participation. By understanding these dynamics, programs aimed at improving family resilience can more successfully address the challenges faced in rural and urban communities.

1) Strategies Applied in Rural Communities

Rural communities often rely on household resilience strategies based on community solidarity and traditional values. One of the main strategies is "*gotong royong*" (cooperation), where community members help each other in daily activities such as farming, infrastructure development, and cultural celebrations. By working together, families in rural areas can overcome economic and social challenges. Engagement in such community activities strengthens social bonds and fosters a sense of ownership and shared responsibility for each other's well-being.

In addition to "*gotong royong*," rural communities depend on strong social networks to maintain household resilience. In rural environments, relationships between individuals tend to be closer, allowing for more effective emotional and financial support. For example, when one family faces difficulties, other community members typically offer assistance through goods, money, or moral support. This is crucial for maintaining stability and the sustainability of the household in the face of challenges such as natural disasters or economic issues. A study by Davis and Moore suggests that the more straightforward social structure in rural areas facilitates more effective support in times of crisis (Davis & Moore, 1945).

Education and skill development are also important to household resilience strategies in rural communities. Rural societies often focus on developing practical skills relevant to local needs, such as farming, animal husbandry, or handicrafts. Through informal training and education, community members can enhance their ability to generate income and improve their quality of life. Research by Glaeser shows that good education can enhance household

economic resilience and help individuals and families adapt to the social and economic changes that occur. Thus, the strategies applied in rural communities reflect a combination of community solidarity, strong social networks, and continuous skill development (Glaeser, 2011).

2) Strategies Applied in Urban Communities

Household resilience strategies in urban communities differ significantly from those in rural areas due to the complexity of social dynamics and urban lifestyles. One of the main strategies is using broader and more diverse social networks. In cities, individuals often build relationships with various people, including friends, coworkers, and larger communities. These networks can serve as important sources of emotional and material support, particularly in times of crisis. According to Glaeser, the diversity in urban societies creates numerous opportunities to form new relationships to help families navigate economic and social challenges.

Moreover, urban communities often rely on education and skill development as strategies to sustain households. With better access to educational institutions and training programs, individuals in cities can enhance their qualifications and skills to compete in the labor market. Research by Fagan and Churchill indicates that higher education contributes to household economic stability, as individuals with strong skills have better chances of securing well-paying and stable jobs. Thus, focusing on education and skill development is a key component of urban household resilience strategies (Fagan & Churchill, 2012).

Finally, strategies in urban areas also involve leveraging technology and social media to build support and connectivity. Many urban families use digital platforms to stay in touch with friends and family, enabling them to receive information and support quickly and efficiently. Castells argues that technology can strengthen social networks and enhance household resilience in urban societies, even though the relationships formed may not be as strong as face-to-face interactions. By utilizing technology, families in cities can create a more responsive and supportive environment in the face of challenges despite the potential for social alienation in a larger urban context (Castells, 2009).

In this context, social network theory, developed by sociologists such as Granovetter, suggests that the relationships between individuals within a community can serve as an essential source of support. Strong social networks enable families to assist each other during crises, share resources, and foster a sense of solidarity that can strengthen household resilience. Sociologists like Putnam also emphasize the importance of community engagement in creating social bonds that can support household resilience, where participation in social and community activities can strengthen relationships among community members and enhance their ability to face challenges (Putnam, 2000).

On the other hand, anthropological theory offers a perspective on how local cultures and traditions shape how individuals and families respond to their challenges. Geertz (1963) explained that cultural anthropology focuses on the practices and rituals within societies that can strengthen household resilience. For example, in many rural communities, traditions of cooperation and cultural celebrations play a crucial role in fostering social solidarity and collective support. Additionally, anthropology examines how individuals construct their identities through artistic practices, which can influence how they interact with their environment and community. Thus, understanding cultural values and local practices can provide insights into how household resilience strategies can be designed and implemented in specific contexts.

The study has implications for uncovering the social, cultural, and economic factors influencing household resilience patterns in different environments. In rural communities, kinship values and cooperation tend to be stronger, allowing households to persist through

social solidarity and subsistence economies. In contrast, urban communities often rely on access to formal economies and more complex social networks to maintain household stability. This research can also assist policymakers in designing more context-specific interventions, such as community support programs in rural areas and social infrastructure in urban settings. For future research, it is recommended that longitudinal studies be conducted exploring the dynamic changes in households as they face social and economic transformations and analyzing the role of technology and urbanization in shaping household resilience patterns in both regions.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results and discussions outlined above, it can be concluded that there are significant differences in household resilience strategies between rural and urban societies, influenced by their respective social, cultural, and economic contexts. Rural communities rely on kinship ties, cooperation, and subsistence economies to maintain household stability, while urban communities depend on broad social networks, individualism, and access to formal economies. Nevertheless, both societies face similar challenges in dealing with the dynamics of modernization, such as urbanization and economic changes. This study provides valuable insights for policymakers to design more inclusive policies sensitive to the socio-economic differences between the two areas while encouraging further research to explore the more profound impacts of social transformation on household resilience.

REFERENCES

Bhandari, P. (2024). *What Is Qualitative Research? | Methods & Examples* (2024. Revised on September 5 (ed.)). Scribbr. Retrieved October 2, 2024. https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/qualitative-research/

Bourdieu, P. (2018). The Forms of Capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education. In *Greenwood*. Greenwood. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429494338

Castells, M. (2009). *The Rise of the Network Society*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444319514

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publication.

Davis, K., & Moore, W. E. (1945). Some Principles of Stratification. *American Sociological Review*, *10*(2), 242–249. https://doi.org/10.2307/2085643

Fagan, P. F., & Churchill, A. (2012). The Effects of Divorce on Children. In *Family Practice News*. Family Research Council. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0300-7073(10)71118-x

Fazlur Rahman. (1964). Islamic Methodology in History. In *Islamic Research Institute* (Issue 2). Islamic Research Institute.

Geertz, C. (1973). The Interpretation of Cultures. In *Basic Books Inc.* https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315613192

Geertz, C. (1983). *Local Knowledge*. Basic Books.

Geertz, C. Clifford. (1963). Agricultural Involution: The Process of Ecological Change in Indonesia. In *American Anthropologist* (Vol. 70, Issue 3). University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1968.70.3.02a00550

Glaeser, E. (2011). Triumph of the City: How Our Greatest Invention Makes Us Richer, Smarter, Greener, Healthier, and Happier. In *The Penguin Press*. The Penguin Press.

https://doi.org/10.2307/41474071

Haryanto, P. (2022). Adaptasi Keluarga di Perkotaan: Studi tentang Strategi Pertahanan Rumah Tangga. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Sosial*.

Iskandar, R. (2023). Ketahanan Sosial di Masyarakat Pedesaan dan Perkotaan: Tinjauan Antropologis. *Jurnal Antropologi Sosial*.

Johnson, M. (2020). Community Solidarity and Household Resilience in Rural Areas. *Journal of Rural Studies.*

Kartika, S. (2023). Cultural Values and Household Resilience Strategies: A Comparative Study. *Indonesian Journal of Anthropology*.

Manuel Castells. (2009). The Space of Flows. In *The Rise of the Network Society* (pp. 407–459). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444319514.ch6

Mukhlas, O. S. (2015). *Pranata Sosial Hukum Islam.* Refika Aditama.

Nasution, R. (2022). Policy Implications for Strengthening Household Resilience in Indonesia. *Policy and Governance Review.*

Parson, T. (1991). the Social System. In *Pareto's General Sociology*. Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Prasetyo, A. (2020). Dinamika Ketahanan Rumah Tangga di Perkotaan: Studi Kasus di Jakarta. *Jurnal Perkotaan Dan Masyarakat*.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community. In *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* Touchstone Books/Simon & Schuster. https://doi.org/10.1145/358916.361990

Rizal, A. (2022). Economic Sustainability and Household Resilience: A Sociological Perspective. *Sociological Studies Journal*.

Saebeni, B. A. (2013). *Perkawinan & Perceraian Keluarga Muslim*. Pustaka Setia.

Sari, R. (2019). Perubahan Sosial dan Ketahanan Keluarga di Pedesaan: Studi Kasus di Desa Cinta Rakyat. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial*.

Simmel, G. (1950). *The Metropolis and Mental Life. In K. H. Wolff (Ed.)* (The Social). The Free Press.

Statistik, B. P. (2021). *Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS). (2021). Statistik Penduduk Perkotaan dan Pedesaan.* BPS.

Su, Q., Chang, H.-S., & Pai, S.-E. (2022). A Comparative Study of the Resilience of Urban and Rural Areas under Climate Change. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *19*(15). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19158911

Susanto, L. (2021). Modernization and Its Impact on Household Dynamics in Urban Indonesia. *Journal of Indonesian Studies.*

Watif, M., Ramadhani, A., Syam Almazini Tahir, L., Hikmah, N., & Negeri Makassar, U. (2024). Ketimpangan Sosial dan Kemiskinan Pada Masyarakat Perkotaan. *PESHUM : Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial Dan Humaniora*, *3. No.4*(4), 536–547.

Widyastuti, N. (2021). Sosial Budaya dan Ketahanan Keluarga: Perspektif Sosiologis di Masyarakat Desa. *Jurnal Sosiologi Dan Antropologi.*