The Factors Affecting of Quality Life Society at Karubaga District Sub District Tolikara Papua Province

Delwien Esther Jacob[a*], A. L. Rantetampang[b], Bernard Sandjaja[c]

[a]Master postgraduate program, School of Public Health, Cenderawasih University, Jayapura
[b,c]Postgraduate Progman, Faculty of Public Health, Cenderawasih Unversity, Papua

Abstract

Quality life are individual perception about his position in the life based on culture, system of value which related with purpose of life, hope, standart and all related ones. Problems that related with quality of life are phisical health status, phsicology status, personal social and environment. The objective of this research are to know the factors that affecting society of Karubaga District, Tolikara region quality of life. This research are cross sectional research, in Health Department of Tolikara region. Population are all society of Karubaga District which in age range between 18 to 40 years old. The data was came from quisioner and be analyzed with chi-square test. Result found that quality of life from society of Karubaga District were affecting by physical factors (*p-value* 0,000; RP= 4,030; CI95% = 2,120 – 7,664), phsicology factors (*p-value* 0,000; RP= 4,788; CI95% = 2,560 – 8,955), social factors (*p-value* 0,000; RP= 7,875; CI95%= 4,342 – 14,282) and environment factors (*p-value* 0,000; RP= 23,324; CI95%= 5,591 – 89,125). Dominan factors that affecting quality of life society of Karubaga district was environment factors.

Keywords: Physical; Phsicology; Social; Environment; Quality of Life.

----

* Corresponding author.

1. Introduction

Quality of life is the individual perception of their position in life, in cultural contexts and value systems in which they are located and its relation to life goals, expectations, standards, and other related. The problems include the quality of life is vast and complex health problems including physical, psychological status, level of independence, social relationships and environment in which they are located [1]. Definition of healthy according to the World Health Organization (WHO) is a condition in which not only the absence of disease or infirmity, but also the balance between physical function, mental, and social. So that measurement of quality of life related to health includes three areas of functionality are: physical, psychological (cognitive and emotional), and social. Until now, the factors causing the decline in the quality of life in humans either individually or jointly is not certain. Another problem is the difficulty of doing research on humans to search for causal relationships. Admittedly the problem is very complex and many factors (multifactorial) that affect the quality of human life. Several authors state the quality of life in humans is influenced by factors: global conditions, external conditions, condition of interpersonal and personal conditions. Given the importance of information on the quality of life, there are various ways to try to measure the quality of life of the various aspects of human life. Eg WHO has tried to make the measuring instrument instrument to measure the quality of human life, known as the World Health Organization Quality Of Life 100 (WHOQOL-100) as well as the shortened version of which is the World Health Organization Quality of Life-BREF (WHOQOL-BREF). This instrument tries to measure the quality of life of several domains such as physical, psychological, social relationships and environment. These instruments have been used widely, especially to assess the quality of life of a person with certain diseases.

Tolikara a result of expansion of Jayawijaya consisting of 46 districts, 4 villages, and 541 villages. Karubaga is one of 46 districts in the district Tolikara. Karubaga consists of one village and 23 villages. The population of Tolikara until the end of 2015 is 296 871 163 447, this amount consists of men - men and 133 433 women. The number of households reached 60 906. So the average - average population per household is 5 people. With a sex ratio of 124 which means 100 girls there are 124 boys - men. The development of human development in Tolikara during the period 2004-2013 experienced a positive trend. Although the movement toward slower but Pempangunan Society Index (HDI) to the right track. Quantitatively, the achievements of the HDI has increased by 5.86 points, from 47.2 in 2004 to 53.06 in 2013. HDI ranking dropped on 16 in the scope of Papua Province. HDI Tolikara increased from 52.66 in 2012 to 53.06 in 2013, with growth accelerating towards IPM IPM ideal of 0.86. Some of the problems in Tolikara is the number of people living below the poverty line still relatively high, the low quality of human resources in various sectors of life, which is reflected in the lack of initiative, creativity and community participation in the development process, the high death toll as a result of the limited outreach and health services and the lack of infrastructure, low quality of maternal and child nutrition.

Still lack a healthy lifestyle among the public and thus susceptible to various diseases, low quality of public education, the low awareness of the community in improving the quality of human resources, lack of educational facilities at all levels both qualitatively and quantitatively, still low commitment of the Regional Government in policies in the education sector is reflected in the low budget allocations for education, the low

role of religious institutions in creating harmony between religious communities, limited facilities and infrastructure religious in an effort to optimize the development of religious, still lack the respect and appreciation of cultural values that grow and develop in society as a heritage, low exploration of the values of the local culture as regional assets that are part of the national cultural treasure, still weak role of traditional institutions as part of the potential of the region in the development process, limited network of roads and bridges that impede movement of people, goods and services, lack of networks and quality of district roads that impede the smooth ground transportation, limited facilities / infrastructure of air transportation leads to low mobility and accessibility thus slowing the development process and the limited electricity network both in cities and in the villages [2].

Based on the description above, the researchers intend to do research about the factors that affect the quality of life Tolikara assessed by a questionnaire World Health Organization Quality of Life-BREF (WHOQOL-BREF). It is based on the suitability of the sample to be tested, reliability and practicality of this instrument. By knowing Tolikara quality people are expected to be useful in the planning and implementation of better health services, preventive, curative, rehabilitative, or promotion [3,4].

2. Materials and Methods

This study was cross sectional research by identifying and measuring the quality of life in District Karubaga Tolikara on time only one with no follow up.

The study was conducted starting on January 1, 2017 until January 30, 2017 in the District Karubaga, Tolikara, in the city area Karubaga Specialize in one village in a location where many people gather such as places of worship, district offices, hospitals, health centers. The study focused on the identification and measurement of the quality of life in the district Karubaga Tolikara then connected with physical factors, psychological factors, social factors and environmental factors. The data were obtained using a questionnaire and analyzed using the chi-square and binary logistic regression [5].

3. Results

3.1 Characteristics of Respondents

Based on table 4.7, shows that most respondents in the age group 21-30 years as many as 38 people (38%), female gender as many as 46 people (46%), not the school a total of 35 people (35%), do not work as many as 53 people (53%), marital status married as many as 81 people (81%) and length of stay> 10 years as many as 65 people (65%).

3.2 Independent and Dependent Variables

Based on table 4.8, shows that most respondents with physical factors either as many as 75 people (75%), psychological factors either as many as 76 people (76%), social factors either as many as 79 people (79%), environmental factors either as many as 84 people (84 %). Quality of life is good most of the respondents were

66 people (66%).

Table 1: Distribution of respondents in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara

No	Variabel	Frekuensi (n)	Presentase (%)
1	**Age**		
	18-20 year	10	10
	21-30 year	38	38
	31-40 year	52	52
2	**Sex**		
	Male	46	46
	Female	54	54
3	**Education**		
	Not school	35	35
	Basic school	17	17
	Junior high school	22	22
	Senior high school	19	19
	Higher education	7	7
4	**Occupation**		
	Not work	53	53
	Farmer	20	20
	Private	15	15
	Civil servant	12	12
5	**Marital status**		
	Marriage	81	81
	Not marriage	15	15
	Widow/widower	4	4
6	**Length stay**		
	1-5 year	11	11
	6-10 year	24	24
	> 10 year	65	65
	Number	100	100

Source: Data Primer, 2016

Table 2: Distribution of respondents in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara

No	Variabel	Frekuensi (n)	Presentase (%)
1	**Physical factor**		
	Less	25	25
	Good	75	75
2	**Psikologis factor**		
	Less	24	24
	Good	76	76
3	**Social factor**		
	Less	21	21
	Good	79	79
4	**Environmental factor**		
	Less	16	16
	Good	84	84
5	**Life quality**		
	Less	34	34
	Good	66	66
	Number	100	100

Source: Data Primer, 2016

3.3 Analysis Bivariat

a. Influence of Physical Factors on the Quality of Life

Table 3: Effect of Physical Factors on the Quality of Life in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara

No	Phusical factor	Life quality				n	%
		Less		Good			
		n	%	n	%		
1	Less	14	58,3	10	41,7	24	100
2	Good	11	14,5	65	85,5	76	100
Total		25	25	75	75	100	100
p-value < 0,001; RP = 4,030; CI95% (2,120 – 7,664)							

Source: Data Primer, 2016

Table 4.9 shows that out of 24 people with less physical factors, as many as 14 people (58.3%) quality of life less and 10 people (41.7%) quality of life is good. While 76 people with either physical factors, as many as 11 people (14.5%) quality of life less and 65 (85.5%) quality of life is good. The test results on the value of chi square statistic significance of 95% (α = 0.05) was obtained p-value <0.001 or p <α (0.05), thus there are physical factors influence the quality of life in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara. When viewed from the RP = 4.030; CI95% (2.120 to 7.664) which interpreted that physical factors are less likely to 4.030 less than the quality of life of respondents with good physical factors.

b. Influence of Psychological Factors on the Quality of Life

Table 4: Effect of Psychological Factors on the Quality of Life in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara

No	Psikologis factor	Life quality				N	%
		Less		Good			
		n	%	n	%		
1	Less	14	66,7	7	33,3	21	100
2	Good	11	13,9	68	86,1	79	100
Total		25	25	75	75	100	100
p-value < 0,001; RP = 4,788; CI95% (2,560 – 8,955)							

Source: Data Primer, 2016

Table 4.10 shows that of the 21 people with less psychological factors, as many as 14 people (66.7%) quality of life less and 7 (33.3%) quality of life is good. Meanwhile, of the 79 people with good psychological factors, as many as 11 people (13.9%) quality of life less and 68 (86.1%) quality of life is good. The test results on the value of chi square statistic significance of 95% (α = 0.05) was obtained p-value <0.001 or p <α (0.05), thus there is the influence of psychological factors on quality of life in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara. When viewed from the RP = 4.788; CI95% (2.560 to 8.955) which interpreted that psychological factors are less likely to 4.788 less than the quality of life of respondents with both psychological factors.

a. Social Factors Influence on the Quality of Life

Table 5: Effect of Social Factors on the Quality of Life in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara

No	Social factor	Life quality				*N*	%
		Less		Less			
		n	%	n	%		
1	less	15	93,8	1	6,3	16	100
2	good	10	11,9	74	88,1	84	100
Total		25	25	75	75	100	100
p-value < 0,001; RP = 7,875; CI95% (4,342 – 14,282)							

Source: Data Primer, 2016

Table 4.11 shows that of the 16 people with less social factors, as many as 15 people (93.8%) quality of life less and 1 (6.3%) better quality of life. While 84 people with good social factors, as many as 10 people (11.9%) quality of life less and 74 (88.1%) quality of life is good. The test results on the value of chi square statistic significance of 95% (α = 0.05) was obtained p-value <0.001 or p <α (0.05), thus there is the influence of social factors on quality of life in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara. When viewed from the RP = 7.875; CI95% (4.342 to 14.282) interpreted that social factors are less likely to 7.875 less than the quality of life of respondents with good social factors.

a. Influence of Environmental Factors on the Quality of Life

Table 6 shows that of the 34 people with less environmental factors, as many as 23 people (67.6%) quality of life less and 11 (32.4%) quality of life is good. While 66 people with good environmental factors, as many as 2 (3%) quality of life less and 64 (97%) good quality of life. The test results on the value of chi square statistic significance of 95% α = 0.05) was obtained p-value(<0.001 or p <α (0.05), thus there is the influence of environmental factors on the quality of life in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara. When viewed from the RP = 23.324; CI95% (5.591 to 89.125) interpreted that environmental factors are less likely to 23.324 less than the quality of life of respondents with good environmental factors.

Table 6: Effect of Environmental Factors on the Quality of Life in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara

No	Environmental factor	Life quality				n	%
		Less		Less			
		n	%	n	%		
1	less	23	67,6	11	32,4	34	100
2	good	2	3	64	97	66	100
Total		25	25	75	75	100	100

p-value <0,001; RP = 23,324; CI95% (5,591 – 89,125)

Source: Data Primer, 2016

3.4 Multivariate Analysis

Multivariate analysis is used to obtain answers to the factors which affect the quality of life using logistic regression with backward method. Results p value of physical factors, psychological, social and environmental value of p <0.25 with binary logistic regression test results can be seen in Table below.

Table 7: Variable Multiple Logistic Regression Analysis

No	Variabel	B	*p-value*	OR	95% C. I. for Exp (B)	
					Lower	Upper
1	Physical factor	0,983	0,343	2,671	0,351	20,314
2	Psikologis	19,591	0,996	322410373,30	0,000	0
3	social factor	3,754	0,006	42.682	2,919	624,126
4	environment	21,028	0,996	1356469806.503	0,000	0
	Constant	-68,309	0,996			

Source: Data Primer, 2016

Table 7 above, the results of the regression analysis, namely y = b0 + b1x1 + b2X2 + b3X3 + e, then the regression equation obtained was Y = -68.309 + 0.983 + 19.591 + 3.754 + 21.028 + e

    a. The constant value of -68.309 if there are no physical factors (X1), psychological factors (X2), social factors (X3) and social factors (X4), the amount of quality of life (Y) amounted to 68.309.

    b. Regression coefficients for the variables of physical factor (X1) is equal to 0.983. This shows that if the variable psychological factors (X2), social factors (X3) and social factors (X4) changes one value, then assuming the variable physical factors (X1) fixed, quality of life (Y) will decrease by 0.983.

c. Regression coefficients for the variables of psychological factors (X2) amounted to -19.591. This suggests that if the variable physical factors (X1), social factors (X3) and social factors (X4) changes one value, then assuming variable psychological factors (X2) remains, quality of life (Y) will decrease by 19.591.

d. Regression coefficients for the variables of social factors (X3) is equal to 3.754. This suggests that if the variable physical factors (X1), psychological factors (X2) and social factors (X4) changes one value, then assuming the variable social factors (X3) fixed, quality of life (Y) will decrease by 21.028. Based on the results of the regression coefficients, the environmental factors are dominant factors on quality of life in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara.

4. Discussion

4.1 Effect of Physical Factors on the Quality of Life

The result showed that there are physical factors influence the quality of life in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara (p-value <0.001). The results are consistent with research conducted by Kosin on the Population in the Village Sentul District of Sumbersuko Lumajang that there is the influence of physical factors on the quality of life of the population. This is because the health service has reached the public, so that people's health is good enough. The results of the analysis showed that respondents' statements regarding the prevention of pain in the move as needed with a total score of 304 is within range of both categories. This shows that the people in the village Karubaga Karubaga District Tolikara have noticed his health in order to move as needed. Addition of a statement of medical therapy to be able to function in everyday life with a total score of 276 in the category enough. It is due to that in the Village District Karubagan Karubaga Tolikara have provided adequate health care, so that people can easily access treatment or health care. This causes most of the respondents have the energy or stamina to athletic activities and work, and socialize with the surrounding community. Development targets in a certain sense in economics is to improve the economy of the self as increasing affluence equitable and dynamic national stability. The basis of the destination development in developing countries is to address the high rate of population growth. Therefore, should pay attention to the quality of life of human resources (HR) as economic planners, by emphasizing programs that aim to control the disease and improve the health and nutrition and improving education [6].

Physical factors diraskaan the most respondents with good physical factor as many as 75 people (75%). Cross-tabulation of the results showed that respondents with less physical factors, as many as 14 people (58.3%) quality of life less and 10 people (41.7%) quality of life is good. While respondents with good physical factor of 11 people (14.5%) quality of life less and 65 (85.5%) quality of life is good. This indicates that the physical semkain fakrtor high kualita felt both further improve people's lives in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara. A description of the statement of the physical factors of the seven questions physical factors with the maximum index value maximum score = 5 and minimum = 1 with the division of the total score of respondents regarding physical factors in the form of a total score of respondents about the physical factor of 7 questions obtained a total score of 2456 and the ideal total score of 3500 with a percentage of 70.17% is considered good.

Results of HDI achievement Tolikara fatherly Life Expectancy (AHH) in the period 2006-2014 has increased from year to year, though not too significant and AHH Tolikara still lower than the overall AHH Regency / City in the province of Papua, which reached 69.13. Meanwhile, if compared with other districts Jayawijaya division, did not differ significantly, which is equal to AHH Tolikara Bintang Mountains district (66.24) but lower than Yahukimo (67.44), and Jayawijaya (66.86).

By 2016 the number of health centers health infrastructure in Tolikara total of 26 health centers and 26 community health posts. the number of medical personnel provided as many as 215 people details of 17 doctors, 144 nurses and 54 midwives. This has caused some residents Each medical personnel have an important role for public health with an average every medical personnel serving about 593 residents Tolikara. Still a small number of facilities and health workers in Tolikara may inhibit community in accessing health services. Moreover, the distribution of medical facilities and personnel are not evenly distributed, from the existing 35 district health centers health facilities only in 26 districts.

In addition, one of the factors that affect the low AHH in Tolikara is not increasing awareness of the population on health that is visible from at least medical personnel in labor utilization and treatment in health facilities provided by the government. It is also evident from the findings of the 100 respondents 35% of respondents did not school, elementary and junior high school 17% 22%. Rendahanya education also affects kesdaran in the utilization of health services, thus affecting the physical factors of the community in the Village Karubaga, where physical factors are still 25% felt less, where the results of the prevalence ratio is obtained that physical factors are less likely to 4.030 quality of life is less than that of respondents with physical factors good Need for pernhatian government in health development program, among others by providing information to the public about the utilization of health services and a healthy lifestyle, as well as classroom education learning packages to people who are not in school.

1. Effect of Psychological Factors on the Quality of Life

The result showed that there was the influence of psychological factors on quality of life in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara (p-value <0.001). The results are consistent with research conducted [7] on the population in the Greater Jakarta in young adults revealed that there is the influence of psychological factors on quality of life. It disebbakan in young adults who do not work cause stress perceptions of health, life satisfaction and happiness. Psychological dimension that is bodily and appearance, negative feelings, positive feelings, self - esteem, thinking, learning, memory, and concentration. Social aspects include personal relationships, social support and sexual activity. Then aspects of the environment that includes financial resources, freedom, physical safety and security, health care and social care home environment, the opportunity to acquire new information and skills, participation and opportunity for recreation or fun activities as well as the physical environment and transport [8].

The ability to read and write is seen as the minimum basic capabilities that must be possessed by every individual, so most do not have the opportunity to become involved and participate in the construction. Literacy Rate (AMH) shows the percentage of population aged 15 years and over who can read and write at 33.56

percent. In other words, there are still many people in Tolikara are illiterate (66.44 per cent) and yet enjoy a good education. With poor education affects the community or the population in work or work such as gardening maximize results in increasing the quantity of production as revenue that may affect the welfare of society in meeting the needs of life.

Reference [7] found that employment status related quality of life in both men and women. Results Tolikara HDI data calculation, obtained a description of the average real spending Tolikara 2016 population, which is around Rp. 621.150, - per year. This figure is higher than the state in 2010 (Rp. 611 635, -). Compared with the achievements of the ideal real spending Rp 737 720, - to say the population's ability Tolikara to meet a decent living is still far from the target should be. This indicates Tolikara human development in the future needs to be more focus mainly promoting economic development in terms of both growth rate and greater equity.

1. **Influence of Social Factors on the Quality of Life**

The result showed that there is the influence of social factors on quality of life in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara (p-value <0.001). The results are consistent with research conducted by Kosin on the Population in the Village Sentul District of Sumbersuko Lumajang that there is the influence of social factors on the quality of life of the population. This is because the health service has reached the public, so that people's health is good enough. Dimensions of social relationships include personal relationships, social support and social activities. Personal relationship is the individual's relationship with others. Social support is describing the relief obtained by individuals from the surrounding environment. While sexual activity is the description of sexual activity by individuals [9]. Results of the analysis showed that respondents' statements related to the dimensions of the quality of life of the social factors that relationship pesonal / social respondents obtained a score of 362 dalan span both categories and score 345 in a span both categories against the life satisfaction of the sexual as well as a score of 374 in a span both categories received support from a friend and family.

Social factors on respondents in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara majority in both categories as many as 79 people (79%). This indicates that most of the good social factors. While 21% of students felt less in social factors.A description of the statement of the social factors of the three questions of social factors with the maximum index value and the maximum score = 5 minimum = 1 with the division of the total score of respondents regarding the social factor of 3 questions obtained a total score of 1084 and a total score of the ideal in 1500 with a percentage of 72.27% categorized as either. Observations that researchers do tinggnya social factors due Karubaga Village community support, especially among the indigenous population very closely and have a high friendship, so that people who are non-natives can interact socially well. In addition to the support the family including husband and wife, so that social factors in sexual satisfaction to the public. Respondents who felt less by social factors in society fraction perceived unmarried or widows and widowers, thus reducing social interaction, so that social interaction is still less and less satisfied with life well lived. Tabulias results showed that respondents with less social factors, as many as 15 people (93.8%) quality of life less and 1 (6.3%) better quality of life. While respondents either social factors, as many as 10 people (11.9%) quality of life less and 74 (88.1%) quality of life is good. This shows that social factors, the better to improve the quality of life, where social factors are less likely to 7.875 less than the quality of life of respondents with

good social factors. It disbebabkan of marital status factor that supports social interaction, where the unmarried as much as 15% and the widow / widower of 4%. But their support for the volunteers, so the majority of respondents were satisfied in life.

1.   Influence of Environmental Factors on the Quality of Life

The result showed that there was the influence of environmental factors on the quality of life in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara (p-value <0.001).

The results are consistent with research conducted by the on the population in the Greater Jakarta in young adults revealed that there is the influence of environmental factors on the quality of life. It disebbakan in young adults with a good environment has motivated a good life, thus enhancing the quality of life. The dimensions of the environment that includes a source of financial, freedom, physical safety and security, health care and social care, home environment, the opportunity to acquire new information and skills, participation and opportunity for recreation or fun activities, the physical environment and transportation [8]. Results of the analysis showed that respondents declared safe by a total score of 388 in a span both categories, it is due to the environment in which tinggai can meet the needs. However, the low availability of information, this is not all yet have electricity, dna scheduled, so the information is still lacking on television and radio. Besides the construction of which is still felt slow, so the place - no place for recreation, but people menyatakn satisfied with the state of unspoiled nature that makes Though the entertainment venues in static or no other entertainment that can reduce stress. Besides advice on transportation that are less supportive, so recreation is rarely done.

A description of the statement of the social factors of the three questions of social factors with the maximum index value and the maximum score = 5 minimum = 1 with the division of the total score of respondents regarding the environmental factor of 8 questions obtained a total score of 2629 and 4000 with a total score of ideal percentage of 65.73% categorized as either.

Results of the analysis showed that most of the environmental factor is expressed either as many as 84 people (84%), where respondents with less environmental factors, as many as 23 people (67.6%) quality of life less and 11 (32.4%) quality of life is good. While 66 people with good environmental factors, as many as 2 (3%) quality of life less and 64 (97%) good quality of life. This shows that most people accept the state of technological development and Opera because of geographical circumstances are quite difficult, so it takes time in the economic and technological development. However, respondents who lived less than 1-5 years old or non-natives feel that environmental factors are still diraskaan less because it feels or residing previously in areas that are adequate as urban areas. But people who have been living 6-10 years or> 10 years has been able to accept the existing development with the local environment.

2. The dominant factor on quality of life

The results obtained by environmental factors are dominant factors on quality of life in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara. This suggests that environmental conditions Village Karubaga Tolikara Karubaga

District can not provide life satisfaction. This is due to the development of technology and information as well as inadequate infrastructure, so the public is more limited compared to the busy urban areas, which are all available and people can enjoy each of these developments. Unlike the case with in the Village Karubaga very limited, so the little community activity and monotonous.

This indicates that the quality of life is more emphasis on the assessment of cognitive and covers about certain aspects of life are interpreted differently by each individual. Therefore, to see the individual assessment of the quality of life necessary to measure happiness in general and the measurement of quality of life that is more specific on those aspects of life that are important to the individual, so that although happiness is part of the quality of life, researchers see the need to do measurements different for both.

5. Conclusion

1. There are physical factors influence the quality of life in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara. When viewed from the value (p-value <0.001; RP = 4.030; CI95% = 2.120 to 7.664).

2. There is the influence of psychological factors on quality of life in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara. When viewed from the value (p-value <0.001; RP = 4.788; CI95% = 2.560 to 8.955).

3. There is the influence of social factors on quality of life in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara. When viewed from the value (p-value <0.001; RP = 7.875; CI95% = 4.342 to 14.282)

4. There is the influence of environmental factors on the quality of life in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara. When viewed from the value (p-value <0.001; RP = 23.324; CI95% = 5.591 to 89.125).

5. The dominant factor on quality of life in the Village in the Village District Karubaga Karubaga Tolikara environmental factors.

References

[1] World Health Organization. 2010. WHO Quality of Life-BREF (WHOQOL-BREF). http://www.who.int/substance abuse/research tools/whoqolbref/en/. Tanggal 31 Oktober 2016. Jam 23.58 WIT.

[2] Dinas Kesehatan Kabupaten Tolikara. 2014. Profil Kesehatan Dinas Kesehatan Kabupaten Tolikara. Kabupaten Tolikara.

[3] Balai Pusat Statistik. 2014. Indeks Pembangunan Manusia Kabupaten Tolikara. Kabupaten Tolikara.

[4] Kementrian Kesehatan RI. 2014. Peraturan Menteri Kesehatan no.97tahun 2014 tentang Pelayanan Kesehatan. Jakarta.

[5] Notoatmodjo. 2010.Metodologi Penelitian Kesehatan.Jakarta:PT.Rineka Cipta.

[6] Samuelson, P.A. 2001. Ilmu Makro Ekonomi. Jakarta : PT Media Global Edukasi

[7] Nofitri, N. F. M. (2009). Gambaran Kualitas Hidup Penduduk Dewasa di Jakarta. Skripsi. Depok: Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Indonesia.

[8] Sekarwiri. 2008. Hubungan antara Kualitas Hidup dengan Sense Of Community pada Warga DKI yang tinggal di Daerah Rawan Banjir. Skripsi. Fakultas Psikologi. Depok : Universitas Indonesia.