

UNIVERSITAS NAHDLATUL ULAMA SURABAYA

LEMBAGA PENELITIAN DAN PENGABDIAN KEPADA MASYARAKAT

Kampus A Wonokromo: Jl. SMEA No.57 Tlp. 031-8291920, 8284508 Fax. 031-8298582 — Surabaya 60243 Kampus B RSIJemursari: Jl. Jemursari NO.51-57 Tlp. 031-8479070 Fax. 031-8433670 — Surabaya 60237 Website: unusa.ac.id Email: info@unusa.ac.id

SURAT KETERANGAN

Nomor: 530/UNUSA/Adm-LPPM/XI/2018

Lembaga Penelitian dan Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat (LPPM) Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Surabaya menerangkan telah selesai melakukan pemeriksaan duplikasi dengan membandingkan artikel-artikel lain menggunakan perangkat lunak **Turnitin** pada tanggal 07 November 2018.

Judul : The Influence Of Type Of Job, Income, Education, And

Religiositu To Vasectomy Quality Of Life

Penulis : Elly Dwi Masita

Identitas : The Proceding International Conference Maternal, Child, And

Family Health 2016

No. Pemeriksaan : 2018.11.13.124

Dengan Hasil sebagai Berikut:

Tingkat Kesamaan diseluruh artikel (Similarity Index) yaitu <u>5%</u>

Demikian surat keterangan ini dibuat untuk digunakan sebagaimana mestinya

Surabaya,13 November 2018

⊀etua LPPM,

<u>Dr. Istas Pratomo, S.T., M.T.</u>

NPP. 16081074

LPPM Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Surabaya

Website : Ippm.unusa.ac.id Email : Ippm@unusa.ac.id Hotline : 0838.5706.3867

THE INFLUENCE OF TYPE OF WORK, INCOME, EDUCATION, QUALITY OF LIFE AGAINST RELIGIOSITY ACCEPTORS VASEKTOMY IN SURABAYA

by Elly Dwi Masita

Submission date: 07-Nov-2018 08:31AM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1034329042

File name: Manuscript Vasektomy E elly.doc (72.5K)

Word count: 1922

Character count: 11158

THE INFLUENCE OF TYPE OF WORK, INCOME, EDUCATION, QUALITY OF LIFE AGAINST RELIGIOSITY ACCEPTORS VASEKTOMY

IN SURABAYA

Elly Dwi Masita ellydm@unusa.ac.id

Faculty Of Nursing And Midwifery Nahdlatul Ulama Surabaya University

Abstrak

Di Jawa timur pada tahun 2013 pengguna metode vasektomy mencapai 0.12% Rendahnya partisipasi pria dalam penggunaan kontrasepsi dipengaruhi oleh beberapa faktor meliputi pengetahuan, persepsi tentang efektifitas, pendidikan, sosial budaya, keyakinan, resiko kontrasepsi, dukungan keluarga/ istri dan terbatasnya akses pelayanan keluarga berencana bagi pria serta mitos yang mengganggap vasektomy dapat mengakibatkan pria mengalami beberapa gangguan kesehatan seperti gangguan kesehatan, gangguan fungsi seksual, gangguan konsep diri, kepercayaan diri menurun, dan menurunnya aktifitas sehari- hari. Tujuan penelitian ini untuk mengetahui pengaruh pekerjaan, pendapatan, pendidikan, religiusitas terhadap kualitas hidup akseptor vasektomy. Jenis Penelitian ini adalah kuantitatif dengan pendekatan *ex past facto*. Jumlah Populasi 30. Sampling menggunakan *purposive* dan total sampling dengan menggunakan rumus *rule of thumb*. Instrument yang digunakan adalah kuesioner dengan skala likert dan quesioner WHOQOL dilakukan di kelurahan Sawunggaling dan Wonokromo. Uji analisis menggunakan regressi linier ganda dengan p< 0.05. Hasil penelitian didapatkan ada pengaruh signifikan pendidikan dan religiusitas terhadap kualitas hidup peserta vasektomy dengan p= 0.001 dan R²square 0.43 dan tidak ada pengaruh pekerjaan dan pendapatan terhadap kualitas hidup.

Kesimpulan : Pendidikan dan religiusitas berpengaruh signifikan terhadap kualitas hidup peserta vasektomy sedangkan pendapatan dan pekerjaan tidak berpengaruh terhadap kualitas hidup akseptor vasektomy

Kata Kunci: Pekerjaan, pendapatan, pendidikan, religiusitas, kualitas hidup akseptor vasektomy

Abstract

In East Java on 2013 , users vasektomy methods were reach up 0.12% . The low participation of contraceptives had influenced by some factors include knowledge, perceptions about the effectiveness of social, educational, culture, belief, risks of contraception, family support/wife and limited access to family planning services for men and myth which to consider that vasektomy method couse of some health problems like health disorders, disfunction of sexual function, self concept disturbance, decrease of confidence , and decrease of daily activities . The purposed of this research was to know the influence of emplyement, income, education, and religiosity againts quality of life on vacectomy acceptors. Type of this research was quantitative with past ex facto approached with 30 population numbers. The sampling was used purposive sampling and total sampling with rule of thumb. The instrument used a questionnaire with likert scale and WHOQOL quesioner in Sawunggaling and Wonokromo Village Analysis test using multiple regressi linier with p < 0.05. This research is resulting there is significant influence education and religiosity against quality of life on vasektomy acceptors with p = 0.001 and R 2 0.43 square and no influence on work and income againts quality of life.

Conclusion: education and religiosity effect significantly against quality of life on vasektomy acceptors while there is not influences income and job againtas quality of life vasektomy acceptors Keywords: employment, income, education, quality of life, religiosity, vasektomy acceptors

INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, prevalence of family planning acceptors had increased of 7.71% on August 2015. The increase had dominated by a non long term methods of contraception reach up 80.53% while 19 % has of long-term methods. Longterm methods mostly used by women, 93% used IUD, 9.45% used implants ,1.60% used MOW while

MOP had reached 0.14% (BKKBN, 2015)

Based on data from the province of East Java province, in BKKBN on 2013 family planning acceptors had reached of 4327 participants with details are injection of 48.09%, 13% of IUD, birth kontrol pills of 15.65%, 9.75% of MOW. condomsof 4.25%, Implant of

2.94%, and MOP of 0.12% (BKKBN JATIM, 2013)

The low of participation of man to use contraceptives had influenced by several factors, there are knowledge, perceptions about the effectiveness, social cultural, educational, belief, risks of contraception, family support/wife and limited access to family planning services for men and existence of the myth that the acceptor vasektomy decreased sexual function, prostate disorders, confidence disorders This condition to decreas quality of life (Suherni, 2006; Azwar, 2006, Everret; 2007)

Quality of life is as many perception of the individual who looked beneficaly and can describe the position of excellences him self against living condition (Kreitleir & Ben (2004) in Nofitri, 2009; Cohen & Lazarus in Larasati, 2012).

Quality of life has four domains among other physical area, psychology area, social and environmental area (WHO, 2012). The physical area consist of activity, rest, fatique, consumption of medicines. pain and discomfort and (Tarwoto Wartonah, 2010: 2008). Sekarwiri, Psychology include appearance, negative positive feelings, thinking, memory and concentration, while the social area are encompasses individuals. support, sexual activity, and an environment area consists of income, freedom from discomfort. recreation, selfactualization (Sekarwiri, 2008).

At this time, the government efforts to increase participation of man in family planning with method vasektomy still has not reach on a regular inspection of the quality of life. Infact, the results of

examination of the quality of life of vasektomy acceptorcan be used basic of promotion to increase vasectomy acceptors. Therefore, the researchers interesting to know influence of employment, education, income and religiosity against quality of life on vasectomy acceptors in Sawunggaling and Wonokromo Village city of Surabaya

RESEARCH METHODS

Type of research is kuantitatif research with ex post facto approach. The research was conducted in December 2015 until March 2016. Independent variables in this study are education, income, emplyement, reliogisity and dependent variable is quality of life. The population in this research totalled 30 acceptors. The sampling method is purposive sampling and totally sampling with rule of thumb it meansthat is 5-10 of independent variables. The Inclusion criteria of sample are a man had been done vasektomy methods for more than three months. The instrument used was a questionnaire with likert scale while quality of life questionnaire was using the adaptation of the WHOQOL BREFF (2012)who have been validated. Statistical tests of this research is multiple regressi linier (Dahlan, 2014; Murti, 2013)

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

a. Result

 Normality test with Kolmogorov-Smirnov

Based on the results of a test of normality by using the Kolmogorov Smirnov obtained p = 0.77 it is mean that data is normaldistributed with p value 0.05 >

2. Frequency distribution

Table 1.1 Frequency distribution

radio i.i rioque	110,	aiburoution	
Variabel	n	frequency	%
Quality of life	30		
Low		-	
Moderete		30	100
High			
Education			
Elementary		15	50
school			
Junior High		15	50
School			
Job			
Traders		14	46
Pedicap		16	54
Income			
1 million/month		22	73.7
>1 million		8	27.3
/mounth			
Religiosity			
Low		0	0
Moderete		30	100
High		0	0
Table 1.1 smale		that most	of the

Table 1.1 explains that most of the subject is on the moderete quality of life and the level of education inelementary of 50 % and junior high school of 50 %, most of them has a job as a pedicab of 54 %, have an income of one million every month of 73.7% and have moderete of religiosity of 100%

3. Univariate analisys

Table 2.1The result of univariate analysis

anarysis			
Variabel	Mean	SD	N
Quality of	76.9	0.84	30
life			
Education	1.5	0.50	
Employement	1.46	0.50	
Income	1.26	0.44	
Religiousity	74.8	0.84	

Table 2.1 Describes that the quality of life have medium quality of life with mean = 47.8, education level with mean = 1.5 it means that education of subjek is junior high school and most

of them has a job as pedicap with mean mean = 1.26, the average monthly income is one million with mean = 1.36 and has moderate religiosity with Mean = 46.5

4. Bivariate analysis

Table3.1 Bivariate analysis

Variabel	Quality of life	р
	Koofisien	
	korelasi	
Job	0.54	0.87
Education	0.57	0.003
Income	0.48	0.66
Religiosity	0.03	0.001

Based on table 3.1 illustrates that there is a positive significant influence the level of education and religiosity towards quality of life. It is mean that the higher level of education and religiosity of the subject can make be better quality of life. But, there is not influence of the type of job and income againts quality of life

5. Multivariate analysis

Table 4.1 result of multiple regressi

Varibel	Koofisien	p< 0.05
	regresi	
constanta	46,9	
Education	-0.68	0.01
Job	0.07	0.70
Income	0.12	0.70
Religiosity	0.04	0.01
Adjused R ² =		
0.428		
42.8%		
p < 0.05		

Table 3.1 Describes that there is significant influence the level of education and religousity on quality of life to vasektomy acceptors, But there is not influence type of joban income on quality of life. The value of R 2 = 0.428 (rounded into 43) it is mean that independent variables may affect dependent variable of 43% while 57% were influenced by the other factors.

b. Discussion

The results of the research there were significant influence education level and religiosity on quality of life towards vasektomy acceptors. Higher education level in line with increasingof consciousness level . This opinion has been supported by research of Noghani, Asghapur and Safa (2007) been concluded had educational effect on quality of life because of awareness behave level is well. Similar statements with this result were Mons, Marquetry, Buds and Dee Gees (2006).

Religiosity is feeling and worship of obedience towards his religion couse of internalization proses of the religion in a person (Diester in Risnawita and Ghufron, 2011). Religiosity has five area there are belief, religious practice, experience, practice, and knowledge (Glok and Stark in Repstad and Furshet, 2006). Religiosity affect individual quality of life because of religiosity was able to fix the Phisical and psyclogical well being. If the individual has a Phisical and psyclogical well being is good then it will balance the physical, mental health, and good social welfare. (Brim in Hamburger, 2009)

Job and income has no effect on quality of life because the subject has high awareness and it's care to the quality of his life.

CONCLUSION

The level of education and religiosity influence on quality of life of vasektomy acceptor of 43% but the types of jobs and incomes do not affect on quality of life to vasektomy acceptors

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Azwar, Azrul, 2005. Kebijakan dan StrategiNasional Kesehatan Reproduksi di Indonesia.
 Dirjen Bina Kesehatan Masyarakat.Jakarta. (online) available.http://Pikas.bkkbn. go.id
- BKKBN,2013. Buku Sistem
 Pencatatan Pelaporan
 Pelayanan Kontrasepsi.
 Surabaya: BKKBN Provinsi
 Jawa Timur
- ______, 2015.Laporan hasil pelayanan Kontrasepsi Agustus 2015.BKKBN. Go .id. diakses Januari 2016 jam 10.00
- Dahlan, Sopiyudin. 2008. Statistik untuk Kedokteran dan Kesehatan. Jakarta: Salemba Medika.
- Everett, Suzanne. 2007. Buku Saku Kontrasepsi dan Kesehatan Seksual reproduktif, Ed.2. Penerjemah Nike Budhi Subekti. Jakarta: EGC: 198.
- Hamburger.(2009). Technology and psychological well-being.
 New York: Cambridge University
- Larasati, T.A. (2012). Kualitas Hidup Pasien Diabetes Melitus Tipe 2 di RS Abdul Moeloek Propinsi Lampung. Jurnal Kedokteran dan Kesehatan Universitas Lampung, Vol.2, No.2, 17-20.

- Moons, P., Marquet K., Budts W., Geest, Sabina. (2005).Validity, Reliability, and Responsiveness of Schedule for the Evaluation of Individual Quality of Live-Direct Weighting (SEIQOL-DW) in 176 Congenital Heart Disease. Health and Quality of Life Outcomes. 2 1-8. USA: BioMed Ltd.
- Murti, Bhisma., 2013. Desain dan Ukuran Sampel untuk Penelitian Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif di Bidang Kesehatan. Yogyakarta : Gajah Mada University
- Noghani, M., Asgharpour A., Safa, S., Kermani, M. (2007). Quality of Life in Social Capital in Mashhad City in Iran. Article 1-5.
- Nofitri NFM.(2009). Gambaran Kualitas Hidup Pada Individu Dewasa Berdasarkan Karakteristik Budaya Jakarta. Depok: Universitas Indonesia
- Repstad & Furseth, I. (2006). An introduction to the sociology of religion classical and contemporary perspectives. Burlington:

 Ashgate PublishingCompany.
- Risnawita, S, & Ghufron, M.N. (2011). *Teori-teori psikologi*. Yogyakarta: Arruzz media
- Suherni, 2006, Studi Gender Peranan Pria dalam Penggunaan Kontrasepsi dipropinsi DIY. Kanwil BKKBNDIY UMY.Yogyakarta. (online)available http://library.usu.ac.id

- Sekarwiri.(2008). Metode penelitian dan uji realibiltas dan validitas WHOQoL-BREF.
 http://www.lontar.ui.ac.id/file
 ?file=pdf/abstrak-94781.pdf
- Tarwoto & Wartonah.(2010).

 Kebutuhan Dasar

 Manusia dan Proses

 Keperawatan Edisi

 keempat.Jakarta : Salemba

 Medika
- WHO. 2012. Programme on Mental Health WHOQOL User Manual. Switzerland: Department of Mental Health, World Health Organization.

THE INFLUENCE OF TYPE OF WORK, INCOME, EDUCATION, QUALITY OF LIFE AGAINST RELIGIOSITY ACCEPTORS VASEKTOMY IN SURABAYA



1% SIMILARITY INDEX

1%

■ 70
INTERNET SOURCES

0%

PUBLICATIONS

0%

STUDENT PAPERS

MATCH ALL SOURCES (ONLY SELECTED SOURCE PRINTED)

1%

★ docobook.com

Internet Source

Exclude quotes On

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches

< 1%