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ABSTRACT: This study aims to illustrate the relationship between social capital and social adaptation in Surakarta society with low socioeconomic status in the Covid-19 era. This research is descriptive type, using qualitative research methods, which are conducted descriptively analytically, to describe the relationship between the concept of social capital and social adaptation. Informants were selected using purposive sampling, taken by 32 informants, which was determined based on the diversity of social capital in people who were in the category of low socioeconomic status. Data analysis is conducted interactively through data collection, data reduction, data presentation and conclusions. Primary data were collected representing variations in employment, education, marital status, and home ownership. Data was collected online using Google Forms instruments. To validate the correctness of the data on the relationship between the concept of social capital and social adaptation. Triangulation of sources was carried out, by presenting informants in Focus Group Discussion activities within 3 days. The collected data was processed using SPSS version 26 and displayed as a cross table. The results showed the diversity of findings, the presence of informants with high social capital, followed by social adaptation. Those with low social capital, followed by low social adaptation. However, an interesting finding found that those with high social capital but low social adaptation categories. In addition, found that even if informants had categorized low social capital, they were still able to survive with the support of high social adaptation.
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1. INTRODUCTION
The definition and understanding of Social Capital and Social Adaptation is very diverse in sociological studies. Thus, it has consequences on the diversity of instruments used for measurement. Therefore, the research that has been done does not have to be a definite reference. Even theorizing about the relationship between social capital and social adaptation is sociologically not necessarily the way it should be.

Theoretically, the trend of increasing social capital will always be followed by an increase in social adaptability. Conversely, the trend of declining social capital always tends to be followed by a decrease in social adaptability. However, the emergence of Covid-19 is often quite disruptive to the theorization of the relationship between the two concepts. In connection with the widespread spread of the virus, in the Covid-19 era, has proven to have led to social distancing policies, business turnover bottlenecks, and the widespread impact on job losses.

Thus, Covid-19 is not just a study of healthy people, but its impact is interesting to become a sociological study. Considering that reality has become a factor that participates in colouring the dynamics of the validity of theories regarding the ownership of social capital with social adaptation.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW
Bourdieu and Coleman are credited with laying the foundation for the theory of social capital. The concept of social capital from experts is still diverse (Bourdieu, 1983; Coleman & Coleman, 2010; Hanlon et al., 2020; Hao et al., 2023; R. D. Putnam, 1997). Social capital with the perspective by social networks as resources built by individuals based on their relationships with others (Bourdieu, 1983). Coleman with his perspective of social integration with emphasis on its function (Coleman & Coleman, 2010; Lee et al., 2021). Putnam stressed the importance of social beliefs and social norms.

The measurement dimension of social networks is social capital from the perspective of social integration and identifies different types of social capital as structural social capital, which opens individual opportunities to structure social networks and
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relationships. The individual will receive the benefits of social networking and participate in social activities within the various associations he has.

In addition, cognitive social capital, in terms of people's perception of the level of interpersonal trust and reciprocal norms within a group includes aspects of trust, solidarity and reciprocity, which serves to bridge and bind social capital (R. Putnam, 1997; R. D. Putnam, 1997). Structural forms of social capital are more formal and objective, whereas cognitive social capital is subjective and more difficult to measure.

Measures of structural social capital will include social ties, network size and diversity, information channels and ethical neutrality. The most important indicator of cognitive social capital is trust, followed by the similarity of goals culture and language. The additional dimension of social capital generally serves to bridge and become a binding chain. Bridging refers to horizontal social bonds that serve to help strengthen individuals to survive tenuous relationships that grow in a heterogeneous network of associations (Initiative, 2002; Lancee, 2012).

Socioeconomic status is a person's socioeconomic position that is valued in the stratification of society. Although this is not a definite measurement, it is generally measured using indicators of education, employment, income, dependents in the family, and status of residence (Blaikie, 2010; Hawkins et al., 2020; Morais et al., 2021; Poon, 2020; Stahl et al., 2018).

The concept of Social Adaptation in sociology is interpreted as accommodation and adjustment. At least there is an influence on the notion of accommodation in the language of biology, which means the effort of organisms to adapt to environmental conditions to survive (Buss, 1996; Terziev, 2019; Terziev & Tarnovo, n.d.).

The dimension of Social Adaptation is distinguished in the context of the individual, which manifests in the form of personality, and social in the form of social action. Adaptation occurs due to the occurrence of a balance between the two (Terziev & Tarnovo, n.d.).

Measurement of Social Adaptation carried out the extent to which a person can survive in social competition in society. Sociologically, adaptation is meaningful as an individual’s accommodation to the social environment or natural selection. Sociologists use it to explain adaptation as the struggle to maintain its existence.

Thus, adaptation includes the interaction of social values and social structures. Through the process of social adaptation occurs the process of absorption of social experience by individuals, which is manifested in their social actions to achieve personality and social balance (M. Bristol., 1915; NicBhloscaidh et al., 2021; Terziev & Tarnovo, n.d.; Wahyono, 2016).

The Covid-19 era is not only interpreted as the spread of the virus, but is broadly related to the dimensions of social distancing policies, business congestion, and the widespread impact on job losses (Karim et al., 2020; Nasruddin & Haq, 2020; Qian & Fan, 2020; Wu et al., 2020). It will be a factor that participates in the dynamics of the next explanation, how the ownership of social capital will be dynamically related to social adaptation.

The linkage of Social Capital and Social Adaptation in the theoretical explanation can be shown in the following table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table. 1 Social Capital and Social Adaptation in Theoretical Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theoretically, the relationship between social capital and social adaptation can be described in table 1. The first condition is that high social capital will be followed by high social adaptability, as can be read in cell A. Conversely, low social capital tends to be followed by low social adaptability, as can be read in cell D. It will be described in this study whether the validity of cells A and D is still relevant or not. Of course, it does not rule out the emergence of B and C cells. B cells will describe the gap between theory and the reality of low social capital linkage followed by high social adaptability. Finally, cell C will describe the gap between theory and reality, high social capital linkage, followed by low social adaptability.

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS
This research is an analytic descriptive type, attempting to describe the concepts of social capital and social adaptation. Descriptions are carried out on each concept but continue with efforts to find relationships between the two (Adger, 2003; Adler & Kwon, 2012;
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Copeland et al., 2020; Glozier, 2015; Hanlon et al., 2020; Initiative, 2002; Jones & Woolcock, 2004; Kerr, 2018; Ledogar & Fleming, 2010; Margaret Arnold and Sergio de Cosmo, 2015; Murphy, D.J., Wyborn, C., Yung, L. & Williams, 2015; Obaitor et al., 2021; Portes, 1998; Roncancio et al., 2020; Rowan & Kwiatkowski, 2020; Smit & Wandel, 2006; Terziev, 2019). This becomes analytical descriptive research, concerning not using quantification measures with inferential statistical calculations, as well as not arriving at the drawing of generalizations.

The explanation is only limited to showing the possibility of the relationship between the two concepts. The informant is a resident of Surakarta, which is determined by purposive sampling (Hinrichs et al., 2017; Hurst, 1987). They are selected who are in low social strata, especially low socioeconomic status. What is meant by this socioeconomic status includes education, employment, income, and home ownership.

The concepts of social capital and social adaptation are given conceptual definitions and their measurement instruments (Copeland et al., 2020; Glozier, 2015; Initiative, 2002; Jones & Woolcock, 2004; Ledogar & Fleming, 2010; Margaret Arnold and Sergio de Cosmo, 2015). Social capital and social adaptation data were collected using Google Form instruments (Zain, 2021). In addition, to validate the correctness of the data provided by informants, triangulation of sources is carried out (Eren & Gauld, 2022). The steps taken were mainly by presenting them in Focus Group Discussion activities, specifically regarding their social capital and social adaptation during the COVID-19 period, which was carried out for 3 days (Faulkner et al., 2018).

Data is processed using SPSS version 26 and displayed with a cross table, in the form of a frequency distribution (Junaidi, 2010; Tasdemir Yigitoglu et al., 2021). Data is analysed interactively starting from data collection, processing, presenting data and drawing conclusions (Sugiyono, 2013).

4. RESULTS

In this study, the relationship between social capital and social adaptation was obtained. The first condition is that high social capital will be followed by high social adaptability. Conversely, low social capital tends to be followed by low social adaptability.

But what is interesting in this study is that high social capital is followed by low social adaptability. Even if social capital is in the high category, it is not always quickly functioning, as a result, social adaptation is low.

The reality of ownership of low social capital is high social adaptation, this happens because social capital is low, but what is owned is very well functioning. Become an alternative to borrowing, or participating in obtaining protection that is morally shared in the extended family. Thus, extended families play a role in multiplying the increase in ownership of low social capital available to them. As a result, they have increased their ability to adapt in the era of Covid-19.

The ownership of social capital in this study amounted to 15.6% of informants with undergraduate education and 84.4% with diploma education or below. The average informant earns 1,608,750/month, with the highest income of 3,500,000/month. But in general, 93.8% earn less than 3 million per month, and only 6.2% earn 3 million and above. In addition, it was found that 65.6% were married and the remaining 34.4% were single. In this study, the ownership of social capital in addition to being included in the low category, was found that 75% of informants had to meet family needs, and the remaining 25% only to meet the needs of themselves or the needs of some family members. The social capital the low category as shown in table 2.

Table 2. Social Capital Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seems that the ownership of social capital in this low category is related to the need to borrow money, from friends, banks, or online loans by 65.6%, the rest have never borrowed money by 34.4%. Online loans were declared simple procedures by 43.8% of informants. The remaining 56.2% was due to trust and personal factors, or force majeure.

In the Covid-19 era, 65% of informants stayed in the same job. The remaining 37.5% were forced to make new social adaptations because they had to change jobs. After all, there were shifts in working time, jobs no longer existed and resigned or terminated contracts by the workplace.

In the Covid-19 era, it is not easy to get a new job, so in this study, it was found that generally, they make social adaptations by trying to survive by doing side jobs 46.9%, borrowing money (25%) and frugality (28.1%). In this era, informants generally received support in the form of basic needs, food amounted to 68.8 %, and the remaining 31.3% never received any assistance.

The high social adaptations category is shown in table 3.
Aid is generally obtained from the government at 53.1%, amounting to 9.4% from families, and 15.6% from neighbours. In addition, 21.9% have never received help from anywhere.

In addition, informants can adapt socially because they get financial support from 75% of their family, 9.4% from friends and 15.6% from online loans. They also received social support from 90.6% of family, and 9.4% of friends. In their efforts to survive in the Covid-19 era, they proved ready to sell property by 81.2%, both in the form of gold, bicycles, motorcycles, and houses, and take savings. The rest tried to survive by selling their skills by 18.8%. More specifically, informants in their efforts to survive in the Covid-19 era are ready to sell property by 56.3%, both in the form of gold, bicycles, motorcycles, and houses, and take savings. In addition, they try to survive with individual effort by selling their self-skills by 40.6%. The rest can survive because there is support from social efforts from friends or the village by 3.1%. With social effort from friends or this relatively small village, in other words, it can be said that they have high social capital, but a low social adaptation category. This may happen due to the still strong ownership of the property they own, the mainstay of savings, and the property they have. In addition, too much time is taken to make money by doing extra work, too focused on work and too often meeting colleagues. Even though the involvement of social activities with colleagues is high at 40.6%, it can have consequences for their lack of involvement in village activities.

It is proven by the social effort given by the village is relatively small, only 3.1%. This is an interesting sociological social reality, about how a person has relatively high social capital but has relatively low social adaptation. This relatively low social adaptation has a vulnerable condition, they have the potential to experience spatial mobility, while the social capital in the form of skills they have is no longer able to cover the need for survival. The skills sold only make money that cannot keep up to cover the needs of themselves and their families. This potentially makes it impossible for them to survive anymore. They will indirectly be forced to be eliminated or have to move from their place of residence because they take the last step by selling property, especially the house and land they own.

The opposite reality is that even though informants have relatively low social capital, it is proven that they can still survive with the support of high social adaptation. Even if social capital is relatively low, at least it still has high social adjustment, especially social community. Because they have high social adaptation, it is proven that they get environmental support from their community by 28.1%.

It is proven that they can still be protected with various environmental efforts to maintain that they do not have to leave or be excluded from the community where they live. At least with this high social adaptation, for a while the person concerned can occupy the land or house that is sold temporarily when it has not been built by the buyer. In addition, the neighbourhood has provided a place to live until death is concerned by providing the location of habitable houses on state land, located on ditches, village edges, or unused waqf land. Even if this second condition can be found in only 3 informants.

Realistically, the relationship between social capital and social adaptation can be described in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Capital and Social Adaptation in Reality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Adaptation</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5 (16 %)</td>
<td>17 (53 %)</td>
<td>22 (69 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3 (9 %)</td>
<td>7 (22 %)</td>
<td>10 (31 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>8 (25 %)</td>
<td>24 (75 %)</td>
<td>32 (100 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first condition is that high social capital tends to be followed by high social adaptability, as can be read as big as 5 (16 %) in cell A. Conversely, low social capital tends to be followed by low social adaptability, as can be read as big as 7 (22 %) in cell D. It will be described in this study whether the validity of cells A and D is still relevant or not. Of course, it does not rule out the emergence of B cells as big as 17 (53 %) and C cells as big as 3 (9 %).
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B cells describe the gap between theory and the reality of low social capital linkage followed by high social adaptability. Finally, cell C describes the gap between theory and reality, high social capital linkage, followed by low social adaptability.

5. DISCUSSION

In other research, a positive relationship between social capital and social adaptation was obtained. The first condition that high social capital will be followed by high social adaptability is found to be 5 (16%). Conversely, low social capital tends to be followed by low social adaptability, found at 7 (22%). Thus, the theory of social capital and adaptation in the normal era or the Covid-19 era is still relevant and can be implemented in the reality of society, even in relatively small numbers (not exceeding 38%).

With this relatively small theoretical relevance, it is consequential that the truth of the theory of social capital and adaptation has opened a very wide new discussion space, especially the relevance of its applicability in the Covid-19 era. This condition occurs considering that in this study, in addition to positive relationships were found, which strengthened the validity of the theory, obtained rejection of the theory by presenting findings of a negative correlation between social capital and social adaptation. Accumulatively, the finding of a negative correlation between social capital and social adaptation was found at 62%. At the same time, this is an interesting finding in this sociological study, that high ownership of social capital was followed by low social adaptability found by 3 (9%).

Even though social capital is in the high category, it turns out that its ownership is not always quickly able to function optimally in the Covid-19 era, as a result, social adaptation is low.

In addition, it was found that low social capital was followed by high social adaptability found at 17 (53%). This happens because even though the assessment of social capital is low, the limitation of ownership can be optimally functioned. In low ownership of social capital, it is proven to be able to open new social capital alternatives by borrowing, or participating in protection that is morally shared in the extended family. Thus, their extended families play a role in multiplying the increase in ownership of low social capital available to them. As a result, they have increased their ability to adapt to the Covid-19 era.

6. CONCLUSION

In academic explanation, describing a theory connects at least two concepts, for example, this article explains the relationship between social capital and social adaptation. The theory of social capital and social adaptation in the normal era has proven to be very widely known and has developed rapidly.

However, in the Covid-19 era, it is proven that the theory of social capital and social adaptation is relatively limited. The positive association between the two could only explain 38% of the informants studied. In other words, the theoretical relevance of social capital and social adaptation in the Covid-19 era is relatively limited.

The remaining 62% of the informants studied, the theoretical relevance of social capital and social adaptation in the Covid-19 era has opened a wider sociological study, as well as opened further academic discussion space. At least it leaves further questions about why the trend of increasing social capital is not always positively correlated with the increase in ownership of social adaptations, or vice versa.
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