

# TJPR



Turkish Journal of Physiotherapy  
and Rehabilitation

Türk Fizyoterapi ve Rehabilitasyon Dergisi

## RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTERNET USE AND WELL-BEING IN URBAN AND RIVERSIDE COMMUNITIES IN SOUTH KALIMANTAN

Marina Dwi Mayangsari<sup>1</sup>, Rika Vira Zwagery<sup>2</sup>, Rendy Alfiannoor Achmad<sup>3</sup>, Muhammad Alfiannoor<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Psychology Studies Program, Faculty of Medicine, Lambung Mangkurat University, Banjarbaru, South Borneo, Indonesia, md.mayangsari@ulm.ac.id

<sup>2</sup>Psychology Studies Program, Faculty of Medicine, Lambung Mangkurat University, Banjarbaru, South Borneo, Indonesia, rika\_vira@yahoo.com

<sup>3</sup>Psychology Studies Program, Faculty of Medicine, Lambung Mangkurat University, Banjarbaru, South Borneo, Indonesia, Rendy.alfiannoor@ulm.ac.id

<sup>4</sup>Psychology Studies Program, Faculty of Medicine, Lambung Mangkurat University, Banjarbaru, South Borneo, Indonesia, alfiandsm@gmail.com

### ABSTRACT

Indonesia's population of 262 million people is more than 50% connected to the internet network in 2017, with an average increase in the last 10 (ten) years of approximately 10 million people per year. This study seeks to explain how the relationship between the use of the internet and well-being and its differences in urban communities and riverside communities is also limited research on community behavior in South Kalimantan, which is largely wetlands. This research uses quantitative research methods. The results obtained in this study reveal that there is a relationship between internet use and wellbeing, and there are differences in internet use and well-being between urban communities and riverside communities.

**Keywords:** Psychological Well Being, Internet Use

### I. INTRODUCTION

Within 10 (ten) years, the internet has experienced very rapid progress, and almost all populations in Indonesia have used the internet. Indonesia's population of 262 million people is more than 50% connected to the internet network in 2017 with an average increase in the last 10 (ten) years of approximately 10 million people per year with internet penetration in urban areas already reaching 72,41% while in urban-rural areas (second tier regions) almost reached half the population of 49.49%. But in rural areas, it is still smaller at 48.25%. The duration of internet use in Indonesian people is 43.89% using the internet for 1-3 hours per day, 29.63% using the internet for 4-7 hours per day, and 26.48% more than 7 hours per day (APJII, 2018). Many studies say that the internet is the most important part of people's daily lives (Cotten, Ford, Ford & Hale, 2012; Thorsteinsson & Davey, 2014; Tzavela, Karakitsou, Halapi & Tsitsika, 2017).

Several studies have shown that there is a relationship between internet use and well-being (Caplan, 2002; Casale, Lecchi, & Fioravanti, 2015; Heo, Chun, Lee, Lee, & Kim, 2015; Huang, 2010; Mei, Yau, Chai, Guo, & Potenza, 2016; Nie, Sousa-Poza, & Nimrod, 2015; Odaci, & Çikrikci, 2014). However, only a few can explain how the connection between the use of the internet and well-being and the difference between urban and rural communities. Indonesia itself has a vast territory, with a total of 83,931 villages (BPS, 2018). Research shows that there is a relationship between well-being and the characteristics of the residential area (Elliot, Gale, Parsons, Kuh, & Tema, 2014; Winterton, Warburton, Keating, Petersen, Berg, & Wilson, 2016), where the characteristics of cities and villages are different each other. Based on this, the researchers propose a hypothesis to be examined, namely:

H1: There is a difference in the use of the internet between urban communities and those living on the riverside

H2: There is a difference between urban and community well-being living on the riverside

Previous research also revealed that there was a negative relationship between problematic internet use and well-being. The basis of well-being in positive psychology is how people judge their well-being based on what they believe. Individuals who use the internet excessively do not see themselves positively and will find it difficult to motivate themselves due to a lack of variety and self-development caused by negative and irrational thoughts and the possibility of becoming a vicious circle (Çikrıkci, Ö. 2016; Senol-Durak & Durak, 2011). Researchers determine the third hypothesis:

H3: There is a relationship between the use of the internet with well-being in South Kalimantan society

## II. METHOD

This study uses quantitative research methods. The selection of quantitative research types because the focus of the research problem is to measure the relationship between internet use and well-being in urban and rural communities. The variables in this study are the use of the internet and well-being, and subjects in this study are urban and rural communities in South Kalimantan. The technique of taking subjects was done by purposive random sampling method of selecting a group of subjects based on certain characteristics or traits that were considered to have a connection. Closely related to the characteristics or characteristics of the population that have been known previously.

Retrieval of data in this study using a scale method. Respondents were asked to fill in the statements on a scale by the instructions given by the researcher. This study uses 2 scales, namely the scale of internet use consisting of 3 dimensions, namely educational, recreational, and social. The use of the internet for education consists of 6 questions, the use of the internet for recreation consists of 3 questions and for social use consists of 4 questions while the psychological well-being scale (Ryff, 1995) consisting of 20 items and focus on different aspects of psychological well-being.

## III. RESULT

### 3.1 Sociodemographic description:

Participants in this study are residents of South Kalimantan who live in cities and live along river banks. Participants were taken randomly through online and offline media. The total number of samples taken was 218 people (female = 152 male = 66 M ages = 1.69 Median = 20 SD = 0.46), consisting of 109 subjects from city community and 109 subjects from riverside community with range of ages from 16 To 43 (M ages = 21.36 Median = 20 SD = 4.51)

### 3.2 Reliability:

Reliability on the Internet use showed scores Cronbach's alpha of 0.790, and the item-total correlation coefficient moves between 0.321-0.595. The total item is 11, and the Psychological well being showed scores Cronbach's alpha of 0.925 and item-total correlation coefficient moves between 0.520-0.776, with the total item are 18.

### 3.3 Hypothesis test: H1:

There is a difference in the use of the internet between urban communities and those living on the riverside Based on the results of the analysis, internet usage in urban communities was higher (M = 32.44) than riverside communities (M = 26.42) ( $p < 0.05$ ). However, there were no differences in internet use ( $p < 0.05$ ) based on gender between urban communities (M = 29.45) and riverside (M = 29.42). These results indicate that H1 is accepted, that there are differences in internet use between urban communities and riverside communities. **H2:** There is a difference between urban and community well-being living on the riverside. There is a difference in psychological well-being in urban and riverside communities ( $p < 0.05$ ), where urban communities have higher psychological well-being (M = 80.65) than rural communities (M = 55.29). Whereas, based on gender, men have higher psychological well-being (M = 97.69) than women (M = 55.06). **H3:** There is a relationship between the use of the internet with well-being in communities in South Kalimantan There is a relationship between the use of the internet with well-being in the people of South Kalimantan with a significance value ( $p < 0.05$ ) with a positive correlation coefficient so it can be concluded that the higher the use of the internet the higher the well-being in the community in south Kalimantan.

#### IV. DISCUSSION

Based on the results of the analysis of urban and rural communities in the internet, using 6.9% belong to the very low category, 23.2% low, 33.9% moderate, 22.7% high, and 6.9% very high (Table 1). Whereas well-being in urban and rural communities was 32.2% low, 45.5% moderate, 3.9% high, and 12% very high (Table 2).

**Table 1:** Internet use categorization

Category	Percent (%)
Very low	7.3
Low	24.8
Medium	36.2
High	24.3
Very High	7.3
Total	100

**Table 2:** Psychological Well-being categorization

Category	Percent (%)
Very low	0
Low	34.4
Medium	48.6
High	4.1
Very High	12.8
Total	100

The results of this study indicate that the internet usage of urban communities is higher than that of riverside communities. South Kalimantan is one of the provinces in Indonesia where part of the territory is wetlands and has infrastructure that is still in the development stage. This land is the potential for the development of integrated farming to increase national food production. (Suryana, 2016). This can cause differences in internet usage in some areas in South Kalimantan. This is in line with the results of research conducted by Berner J., Rennemark, M., Jogr us C., and Anderberg P., Sk oldunger, A., and Wahlberg, M., Elmst ahl S., and Berglund, J. (2015), Those living in rural areas used the Internet less than their urban counterparts. And the research conducted by Guido De Blasio (2008), Internet usage is much more frequent among urban consumers than among their non-urban counterparts. The results also showed that urban communities have higher well-being than riverside communities. This is different from the results of research conducted by Nepomuceno, Cardoso, Ximenes, Barros & Leite (2016) that states there are significant differences between the inhabitants of the rural and urban communities, with a higher average well-being score in the rural context. This study also found that there is a relationship between internet use and well-being in the people of South Kalimantan.

#### REFERENCES

- Asosiasi Penyelenggara Jasa Internet Indonesia, 2018. Infografis Penetrasi dan Perilaku Pengguna Internet Indonesia 2017. Jakarta: APJII
- Berner, J., Rennemark, M., Jogr us, C., Anderberg, P., Sk oldunger, A., Wahlberg, M., Elmsthal, S., Berglund, J. (2015). Factors influencing Internet usage in older adults (65 years and above) living in rural and urban Sweden. *Health Informatics Journal*, 21(3), 237–249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1460458214521226>
- Caplan, S. E. (2002). Problematic internet use and psychosocial well-being: Development of a theory-based cognitive-behavioral measurement instrument. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 18(5), 553-575
- Casale, S., Lecchi, S., & Fioravanti, G. (2015). The association between psychological well-being and the problematic use of internet communicative services among young people. *The Journal of Psychology*, 149(5), 480-497.
-  ikr kci,  . (2016). The effect of internet use on well-being Meta-analysis. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 65, 560–566.
- Cotten, S. R., Ford, G., Ford, S., & Hale, T. M. (2012). Internet use and depression among older adults. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28, 496–499.
- De Blasio, Guido. (2008). Urban-Rural Differences in Internet Usage, e-Commerce, and e-Banking: Evidence from Italy. *Growth and Change*. 39. 341-367. [10.1111/j.1468-2257.2008.00422.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2257.2008.00422.x).
- Elliott, J., Gale, C. R., Parsons, S., Kuh, D. & Team, H. A. S. 2014. Neighborhood cohesion and mental wellbeing among older adults: A mixed-methods approach. *Social Science & Medicine*, 107, 44-51.
- Heo, J., Chun, S., Lee, S., Lee, K. H., & Kim, J. (2015). Internet use and well-being in older adults. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 18(5), 268-272.
- Huang, C. (2010). Internet use and psychological well-being: A meta-analysis. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 13(3), 241-249.
- Nepomuceno, B. B., Cardoso, A.A.V., Ximenes, V. M., Barros, J.P.P. & Leite J.F. (2016). Mental health, wellbeing, and poverty: A study in urban and rural communities in Northeastern Brazil, *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 44:1, 63-75 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10852352.2016.1102590>.
- Nie, P., Sousa-Poza, A., & Nimrod, G. (2015). Internet use and subjective well-being in China. *Social Indicators Research*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-015-1227-8>.
- Odacı, H., &  ikr kci,  . (2014). Problematic internet use in terms of gender, attachment styles, and subjective well-being in university students. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 32, 61-66.

- 14 Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(4), 719-727.
- 15 Senol-Durak, E., & Durak, M. (2011). The mediator roles of life satisfaction and self-esteem between the affective components of psychological well-being and the cognitive symptoms of problematic internet use. *Social Indicators Research*, 103(1), 23-32.
- 16 Suryana. (2016). Potential and Opportunity of Zone-Based Integrated Farming System Development in Swampland. *Jurnal Litbang Pertanian* Vol. 35 No. 2 Juni 2016 : 57-68 DOI : 10.21082/jp3.v35n2.2016.p57-68.
- 17 Thorsteinsson, E. B. and Davey, L. (2014). Adolescents' compulsive Internet use and depression: A longitudinal study. *Open Journal of Depression*, 3, 13–17. doi:10.4236/ojd.2014.31005.
- 18 Tzavela, E. C., Karakitsou, C. Halapi, E. and Tsitsika, A. K. (2017). Adolescent digital profiles: A process-based typology of highly engaged internet users. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 69, pp. 246-255. Doi <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.11.032>.
- 19 Winterton, R., Warburton, J., Keating, N., Petersen, M., Berg, T. & Wilson, J. 2016. Understanding the influence of community characteristics on wellness for rural older adults: A meta-synthesis. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 45, 320-327.