The Corellation of Social Environment and Quality of Life People Living at Coastal Areas in Surabaya

Meiana Harfika, Lela Nurlela, Mahesta Ratna Dewi

STIKES Hang Tuah Surabaya, Indonesia

Keywords: Social Environment, Coastal People, Quality of Life.

Abstract: The social environment is the whole of human interaction are influenced by cultural, economic, and social psychology. A good social environment will create a good level of harmony between communities, but if the social environment is bad then there will be many problems and conflicts in the community. The purpose of this research was to analyse the relationship of social environment condition to quality of life in coastal society. This research design was observational research design with independent variable that was social environment condition and dependent variable was quality of life in society. Samples taken with simple random sampling technique obtained 36 respondents that were the adult age (35-45 years). Quality of life of the community using WHOQOL-BREF. Data analyse was using Spearman's rho. The results showed that from 36 respondents have low quality of life (55.6%) and good life quality (44.4%). Spearman's rho test shows that there is correlation between social environment condition with quality of life of society p=0.001 (α =0.05). The implications of this study will be more perfect if accompanied by health counselling about the importance of knowing the surrounding community so, it is expected to be directly applicable in life.

1 BACKGROUND

Social environment is the entire interaction between humans that is influenced by cultural factors, economy and social psychology. A good social environment will create a good level of harmony between communities, but if the social environment is bad there will be many problems and conflicts among the people. The social condition of the workers coupled with the economic level of the people who tend to be below the poverty line will further aggravate the situation.

According to data from the Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS) year (2009) in Fargomeli, (2014), noted that the number of poor people in Indonesia reached 32.59 million people and 63.47% of whom are people living in coastal and rural areas.

In general, people living in coastal areas live by relying on the wealth of the sea and the majority are below the poverty line. This can be illustrated from the environmental conditions that are far from the urban community.

In terms of social interaction, fishing communities generally have a very deep interaction pattern, the pattern of interaction can be seen from the relationship of cooperation in carrying out activities,

carrying out joint contacts between fishermen with fishermen and other communities, they have a clear purpose in implementing his business and carried out with a permanent system, in accordance with the culture of the fishing community.

Various programs that have been proclaimed by the government to improve the sense of kinship between communities such as mutual cooperation. In fact the interest of the community is very lacking in these activities so that the goal to be achieved becomes more difficult to be realized. Therefore, the need for awareness from within the individual to make themselves as part of the community and mobilize themselves to participate in socializing with avoid all kinds of problems or social conflict.

The purpose of this research was to analyze the correlation of physical and social environment condition to quality of life in coastal community in RT.03 RW.03 Kedung Cowek Sub-District, Bulak Surabaya District.

567

2 METHODS

2.1 Study Design, Population and Sampling

The method used in this research was cross sectional. The sample was coastal community of middle age (36-45 years old) in RT.03 RW.03 Kedung Cowek of Bulak Surabaya 36 respondents from population 40 peoples. The sampling technique was Simple Random Sampling that was method of selecting respondents by random method.

2.2 Measures

For Social Environment Condition the instrument used was questionnaire with Likert scale. Questionnaires were prepared by researchers of 20 questions. In question includes both positive and negative statements about the social interactions experienced by respondents during life in society.

The instrument uses standard WHO measuring instruments to measure quality of life with WHOQOL-BREF. In it there are 26 questions with divided into 4 (four) domains and if in the value can be high then the level of quality of life can also be said high.

2.3 Data Analysis

In this research type of data analysis used is Spearman Rho at 95% confidence level with significance value $\alpha=0.05$. Knowledge and confidence before to after treatment in each group); Researchers determined by the degree of significance at $p<0.05$. End of life care preferences was obtained through structured interviews and described the results section.

3 RESULTS

Table 1 showed that the woman respondents had larger number than man and all of the respondents had 35-45 years old. Still there were respondents who had no formal education about 13.9% and the most were elementary school education with occupancy as housewives.

Result showed that from 36 respondents, there are 20 respondents (55.6%) have low quality of life and 16 respondents (44.4%) have good quality of life. Respondents with poor quality of life who have social environment condition (social interaction) are not good as much as 16 respondents (44,4%).

Table 1: Demographics data.

Category	Frequency	%
Sex		
Man	7	19.4
Woman	29	80.6
Age (years old)		
21-34	0	0
35-45	36	100
46-60	0	0
Education		
Uneducated	5	13.9
Elementary school	20	55.6
Junior high school	7	19.4
Senior high school	4	11.1
Bachelor	0	0
Occupancy		
Unemployment	0	0
Housewife	27	75
Entrepreneurs	2	5.6
Fisherman	7	19.4
Income (Rp)/month		
< 1 million	3	8.3
1-2 million	20	55.6
>2 million	7	19.4
3-4 million	5	13.9
>4 million	1	2.8
Marital status		
Married	36	100
Unmarried	0	0

Table 2: Distribution of respondents based on the relationship of social environment conditions (social interaction) to the quality of life of the community.

Variable	Quality of Life				Total	
Social Environment	Less		Good			
	F	%	F	%	N	%
Poor	16	44,4	5	13,9	21	100
Enough	3	8,3	5	13,9	8	100
Good	1	2,8	6	16,7	7	100
Total	20	55,6	16	44,4	36	100
Statistical Test Value Spearman's rho **p**= 0,001						

Respondents with poor quality of life who have social environment condition (social interaction) is good enough as many as 3 respondents (8.3%). Respondents with poor quality of life but had good social interaction as much as 1 respondent (2.8%).

Then the respondents with good quality of life but the social interaction was less good as much as 5 respondents (13.9%). Respondents with good quality of life with social condition (social interaction) were good enough 5 respondents (13.9%) and respondents

with good quality of life and have good social environment (social interaction) were 6 responden (16.7) %) (table 2).

4 DISCUSSION

4.1 Social Environment Condition

The social environment in this study was to focus on social interaction. Where, social interaction can be interpreted as dynamic social relationships. Social relationships can be a relationship between individuals with one another, between groups of one with another group or between groups with individuals (Fitriyah, 2014).

From the result of the research in RT.03 RW.03 Kedung Cowek Subdistrict, Bulak Surabaya, most of respondent have social environment condition (social interaction) which is not good, that is 21 respondents (58.3%). This is due to various factors such as imitation, suggestion, identification and sympathy.

Imitation factors are factors that can encourage a person to comply with applicable rules and values. Factor suggestion is a factor that gives a view or attitude that comes from him, which then received by the other party.

Identification factors can be interpreted as factors that have tendencies or desires in a person to be the same as the other party. Next is the sympathy factor that can also affect the process of social interaction, where the sympathy factor is a process whereby a person feels interested in the other party.

Not only the four factors above, the researchers added the state of the economy and the level of knowledge became the cause of the lack of social interaction among people because they prefer to make money (work) than just sitting and socializing.

4.2 Quality of Life in Coastal Communities

The World Health Organization (WHO) defines Quality of Life (QoL) as the individual's perception of his position in life, in the context of culture and values, according to where the individual lives, in relation to life goals, expectations, standards and worries (Bahasuan, 2016).

Based on the result of the research in RT.03 RW.03 Kedung Cowek, Bulak, Surabaya, it is known that majority of respondents have the lowest quality of life that is 20 respondents (55.6%) while the quality of life is good 16 respondent (44.4%).

According to research conducted by Pratiwi (2015), argues that there are several factors that can affect the quality of life of a person, among others; good social relationships with family, friends, and neighbors, standards of hope in life, involvement in social activities and charitable activities, hobby and fun activities, good health and functional ability, good home and environment and feelings of security, trust or self-worth positive, psychological and emotional well-being, sufficient income, easy access to transportation and social services and feelings of respect and respect for others. One of the factors above is sufficient income is the cause of the declining quality of life in the community.

From the results of research in RT.03 RW.03 Kedung Cowek, Bulak, Surabaya, most of the respondents have quality of life that I have. This is due to individual dissatisfaction with the life that is lived at this time which of course is related to the level of income is less so that the fulfilment of the needs do not run optimally.

4.3 Relationship of Social Environment Condition (Social Interaction) to Quality of Life in Coastal Communities

Based on Spearman's Rho test, the value of p=0.001 (α<0.05) means that there is a statistically significant relationship between social environment condition (social interaction) and the quality of life of the community in RT.03 RW.03 Kedung Cowek, Bulak, Surabaya which then can be interpreted that the condition of the social environment (social interaction) can affect the quality of life of the community. Nominal correlation between the two variables above reach 0.001 means there is a relationship between social environment conditions (social interaction) with quality of life in coastal communities.

This study was supported by research conducted by Fargomeli (2014), states that in social interaction there are factors that influence the interaction that is.

The social situation (The nature of the social situation) provides a form of behavior toward the individual in the situation. The power of group norms (The norms of prevailing in any given social group) very influential on the occurrence of social interaction between individuals. Personality Objectives (Their own personality trends) the existence of personality goals owned by each individual so as to affect his behavior

Researchers assume that social environmental conditions have an influence on the quality of life of

the community. This can be illustrated from the social environment of the community, especially in coastal communities, mostly focused more on doing work when compared to gathering with the surrounding community. Conditions like this will have an indirect impact such as a lack of concern among members of the community, the help - a helping attitude that is increasingly disappearing and not know each other among the community.

There were reinforced by a study conducted by Nofitri (2009) which states that the objective component of quality of life does not directly affect the quality of life itself but is mediated by individual perceptions. Quality of life is the interaction between comprehension / subjective components and components of interest in certain aspects of life, with some factors of living conditions that can affect or not depend on the individual's perception of various living conditions.

Nofitri (2009) says that when the need for close relationships with others is fulfilled, whether through mutually friendly relationships or through marriage, humans will have a higher quality of life both physically and emotionally.

5 CONCLUSIONS

This research was conducted to find out the correlation of social environment condition to quality of life in coastal community in RT.03 RW.03 Kedung Cowek sub-district, Bulak district of Surabaya.

REFERENCES

Bahasuan, H. H. (2016). Gambaran Quality of Life (QoL) Pada Anggota Sanggar Yoga di Surabaya.

Fargomeli, F. (2014). Interaksi Kelompok Nelayan Dalam Meningkatkan Taraf Hidup Di Desa Tewil Kecamatan Sangaji Kabupaten Maba Halmahera Timur. Acta Diurna, III.

Fitriyah. (2014). Pengantar Psikologi umum. Jakarta: Pustaka Raya.

Nofitri. (2009). Gambaran Kualitas Hidup. FPSi Universitas Indonesia. diunduh pada tanggal 08 Mei 2017 pukul 08.00 WIB.

Pratiwi, Y. (2015). Pengaruh Dukungan Sosial Terhadap Kualitas Hidup Lanjut Usia di Pusat Santunan Keluarga (Pusaka) Kecamatan Pancoran Jakarta Selatan.

Potter & Perry. (2010). Fundamental Keperawatan. Singapore: Elsevier.

WHO. (1996). WHOQOL-BREF Introduction, Administration, Scoring and Generic Version of The Assassement. Switzerland : Programme on Mental Health World Health Organization. diunduh pada tanggal 14 Februari 2017 pukul 10.29 WIB.

WHO. (1998). Programme On Mental Health. Switzerland: Division Of Mental Health and Prevention of Substance Abuse. diunduh pada tanggal 16 Januari 2017 pukul 09.16 WIB.

WHO. (2007). .Health in the Green Economy. Geneva: World Health Organization. diunduh tanggal 17 Januari 2017 jam 14.43 WIB.

WHO. (2012). Programme On Mental Health. Switzerland: Division Of Mental Health and Prevention of Substance Abuse. diunduh pada tanggal 17 Januari 2017 jam 14.40 WIB.