Dating Violence Among University Students in Indonesia: Help-Seeking Communication Strategies and Barriers to Disclosure

Deborah N. Simorangkir [1*]

ABSTRACT

Indonesia is experiencing a rise in dating violence (DV) in the last 5 years. The Indonesian Ministry of Education has issued a regulation for violence prevention and handling in higher education institutions to protect the academic community from all forms of sexual violence through the Regulation No. 30 of 2021 concerning Prevention and Handling of Sexual Violence. This was later changed to the Regulation number 55 of 2024 concerning Handling Violence in Higher Education Environments. Research, however, suggests that adolescents and emerging adults often prefer turning to informal sources of support for help rather than formal resources such as health professionals or university officials. This study seeks to identify the prevalence of DV among university students in Indonesia and to document their strategies to communicate their need for help, both formally and informally. A survey of 315 university students in Indonesia was conducted using a modified version of the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (CADRI). Findings show that: 1) Emotional and verbal aggressions are more prevalent than other forms of DV; 2) The type of DV experienced influences the perception of DV normalcy; 3) The type of DV experienced does not influence the self-perception of DV victimisation. Rather, high levels of DV and its consequences are the reason for disclosure; 4) There is a statistically significant correlation between formal disclosure and the level of emotional and verbal aggression; 5) The majority of respondents are satisfied with the support they received from their chosen source of support. Both formal and informal channels result in the same level of satisfaction.

Keywords: Dating violence, Indonesia, university students, gender-based violence, violence against women and girls (VAWAG)

BACKGROUND

Dating violence (DV) is a prevalent issue among university students in Indonesia, with significant implications for the academic community. A 2021 study on Indonesian late adolescents found that that 61.3% of participants had experienced DV before. Moreover, 42.5% of the participants reported that they were victims, 15.1% were perpetrators, while 42.5% have experienced both being victims and perpetrators (Putri et al., 2021). Despite efforts to prevent and address it, there remains a need to understand communication strategies and barriers to disclosure among students. This study aims to tackle this challenge by exploring the prevalence of DV and students' strategies for seeking help.

Indonesia's National Commission on Violence Against Women – known as Komnas Perempuan – and service institutions have recorded a rise in the number of reports on DV cases in the last 5 years. In fact, there were 3,950 cases reported in 2022, a double increase from the previous year. The majority of these reports were of violence against girlfriends, followed by violence against wives, and then violence against girls (National Commission on Violence Against Women, 2024). According to Komnas Perempuan, psychological violence ranked first at 40 percent, followed by sexual violence at 29 percent, physical violence at 19 percent, and economic violence at 12 percent (Antara, 2023).

The prevalence of DV among adolescents has become a universal problem. In a U.S. study by Wincentak et al. (2017), 20% of adolescents reported being victims of physical DV and 9% of sexual DV. Seeking help is often challenging for these adolescents and young adults as they often want to solve their own problems while at the same time lacking knowledge about formal support providers. Some other barriers to seeking help include stigma

[1] *Swiss German University*, INDONESIA
***Corresponding Author:** Deborah.simorangkir@sgu.ac.id

and shame. On the other hand, positive past experiences, encouragement and support from others are factors that facilitate help-seeking among victims of DV (Gulliver et al., 2010). When they do decide to seek help, research suggests that adolescents and young adults usually opt for informal – rather than formal – sources of support to seek help in times of difficulties. Such informal sources include family and friends (Rickwood et al., 2007).   In response to the increasingly frequent reports of cases of sexual violence occurring in higher education, Indonesia's Ministry of Education and Culture issued the Ministerial Regulation No. 30 of 2021 concerning Prevention and Handling of Sexual Violence (*Pencegahan dan Penanganan Kekerasan Seksual* or PPKS), which aims to create a higher education environment free from sexual violence (Mudzakkir et al., 2023). The term 'sexual violence' usually means rape and sexual assault while the term 'gender-based violence' is broader and includes women being controlled by threats and physical violence. However, the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture (*Permendikbud*) Number 30 of 2021 uses the term '*kekerasan seksual*' which translates to 'sexual violence', and defines sexual violence as acts carried out verbally, non-physically, physically, and/or through information and communication technology. The 21 acts that fall into the category of sexual violence are (Chaterine and Prabowo, 2021; Saimima et al., 2022):

1. Making remarks that discriminate or insult the physical appearance, body condition, and/or gender identity of the victim;
2. Intentionally showing one's genitals without the victim's consent;
3. Making remarks that contain sexual advances, jokes, and/or whistles at the victim;
4. Staring at the victim with sexual and/or uncomfortable nuances;
5. Sending messages, jokes, pictures, photos, audio, and/or videos with sexual nuances to the victim even though the victim has forbidden it;
6. Taking, recording, and/or distributing photos and/or audio and/or visual recordings of the victim with sexual nuances without the victim's consent.
7. Uploading photos of the victim's body and/or personal information with sexual nuances without the victim's consent;
8. Distributing information related to the victim's body and/or personal information with sexual nuances without the victim's consent;
9. Peeking or intentionally looking at the victim who is doing activities privately and/or in a space that is personal;
10. Persuading, promising, offering something, or threatening the victim to carry out transactions or sexual activities that the victim does not agree to;
11. Giving punishment or sanctions that have sexual nuances;
12. Touching, rubbing, groping, holding, hugging, kissing and/or rubbing parts of his/her body on the victim's body without the victim's consent;
13. Undressing the victim without the victim's consent;
14. Forcing the victim to engage in sexual transactions or activities;
15. Practicing the culture of the student, educator, and education personnel community that has nuances of sexual violence;
16. Committing attempted rape, without penetration;
17. Committing rape including penetration with objects or body parts other than the genitals;
18. Forcing or deceiving the victim to have an abortion;
19. Forcing or deceiving the victim to become pregnant;
20. Intentionally allowing sexual violence to occur; and/or
21. Committing other acts of sexual violence (Chaterine and Prabowo, 2021; Saimima et al., 2022).

However, such effort was not deemed sufficient to eradicate and reduce gender-based violence in various forms that occur within the university environment. Therefore, the Ministry of Education and Culture issued the Regulation of the Minister of Education, Culture, Research and Technology (*Permendikbudristek*) number 55 of 2024 concerning Handling Violence in Higher Education Environments. While the Regulation number 30 of 2021 focused on handling sexual violence in campus environments, Regulation number 55 of 2024 complements the wider points that were not covered in the Regulation number 30 of 2021, namely:

1. Physical violence;
2. Psychological violence;
3. Bullying;
4. Sexual Violence;
5. Discrimination and intolerance; and,
6. Policies that contain violence (Tani, 2024).

Moreover, there has been a rise of interest in the topic of DV in Indonesia as evidenced by the numerous research studies conducted particularly since 2023 – possibly due to the passing of the controversial and highly-

discussed Sexual Violence Crime Law in 2022 (Simorangkir, 2022). However, most of these studies focus on the psychological impacts on the victims. Literature on the particular help-seeking needs of Indonesian university students who are victims of DV and the pedagogical strategies that universities could adopt to counter DV is scarce.

OBJECTIVES

This study aimed to identify the prevalence of DV among university students in Indonesia and to document their strategies to communicate their need for help, both formally and informally. In doing so, this study strives to recommend pedagogical strategies that Indonesian university students should adopt to counter DV within their students.

The following research questions framed this study:
1. What is the most prevalent type of dating violence among university students in Indonesia?
2. Does the type of dating violence experienced influence the perception of dating violence normalcy?
3. Does the type of dating violence experienced influence the self-perception of victimisation of dating violence?
4. What is the most chosen type of disclosure among the victims of the different types of dating violence?
5. How satisfied are the victims of dating violence with their chosen type of disclosure?

METHODS

To answer these research questions, a survey on 315 university students in Indonesia was conducted using the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (CADRI; Wolfe et al., 2001), which is a questionnaire that contains 46 items regarding the respondents' experience of DV. These items are arranged in 5 dimensions: Verbal/Emotional Abuse, Physical Abuse, Relational Abuse, Sexual Abuse, and Threatening Behaviours.

The CADRI is a self-report measure designed to assess the frequency of conflict behaviours in adolescent dating relationship, as well as to identify potential risk factors for relationship violence (Wolfe et al., 2001).

Some modifications were made to the instrument to better suit the purpose of this research. Whereas CADRI also measures the types of violence perpetrated by the respondents, the instrument used in this study only measured the types of violence suffered by the respondents. Using 5-Likert-scale statements, additional items were added to the questionnaire to investigate the respondents' perception of the normalcy of DV, chosen type of disclosure, and level of satisfaction with their chosen type of disclosure.

According to the Indonesian Central Statistics Agency (BPS), the number of university students in Indonesia in 2023 is approximately 7.8 million students — consisting of around 3.3 million students at state universities and 4.4 million students at private universities (Putri, 2023). However, the population of this study is not merely all active university students but rather those who have dated within twelve months of this survey. Therefore, the population size is unknown.

Since the total population in this study is unknown, the sample size was calculated using the unknown population formula (Sugiyono, 2016):

$$N = \frac{z^2 \cdot p \cdot q}{d^2}$$

where

N = Population size
z = Value of the normal distribution table for the 95% confidence level (1.96)
p = Estimates on population proportion
q = $1 - p$
d = Margin of error.

Based on this formula, the minimum sample size of this research was calculated as follows:

$$N = \frac{(1.96)^2 \cdot (0.5) \cdot (0.5)}{(0.1)^2} = 96.04.$$

Thus, the minimum sample size of this study is 96.04 respondents.

Using a purposive sampling technique, the survey was conducted between October and December 2023 on active university students in Indonesia who have dated within twelve months at the time of this survey. This study did not place restrictions on the level of university study the respondents were undergoing or the level of seriousness and duration of their dating relationship.

To answer research question (RQ) 1, classical assumptions analyses were conducted to see which 'type of DV' – Psychological Aggression; Sexual Aggression; Threatening Behaviour; Relational Aggression; or,

Emotional/Verbal Aggression – has the highest score and is thus most prevalent. Several research studies (e.g., Rubio-Garay et al., 2017; Exner-Cortens et al., 2021; Putri et al., 2021) in various countries show that the most common type of aggression in dating is psychological aggression, therefore it is hypothesised that,

H1: The most prevalent type of dating violence among university students in Indonesia is Emotional/Verbal Aggression.

To answer RQ2, a multiple regression analysis between 'type of dating violence' and 'perception of dating violence normalcy' was conducted, with the following hypothesis:

H2: Yes, the type of experienced dating violence influences the perception of dating violence normalcy.

H0: No, the type of experienced dating violence does not influence the perception of dating violence normalcy.

To answer RQ3, a multiple regression analysis between 'type of dating violence' and 'self-perception of victimisation of dating violence' was conducted, with the following hypothesis:

H3: Yes, the type of experienced dating violence influences the self-perception of victimisation of dating violence.

H0: No, the type of experienced dating violence does not influence the self-perception of victimisation of dating violence.

To answer RQ4, a crosstabulation analysis was conducted between 'type of disclosure' (formal and informal) and 'type of experienced dating violence'.

To answer RQ5, a crosstabulation analysis was conducted between 'type of disclosure' (formal and informal) and 'level of satisfaction'

LITERATURE REVIEW

Dating Violence Among University Students

DV is defined as 'physical, sexual, emotional, or verbal aggression from a romantic or sexual partner' (Office on Women's Health, 2021). Due to their social environment, university students are vulnerable to DV. However, there is no consensus on the main reasons leading to DV. According to Duval et al. (2020), in general, females are more likely than males to perpetrate and/or experience DV. The most common risk factors are the individual factors, such as perceived risky sexual behaviours and substance abuse. These factors were more commonly found compared to peer and social risk factors, such as membership in athletic teams, student organisations, or sororities, and family risk factors, such as intergenerational violence (Duval et al., 2020). However, another study on U.S. college students by Lasley and Durtschi (2015) found that experience of neglect and prior domestic violence experienced during childhood were significantly related to victimisation and the perpetration of DV, whereas coming from a two-parent household tend to be linked to less violence. These findings show that early life experiences and family upbringing play important roles in the university students' tendency to experience or perpetrate DV. Dosil et al. (2020) also agree that early childhood experience plays a significant factor. In their study focusing on personal aspects of both victims and perpetrators of DV, factors such as social problems, sexism, and self-esteem were found to play a significant role. These factors are usually formed at a young age, thus showing how crucial early intervention is to prevent eventual DV (Dosil et al., 2020)

Sexual assault – one of the types of DV – on university campuses happen frequently, but disclosure to formal on-campus resources remains low as victims often prefer to disclose their experiences to friends and family members. A study by Mennicke et al. (2021) revealed that students who disclosed to formal on-campus resources are those who have suffered frequent poly-victimisation and experienced more severe physical and emotional consequences (Mennicke et al., 2021). This leads to the question of whether university students tend to perceive some type of dating aggression as normal behaviour and thus delay disclosure to formal resources until they become more serious. However, another possibility is also that university students – due to their young age – consider reporting to their parents as a form of formal disclosure.

Types of Disclosure

There have been numerous studies on the disclosure and non-disclosure of intimate partner violence (Andersson et al., 2010; Ansara and Hindin, 2010; Ashley and Foshee, 2005; Barrett and St. Pierre, 2011; Dunham and Senn, 2000; Fanslow and Robinson, 2010; Sylaska and Edwards, 2014). The types of disclosure are usually categorised into two types of disclosure recipients: Informal (e.g., family and friends), formal (e.g., the police, legal system, and health professionals).

According to Padilla-Medina et al. (2021), adolescents prefer informal sources of support, particularly from family and friends. Their hesitation to seek help from formal sources is caused by lack of trust, shame, embarrassment, and lack of closeness. Additionally, a possible barrier is because they wish to remain in the relationship and they fear that others may try to make them leave the partner (Andersson et al., 2010; Lempert, 1997). Still, there are advantages and disadvantages to informal disclosure. Advantages include emotional support,

having someone willing to listen, and getting practical help (Sylaska and Edwards, 2014). On the other hand, barriers include fear of victim-blaming, avoidance by the disclosure recipient and minimisation of the abuse (Goodkind et al., 2003; Trotter and Allen, 2009).

The time when victims choose to disclose abuse also varies. A study by Dunham and Senn (2000) indicated that after a violent situation, approximately half of the victims choose to disclose immediately, while over one-third wait for more than 2 years before disclosing the abuse to anyone. In fact, disclosure is related to stress due to the abuse, partner blame, and decision to end the relationship. The main reason for nondisclosure is the victim's minimisation of the abuse (Edwards et al., 2012).

Victims who disclose DV claim that the responses they find most helpful are: giving 'good advice', a chance to vent and talk about it, offering comfort and emotional support, rationalising the partners' behaviour, and offering an objective point of view. On the other hand, the least helpful responses are: telling to leave the relationship, lack of understanding, joking about the experiences, and giving bad advice (Edwards et al., 2012).

Dating Violence in Indonesia

According to Komnas Perempuan's 2023 report, of the 9,806 cases handled by service institutions, most cases occurred in the personal realm, amounting to 8,172 cases, including cases of violence in relationships (3,528 cases), violence against wives (3,205 cases), violence against girls (725 cases), other domestic violence (421 cases), violence against ex-boyfriends (163 cases), violence against ex-husbands (47 cases). and other violence in the personal realm (83 cases). The most common form of violence is physical violence (Komnas Perempuan, 2023).

Not surprisingly, violence in dating has become a worrying problem among Indonesia's youth. In a survey on university lecturers conducted by the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture in 2020, 77% of the respondents said that sexual violence had occurred on their campuses and 60% of them did not report acts of sexual violence (Pambudi, 2024). There are still campuses that cover up cases of sexual violence to protect the reputation of their campus. Campuses as educational institutions that are supposed to produce superior human resources for a better Indonesia should not cover up cases of sexual violence.

A survey conducted by the Ministry of Education and Culture and the Ministry of Religious Affairs on 1,026 students across 157 universities in Indonesia indicated that 110 students identified as victims of sexual harassment, while 906 reported as being bystanders. Interestingly, the survey results indicated that in recent years, university students have become more willing to report sexual violence – whether as victims or bystanders – and are also more aware of the sexual violence happening within higher education (Fazny et al., 2024).

A report on cases of sexual violence and revenge porn across Indonesian universities between 2019 and 2023 indicates that university lecturers abused their power over female students to commit acts of sexual violence, such as coercive intercourse, attempted rape, sexting, masturbation, unwanted physical contact, and blackmailing (Nurdin, 2023). Indeed, sexual violence has been reported in numerous universities. For instance, at Universitas Gunadarma in 2022, a viral video surfaced showing a student being persecuted by peers after accusations of sexual harassment (Gabriela et al., 2024). At Universitas Pelita Harapan, a piano lecturer was accused of sexually harassing multiple students (Gabriela et al., 2024). At Universitas Islam Riau in 2023, a Dean was fired after being accused of sexual violence against an alumnus (Gabriela et al., 2024). At Universitas Brawijaya, a student reported being sexually harassed by a senior in 2017, but the case was only formally reported in January 2020 (Farahdiba et al., 2024). At Universitas Sriwijaya, a lecturer was accused of sexually harassing a student during a thesis supervision session in 2021 (Farahdiba et al., 2024). At Universitas Indonesia, the 2023 Chairman of the Student Association was accused of committing sexual violence (Farahdiba et al., 2024). At Universitas Hasanuddin, a lecturer was accused of sexually harassing a female student beginning in 2023, while the student was dealing with administrative matters related to her thesis. The perpetrator was in charge of quality assurance and reputation improvement (Farahdiba et al., 2024).

At IAIN Ambon, a special edition of the student magazine *Lintas* published in January 2022 reported sexual harassment involving 32 victims, including 25 women and 7 men. The cases spanned from 2015 to 2021, with the perpetrators being 14 individuals, including 8 faculty members, 3 staff members, 2 students, and 1 alumnus. In response, the university administration shut down the student magazine and threatened the editorial team. The magazine's editorial leader revealed the threats and stated that the university accused the publication of spreading false information (Farahdiba et al., 2024).

The Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology's Regulation Number 30 of 2021 concerning Prevention and Handling of Sexual Violence in Higher Education Environments aims to help victims of sexual violence on campus. Due to the widespread occurrence of sexual violence, universities are now obliged to provide modules regarding the prevention and handling of sexual violence as established by the Indonesian government to the entire academic community. The handling of victims of sexual violence is regulated in Article 10–19 of the Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation Number 30 of 2021, which consists of: 1) Assistance in the form of counselling, health services, legal assistance, advocacy, and social and spiritual guidance based on the victim's

consent; and 2) Protection for victims while undergoing higher education, protection from threats to victims, provision of safe housing, and protection from criminal or civil lawsuits (Pambudi, 2024).

Sexual violence has not been taken seriously by the Indonesian government until recently. This is shown by how controversial the Elimination of Sexual Violence Bill was considered, and how long it took from being proposed in 2016 to finally be passed in 2022. Prior to that, crimes of a sexual nature were treated just as other crimes would be treated. This was immensely disadvantageous to the victims, especially when they decide to report to the law enforcement, as victims would need to provide several types of evidence, have witnesses, and fulfil other requirements that are more difficult in criminal cases of sexual nature. Still, at least the government has now taken steps to solve this growing problem. Finally, there is a legal umbrella that could cover sexual violence cases and the unique nature that distinguishes them from other criminal cases. The much-awaited passing of the Law on Sexual Violence Crimes was viewed as a glimmer of hope and was well-regarded internationally (Simorangkir, 2022).

However, though DV includes sexual abuse, it is not limited to the abuse or the threat of such abuse. The other types of DV – physical abuse, financial abuse, relational abuse, coercive control, and emotional and verbal abuse are not yet receiving proper attention. A research study on the impacts of DV on adolescents in Yogyakarta found that psychological violence in dating relationships impacts the victims' self-esteem, causing them to be insecure, have low self-esteem, like to compare, and feel like a failure. These traumatic effects interfere with their daily activities (Ayu et al., 2023). This makes it even more important for schools and universities to be proactive in preventing and handling DV among their students.

The Role of Universities

Article 57 *Permendikbudristek* number 30 of 2021 concerning Prevention and Handling Sexual Violence regulated that all universities are required to form a Task Force for the Prevention and Handling of Sexual Violence (PPKS) no later than one year after the promulgation of the regulation (LLDikti7, 2024). Minister of Education, Culture, Research and Technology Nadiem Makarim emphasised that there are categories of sanctions that would be imposed on perpetrators of sexual violence in campus environments which vary from mild, moderate to severe. The most severe sanctions can be dismissal as a student or removal from the position of lecturer or teaching staff. For perpetrators who receive light and moderate sanctions, they are required to take part in a counselling programme. The report on the results of this counselling will then be used by the university leadership as a basis for issuing a letter stating that the perpetrator has undergone the sanctions given. In addition, the costs of the counselling programme will be borne by the perpetrator (Puspitalova, 2024).

From a prevention perspective, this regulation requires universities to strengthen their governance in order to prevent sexual violence by forming a PPKS Task Force. Meanwhile, in handling cases of sexual violence, campuses are obliged to handle victims through mechanisms for assistance, protection, application of administrative sanctions, and recovery of victims. Higher education institutions that do not carry out the PPKS process in accordance with the Regulation number 30 of 2021 may be subject to administrative sanctions, including sanctions related to finance and accreditation (Puspitalova, 2024).

The Minister of Education, Culture, Research and Technology Regulation number 55 of 2024 concerning Handling Violence in Higher Education Environments was later issued with the aim of strengthening the prevention and handling of violence in the campus environment. While the Regulation number 30 of 2021 focused more on handling sexual violence in campus environments, the Regulation number 55 of 2024 aims to complement the points that were not covered by the previous Regulation, which are (Tani, 2024):

1. Physical violence, which includes brawls, abuse, fights, economic exploitation to provide profits for the perpetrator, murder and other physical violence regulated by law.
2. Psychological violence, which includes exclusion, rejection, neglect, humiliation, spreading rumours, mocking calls, intimidation, terror, acts of public humiliation, blackmail, and other acts that are declared as psychological violence.
3. Bullying, which include behavioural patterns of physical violence or psychological violence that is carried out repeatedly.
4. Sexual Violence, which is actually explained in more detail in the Regulation number 20 of 2021. This includes acts of humiliating, harassing, attacking a person's body or reproductive function due to unequal power or gender relations.
5. Discrimination and intolerance, which are forms of differentiation, exclusion, restriction or selection based on ethnicity, religion, race, skin colour, age, economic status, nationality, affiliation, socio-economic status or mental, sensory and physical abilities.
6. Policies that contain violence, which include policies that have the potential to cause violence, whether written or unwritten (Tani, 2024).

Seeing how rampant sexual abuse and violence still is in Indonesian universities, and how long it took the Indonesian government to finally pass the Law on Sexual Violence Crimes in 2022, it seems counterproductive – if not anticlimactic – for the Ministry of Education to put sexual violence cases in universities back under the same category as other types of violence. Regulation No. 30 of 2021 was merely part of the short-lived momentum, in which the Indonesian government appeared as though putting effort and paying special attention to the sexual violence problem. One may argue that such momentum – the passing of the Law on Sexual Violence Crimes in 2022 and Regulation No. 30 of 2021 – was merely a political strategy as Indonesia was approaching the presidential and general elections in 2024.

Moreover, it seems rather premature for the Ministry to conclude that the Regulation No. 30 of 2021 concerning Prevention and Handling of Sexual Violence is ineffective within only three years and thus sexual violence must be put back under the same category of other types of violence.

Why should educational institutions address DV? The following are some of the reasons why universities have a responsibility to recognise and prevent DV:

1. Universities are different from most other contexts in that they require interaction between a perpetrator and a victim;
2. Universities have an obligation to offer their students protection, which includes guarding them against physical violence caused by other students;
3. Universities have a greater opportunity than any other environment to address the behaviour of the abuser since they are the target of legal obligations to expand their efforts against sexual harassment to include DV. Students who grew up observing adults in their lives downplaying, ignoring, and overlooking adolescent DV are more likely to develop a violent streak as adults;
4. Educational institutions and districts have responsibility for documented instances of sexual harassment that transpire on campus. Universities have a strong incentive to prevent domestic violence in the future by preventing it in today's youth. DV and domestic violence have the same underlying cause and patterns that can be unlearned (Carlson, 2003).

Administrators have the power to decide how to handle behaviour relating to the school and on campus. They can address behavioural issues with students by following the guidelines provided by state legislation, board policies, and student handbooks. Unfortunately, policies rarely address DV, despite the fact that it is a criminal offense (Surface et al., 2012).

Pedagogical Strategies for Dating Violence

As teenagers begin to experience their first romantic relationships, schools are an important avenue for DV prevention. However, lack of training for school administrators and teachers, as well as lack of appropriate protocols to respond to DV incidents are often barriers to assisting DV victims. Meanwhile, without intervention, the older they get (university age), the more likely they fail to see the problem. This calls for greater emphasis on DV prevention (Khubchandani et al., 2017).

Recent studies have shown that pedagogical strategies play a crucial role in preventing DV among students. Smith and Johnson (2016) emphasise the importance of early intervention through educational programs to address gender stereotypes and promote respectful behaviour among students.

A 2014 review that examined how effective school-based interventions were in reducing or preventing DV showed that these prevention programmes in fact improved young people's knowledge about, and attitudes towards, DV. Moreover, these effects were sustained at follow-up as students demonstrated moderate increases in knowledge about DV, a lower acceptance of rape stereotypes, and moderate improvements in conflict resolution in interpersonal relationship settings (de la Rue et al., 2014).

However, while these programs are effective in preventing DV, they have little impact on already-established DV behaviour. In order to support actual behavioural change, programmes must explicitly aim to incorporate skill-building components. School policy must also address the role of bystanders more explicitly and shift the school culture to be less tolerant of DV (de la Rue et al., 2014; Wong et al., 2023).

FINDINGS

Profile of Respondents

A total of 315 respondents participated in this study, with 144 respondents (45.71%) being male and 171 (54.29%) being female. The majority (71.5% [n = 226]) of the respondents reside in the capital area of Jakarta, whereas 28.25% (n = 89%) reside outside of the capital area.

Table 1. Prevalence of dating violence

Descriptive statistics	Sample size	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard deviation
Physical aggression	315	1.00	4.50	1.4611	.80496
Threatening behaviour	315	1.00	4.75	1.4675	.82309
Relational aggression	315	1.00	5.00	1.4741	.86548
Sexual aggression	315	1.00	5.00	1.5087	.81982
Emotional and verbal aggression	315	1.00	4.33	1.6339	.82763

Table 2. Model summary: 'Type of dating violence' - 'Perception of dating violence normalcy'

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Standard error of the estimate	Change statistics		
					R square change	F change	df1
1	.445a	.198	.131	.84295	.198	2.979	24

Table 3. Analysis of variance: 'Type of dating violence' - 'Perception of dating violence normalcy'

Model		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Significance
1	Regression	50.804	24	2.117	2.979	.000b
	Residual	206.063	290	.711		
	Total	256.867	314			

1. What is the most prevalent type of dating violence among university students in Indonesia?

In order to answer the first research questions, a descriptive statistics analysis was conducted. To determine which dimension of DV is the most prevalent based on the provided descriptive statistics, we look at the means of each variable Index. The higher the mean, the more prevalent that dimension of DV is among the respondents.

Table 1 shows the mean values of each dimension and indicates that Emotional and Verbal Aggression has the highest mean value (1.6339), indicating that it is the most prevalent dimension of DV among the respondents. This suggests that emotional manipulation, verbal aggression, and other forms of psychological aggression may be more common than physical, sexual, or other forms of DV in the studied population.

2. Does the type of experienced dating violence influence the perception of dating violence normalcy?

In order to answer the second research question, a multiple regression analysis between 'type of dating violence' and 'perception of dating violence normalcy' was conducted.

Table 2 indicates an R-squared value of approximately 19.8% of the variance in the dependent variable (Index_Perception_TRUE) explained by the independent variables included in the model. The adjusted R-squared value is 0.131 based on the number of predictors in the model.

Table 3 indicates the F-statistic of 2.979 with a p-value of less than 0.05, indicating that the overall regression model is statistically significant. As **Table 4** shows, the significant predictor variables ($p < 0.05$) are the experience of the following:

- Victimisation_of_DV_PA3 (Physical aggression: 'My dating partner slapped or pulled my hair')
- Victimisation_of_DV_TB2 (Threatening behaviour: 'My dating partner deliberately tried to frighten me')
- Victimisation_of_DV_RA1 (Relational aggression: 'My dating partner tried to turn my friends against me')

These predictor variables ('experienced dating violence') have a significant impact on the dependent variable ('perception of dating violence normalcy'), which means that they significantly predict whether the victim of such aggressions perceive these aggressions as normal in a dating relationship.

Therefore, H2: 'Yes, the type of experienced dating violence influences the perception of dating violence normalcy' is approved. However, the other predictor variables do not have a significant impact on the 'perception of dating violence normalcy'.

Nevertheless, even though only some predictor variables have significant impacts on the 'perception of dating violence normalcy', responses regarding the participants' perception of whether the different types of aggressions are normal in a dating relationship are alarming. **Table 5**, **Table 6**, **Table 7**, **Table 8**, and **Table 9** show that there are many students who perceive threatening behaviour, physical aggression, relational aggression, sexual aggression and emotional aggression as normal in dating relationships, while many are undecided. This indicates an urgent need to raise awareness about proper and improper behaviour in relationships.

Table 4. Coefficients [a]: 'Type of dating violence' - 'Perception of dating violence normalcy'

Model	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	1.143	.114		10.048	.000
Victimisation_of_DV_PA1 'My dating partner threw something at me'	.108	.098	.114	1.099	.272
Victimisation_of_DV_PA2 'I was kicked, hit, or punched by my dating partner'	-.073	.110	-.071	-.665	.507
Victimisation_of_DV_PA3 'My dating partner slapped or pulled my hair'	-.222	.112	-.218	-1.977	.049
Victimisation_of_DV_PA4 'I was pushed, shoved, or shook by my dating partner'	.171	.101	.166	1.696	.091
Victimisation_of_DV_TB1 'My dating partner deliberately tried to frighten me'	-.033	.107	-.034	-.306	.759
Victimisation_of_DV_TB2 'My dating partner destroyed or threatened to destroy something I valued'	.181	.090	.190	2.012	.045
Victimisation_of_DV_TB3 'My dating partner threatened to hurt me'	.135	.104	.131	1.307	.192
Victimisation_of_DV_TB4 'My dating partner threatened to hit me or throw something at me'	-.022	.107	-.023	-.208	.836
Victimisation_of_DV_SA1 'My dating partner touched me sexually when I didn't want to'	-.062	.095	-.065	-.659	.510
Victimisation_of_DV_SA2 'My dating partner forced me to have sex when I didn't want to'	-.001	.097	-.001	-.013	.990
Victimisation_of_DV_SA3 'My dating partner threatened me in an attempt to have sex with me'	-.010	.103	-.010	-.098	.922
Victimisation_of_DV_SA4 'My dating partner kissed me when I didn't want to'	-.023	.089	-.023	-.258	.797
Victimisation_of_DV_RA1 'My dating partner tried to turn my friends against me'	.214	.103	.214	2.084	.038
Victimisation_of_DV_RA2 'My dating partner said things to my friends about me to turn them against me'	.061	.109	.064	.556	.579
Victimisation_of_DV_RA3 'My dating partner spread rumours about me'	-.096	.100	-.101	-.965	.335
Victimisation_of_DV_EVA1 'My dating partner did something to try to make me jealous'	.077	.077	.082	1.003	.317
Victimisation_of_DV_EVA2 'My dating partner brought up something bad that I had done in the past'	.150	.079	.183	1.888	.060
Victimisation_of_DV_EVA3 'My dating partner said things just to make me angry'	-.064	.075	-.077	-.863	.389
Victimisation_of_DV_EVA4 'My dating partner spoke to me in a hostile or mean tone of voice'	-.064	.086	-.068	-.749	.455
Victimisation_of_DV_EVA5 'My dating partner insulted me with put-downs'	.109	.093	.114	1.173	.242
Victimisation_of_DV_EVA6 'My dating partner ridiculed or made fun of me in front of my friends'	.082	.108	.076	.753	.452
Victimisation_of_DV_EVA7 'My dating partner blamed me for the problem'	-.089	.079	-.107	-1.130	.259
Victimisation_of_DV_EVA8 'My dating partner accused me of flirting with someone else'	-.093	.072	-.107	-1.298	.195
Victimisation_of_DV_EVA9 'My dating partner threatened to end the relationship'	-.032	.075	-.038	-.427	.670

Table 5. 'Threatening in a dating relationship is normal'

Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Undecided	Moderately agree	Strongly agree	Total	Weighted average
67.62%	17.14%	5.71%	6.03%	2.49%	315	1.61
213	54	18	19	11		

Table 6. 'Physical aggression in a dating relationship is normal'

Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Undecided	Moderately agree	Strongly agree	Total	Weighted average
63.81%	18.41%	7.62%	6.67%	3.49%	315	1.68
201	58	24	21	11		

Table 7. 'Relational aggression (toward other relationships) in a dating relationship is normal'

Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Undecided	Moderately agree	Strongly agree	Total	Weighted average
57.46%	24.44%	12.38%	4.44%	1.27%	315	1.68
181	77	39	14	4		

Table 8. 'Sexual aggression in a dating relationship is normal'

Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Undecided	Moderately agree	Strongly agree	Total	Weighted average
57.14%	24.44%	10.48%	5.40%	2.54%	315	1.72
180	77	33	17	8		

Table 9. 'Emotional/verbal aggression in a dating relationship is normal'

Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Undecided	Moderately agree	Strongly agree	Total	Weighted average
52.38%	24.44%	9.84%	9.21%	4.13%	315	1.88
165	77	31	29	13		

Table 10. Model summary: 'Experienced dating violence' - 'Self-perception of victimisation of dating violence'

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Standard error of the estimate	Change statistics		
					R square change	F change	df1
1	.837[a]	.701	.676	.60484	.701	28.268	24

Table 11. Analysis of variance - ANOVA[a]: 'Experienced dating violence' - 'Self-perception of victimisation of dating violence'

Model		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Significance
	Regression	248.194	24	10.341	28.268	.000[b]
1	Residual	106.092	290	.366		
	Total	354.286	314			

3. Does the type of experienced dating violence influence the self-perception of victimisation of dating violence?

In order to answer the third research question, a multiple regression analysis of the 'type of dating violence' and 'self-perception of victimisation of dating violence' was conducted. **Table 10** shows that the model shows a good fit as indicated by an R Square of 0.701, meaning 70.1% of the variance in the dependent variable 'Self-perception' is explained by the independent variables. The Adjusted R Square of 0.676 suggests that after adjusting for the number of predictors, the model still explains a substantial amount of variance.

Table 11 showcases the ANOVA results, indicating that the regression model is significant (Sig. = 0.000), thus the model as a whole explains a significant amount of variance in the dependent variable. This significance is further supported by the F statistic (28.268), which is much larger than 1.

Table 12 shows the predictor variables and their coefficients. Among the predictor variables, Victimisation_of_DV_TB1 (Threatening behaviour: 'My dating partner destroyed or threatened to destroy something I valued') has a p-value of 0.000, indicating it is statistically significant. However, none of the other predictors have p-values less than 0.05, suggesting they do not significantly contribute to explaining the variance in the dependent variable. Therefore, H3: 'Yes, the type of experienced dating violence influences the self-perception of victimisation of dating violence' is rejected.

Even though all but one predictor variable do not have a significant correlation with 'self-perception of victimisation of dating violence', it must be noted that despite the amount of participants who have experienced various types of aggressions based on the survey, only a small percentage perceive themselves as victims of DV, as shown in **Table 13**. Once again, this is likely due to the lack of understanding about proper and improper

Table 12. Coefficients [a]: 'Experienced dating violence' - 'Self-perception of victimisation of dating violence'

Model	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.095	.082		1.167	.244
Victimisation_of_DV_PA1 'My dating partner threw something at me'	.021	.070	.019	.304	.762
Victimisation_of_DV_PA2 'I was kicked, hit, or punched by my dating partner'	.010	.079	.008	.124	.901
Victimisation_of_DV_PA3 'My dating partner slapped or pulled my hair'	.065	.081	.054	.804	.422
Victimisation_of_DV_PA4 'I was pushed, shoved, or shook by my dating partner'	-.053	.073	-.044	-.737	.462
Victimisation_of_DV_TB1 'My dating partner deliberately tried to frighten me'	.335	.077	.294	4.353	.000
Victimisation_of_DV_TB2 'My dating partner destroyed or threatened to destroy something I valued'	.069	.065	.062	1.074	.284
Victimisation_of_DV_TB3 'My dating partner threatened to hurt me'	.118	.074	.098	1.590	.113
Victimisation_of_DV_TB4 'My dating partner threatened to hit me or throw something at me'	-.033	.076	-.029	-.430	.668
Victimisation_of_DV_SA1 'My dating partner touched me sexually when I didn't want to'	.075	.068	.066	1.104	.270
Victimisation_of_DV_SA2 'My dating partner forced me to have sex when I didn't want to'	.176	.069	.161	2.540	.012
Victimisation_of_DV_SA3 'My dating partner threatened me in an attempt to have sex with me'	.089	.074	.074	1.208	.228
Victimisation_of_DV_SA4 'My dating partner kissed me when I didn't want to'	-.014	.064	-.012	-.212	.832
Victimisation_of_DV_RA1 'My dating partner tried to turn my friends against me'	-.092	.074	-.078	-1.243	.215
Victimisation_of_DV_RA2 'My dating partner said things to my friends about me to turn them against me'	.129	.078	.117	1.646	.101
Victimisation_of_DV_RA3 'My dating partner spread rumours about me'	-.015	.071	-.013	-.206	.837
Victimisation_of_DV_EVA1 'My dating partner did something to try to make me jealous'	.040	.055	.036	.725	.469
Victimisation_of_DV_EVA2 'My dating partner brought up something bad that I had done in the past'	-.084	.057	-.087	-1.474	.142
Victimisation_of_DV_EVA3 'My dating partner said things just to make me angry'	-.069	.054	-.071	-1.296	.196
Victimisation_of_DV_EVA4 'My dating partner spoke to me in a hostile or mean tone of voice'	.056	.062	.050	.911	.363
Victimisation_of_DV_EVA5 'My dating partner insulted me with put-downs'	.107	.067	.095	1.605	.110
Victimisation_of_DV_EVA6 'My dating partner ridiculed or made fun of me in front of my friends'	.077	.078	.061	.987	.325
Victimisation_of_DV_EVA7 'My dating partner blamed me for the problem'	.045	.057	.046	.800	.424
Victimisation_of_DV_EVA8 'My dating partner accused me of flirting with someone else'	-.013	.052	-.013	-.259	.796
Victimisation_of_DV_EVA9 'My dating partner threatened to end the relationship'	.062	.054	.063	1.157	.248

Table 13. 'I am a victim of dating violence'

Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Undecided	Moderately agree	Strongly agree	Total	Weighted average
55.87%	30.16%	6.03%	2.54%	5.40%	315	1.71
176	95	19	8	17		

behaviour in relationships. Another possibility – though arguably less likely – is because of the use of the term 'victim', as the respondents may consider themselves survivors instead of victims.

Table 14. Chosen types of disclosure

Formal disclosure		Informal disclosure	
Police	19	Parents/grandparents/aunts/uncles	27
Psych. counsellor	20	Siblings	24
Legal counsellor	18	Friends	33
University officials	21	Anonymous forum	20

Table 15. Crosstab: Formal disclosure - Level of emotional and verbal aggression

Index_Formal disclosure	Level of emotional and verbal aggression			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
1.00	6	3	1	10
1.25	3	0	0	3
1.50	1	0	0	1
1.75	5	0	0	5
2.00	2	0	0	2
2.25	2	0	0	2
2.50	5	0	0	5
2.75	2	0	0	2
3.00	5	0	0	5
3.25	1	0	0	1
3.50	1	0	0	1
3.75	2	0	0	2
5.00	0	1	0	1
Total	**35**	**4**	**1**	**40**

Table 16. Chi-square test: Formal disclosure - Level of emotional and verbal aggression

	Value	df	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-square	20.257[a]	24	.682
Likelihood ratio	17.187	24	.841
Number of valid cases	40		

[a] 38 cells (97.4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.

4. What is the most chosen type of disclosure among the victims of the different types of dating violence?

Table 14 indicates that the most preferred form of disclosure of the respondents who consider themselves as victims of DV is informal disclosure, and friends are the most sought-after source of support. This is in-line with existing literature (e.g., Padilla-Medina et al., 2021) on adolescents and DV. However, university officials are the most sought-after support sources in the formal disclosure category. This indicates that universities have potential to play an important role in the handling and prevention of DV among its students.

In order to answer the fourth research question, cross-tabulation analyses were conducted between 'type of disclosure' (formal and informal) and 'type of experienced dating violence'. However, most associations between the indices and different levels of aggression are not statistically significant, except for a significant association found between 'Index_FD' (formal disclosure) and the level of 'emotional and verbal aggression'.

Table 15 shows the relationship between the 'Index_FD' variable and the 'Level of Emotional and Verbal Aggression' variable, with each row representing a specific value of 'Index_FD' and each column representing a level of emotional and verbal aggression. Unlike in other analyses with the different types of experienced DV, the Chi-Square test illustrated in **Table 16** does indicate a statistically significant association between Index_FD and the level of emotional and verbal aggression.

5. How satisfied are the victims of dating violence with their chosen type of disclosure?

In order to answer the fifth research question, a crosstabulation analysis was conducted between 'type of disclosure' (formal and informal) and 'level of satisfaction'.

a. Formal disclosure: The following are results cross tabulation results between the formal disclosure and level of satisfaction. **Table 17** shows that among those who have opted for formal disclosure, 17 respondents are satisfied, 15 are not satisfied, while 8 respondents are undecided about whether they are satisfied with the support they have received from the formal source of support. **Table 18** shows a Pearson Chi-Square p-value: 0.605, which indicates statistical significance.

Table 17. Crosstab: Formal disclosure - Support satisfaction

Index_Formal disclosure	Support_satisfaction				
	Disagree strongly	Disagree moderately	Undecided	Agree moderately	Agree strongly
1.00	2	0	2	5	1
1.25	0	1	0	1	1
1.50	0	0	1	0	0
1.75	2	1	1	0	1
2.00	0	0	1	0	1
2.25	0	1	0	1	0
2.50	1	1	1	0	2
2.75	2	0	0	0	0
3.00	2	0	0	2	1
3.25	1	0	0	0	0
3.50	0	0	0	1	0
3.75	1	0	1	0	0
5.00	0	0	1	0	0
Total	**11**	**4**	**8**	**10**	**7**

Table 18. Chi-Square Test: Formal disclosure - Support satisfaction

	Value	df	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-square	44.784[a]	48	.605
Likelihood ratio	48.186	48	.465
Linear-by-linear association	1.316	1	.251
Number of valid cases	40		

[a] 65 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .10.

Table 19. Crosstab: Informal disclosure - Support satisfaction

Index_Informal disclosure	Support_satisfaction				
	Disagree strongly	Disagree moderately	Undecided	Agree moderately	Agree strongly
1.00	1	0	0	0	0
1.50	0	0	1	2	0
1.75	2	1	1	1	2
2.00	1	2	1	1	0
2.25	2	0	0	0	0
2.50	2	0	2	0	0
2.75	0	0	2	1	0
3.00	1	1	0	1	1
3.25	2	0	0	1	1
3.50	0	0	1	2	1
4.00	0	0	0	1	2
Total	**11**	**4**	**8**	**10**	**7**

Table 20. Chi-square test: Informal disclosure - Support satisfaction

	Value	df	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-square	40.664[a]	40	.441
Likelihood ratio	44.953	40	.272
Linear-by-linear association	3.906	1	.048
Number of valid cases	40		

[a] 55 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .10.

b. Informal disclosure: Similar to **Table 17**, **Table 19** indicates a total number of 17 respondents who are satisfied with the support they received from the informal source, while 15 are not satisfied, and 8 are undecided. **Table 20** shows a linear-by-linear association p-value of 0.048, which is less than 0.05, indicating a significant association between the variables in that analysis.

In both analyses, the chi-square tests has a p-value that is greater than 0.05, which is the conventional threshold for statistical significance. Findings from the crosstabulation analyses show that the majority of respondents are satisfied with the support that they have received from their chosen source of support. However, the number is

not much greater than those who are not satisfied with the support. Moreover, there is no difference between the level of satisfaction of those who received support from informal and formal sources of support.

DISCUSSION

The findings from this study revealed that emotional and verbal aggression were the most prevalent types of DV among university students in Indonesia. Significant predictors influencing victim perception and self-perception were identified, highlighting the complexity of factors influencing how students perceive and respond to DV. The analysis of the chosen type of disclosure showed that the majority of respondents choose to disclose their DV experience and seek support from informal sources. However, the level of satisfaction obtained by those receiving support from formal and informal sources are identical.

This shows that universities have just as much potential to offer satisfactory support services as the more-frequently chosen informal support from family and friends. According to literature, the responses that DV victims find most helpful are:

- 'Good advice'
- Giving the opportunity to tell their story without judgment and interruptions
- Helping them understand the partners' behaviour by offering a neutral perspective, offering comfort and emotional support

However, not all adolescents come from families with such supportive, positive, and non-judgmental environment. In fact, perceived quality of family relationships is a significant predictor of whether victims of DV would disclose to their families. Therefore, it is essential that universities give training to their administrators and faculty members on how to properly handle victims of DV. It is even more advisable for universities to have a special task force or unit dedicated offering support to students who experience DV. Such unit must employ sympathetic staff who can offer a generally supportive atmosphere. Because the majority of respondents disclosed informally to their friends and family, it is important that universities embody familial and friendly traits into the support service the offer to victims of DV.

Another concern based on the literature is that only half of the victims choose to disclose immediately, while the others can wait for over 2 years. In fact, studies indicate that the victim's decision to disclose was related to their level of stress due to the abuse, whether they blame their partner, and their decision to end the relationship. This was also found among the respondents of this study, which indicates that despite their experience with various types of DV, only 40 out of 315 respondents consider themselves victims of DV. Those who do consider themselves victims and have chosen disclosure usually have experienced high levels of DV.

Findings of this study show that the type of experienced DV does not influence the self-perception of DV victimisation. In fact, the main reason for nondisclosure is the victim's belief that the incident was not serious. That is why universities must also offer educational and preventive programmes to raise awareness about behaviours that are improper in relationships. Nevertheless, education must start young because the factors leading to DV are usually found during early childhood. Also, school policy must address the role of bystanders more explicitly and shift the school culture to be less tolerant of DV. Teaching students to engage as bystanders is very important because university leaders have influence over students and can make an impact on young lives by equipping them to handle violence between intimate late teen couples. This is especially crucial since young adult couples often fail to recognise the abuse.

Though demographically and geographically the sample of this study is quite similar, however research studies and news reports have indicated that sexual misconduct happens all over Indonesia. Therefore, results may not differ greatly had this study involved more participants from outside of Jakarta.

CONCLUSION

This study's findings align with previous research on DV among university students, highlighting the importance of understanding the underlying factors that influence help-seeking behaviours and disclosure patterns. The results contribute to a better understanding of how students communicate their needs for help and shed light on the challenges they face in seeking assistance.

Based on the research findings, it is recommended that educational institutions in Indonesia implement targeted pedagogical strategies to prevent DV among university students. These strategies must focus on promoting healthy relationships, communication skills, and gender equality. Universities should also create a supportive and confidential atmosphere for students who seek help when experiencing DV. These prevention programs are especially important because relational and verbal-emotional violence often go unnoticed as they are more subtle than sexual and physical abuses.

Universities should develop training campaigns targeting educational professionals and society itself to eradicate DV. In doing so, collaborations could be fostered with organisations that can offer services such as family counselling, relationship reconstruction, self-enhancement to confront childhood trauma.

In regard to DV in Indonesia, future studies could explore the impact of culture and religion on the development of emotional intelligence as a way of preventing these violent behaviours among adolescents. Such studies could involve a larger sample representing the vast diversity of Indonesia. Interviews with experts could also offer a deeper insight into the DV issue in Indonesia.

One of the limitations of this research study is the small number of participants, which may make the results ungeneralisable. This is made especially difficult because the population size of students experiencing DV in dating relationships in Indonesia is relatively unknown. There have been a few studies on DV in specific universities (e.g., Wahyuni and Sartika, 2020; Wulandari et al., 2021; Apipin et al., 2022) and cities (e.g., Widyasari and Aryastami, 2018; Ariadne, 2023). However, unfortunately, there is no specific and accurate data on the exact number of university students who experience DV in Indonesia available. Still, research shows that DV is a serious problem, and many university students experience it. Future research must put more effort into obtaining responses from all over Indonesia, for instance, by visiting several universities and collaborating with the universities to encourage participation. Qualitative methods could also give a more in-depth view into the experiences of the victims, their perceptions about what constitutes DV, factors influencing their decision to disclose, and more.

Nevertheless, this study has analysed the issue of DV without limiting it to sexual violence, whereas research studies focusing on the lived experiences of DV in Indonesia are scarce. Therefore, this study gives a significant contribution to this research gap. Findings from this research may help formulate the traits that universities should have to provide optimal support services for victims of DV. This study is unique because it also highlights the communication aspect. Based on these findings, it is hoped that a template for a nationwide communication campaign against DV among university students could be developed.

Finally, the change from the Regulation No. 30 of 2021 concerning Prevention and Handling of Sexual Violence to the Regulation number 55 of 2024 concerning Handling Violence in Higher Education Environments must be closely analysed. Future research could investigate how this change affects the way universities handle DV cases and how this affects the willingness and method of disclosure of the victims.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Andersson, N., Cockcroft, A., Ansari, U., Omer, K., Ansari, N. M., Khan, A. and Chaudhry, U. U. (2010). Barriers to disclosing and reporting violence among women in Pakistan: Findings from a national household survey and focus group discussions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25(11), 1965–1985. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260509354512

Ansara, D. L. and Hindin, M. J. (2010). Formal and informal help-seeking associated with women's and men's experiences of intimate partner violence in Canada. *Social Science & Medicine*, 70(7), 1011–1018. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.12.009

Antara. (2023, March 9). *Komnas: Kekerasan pacaran dominasi kekerasan personal tahun 2022*. Available at: https://www.antaranews.com/berita/3433989/komnas-kekerasan-pacaran-dominasi-kekerasan-personal-tahun-2022. (Accessed 10 April 2025).

Apipin, A., Mariyati, M. and Tamrin, T. (2022). Kekerasan dalam Berpacaran dengan Kecemasan pada Remaja. *Jurnal Keperawatan*, 14(4), 1137–1144.

Ariadne, A. L. (2023). Pengaruh kecerdasan emosi terhadap kekerasan dalam pacaran pada mahasiswa di Kota Bandung. *Jurnal Riset Psikologi*, 139–146. https://doi.org/10.29313/jrp.v3i2.2954

Ashley, O. S. and Foshee, V. A. (2005). Adolescent help-seeking for dating violence: Prevalence, sociodemographic correlates, and sources of help. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 36(1), 25–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2003.12.014

Ayu, S., Gustina, E., Sofiana, L. and Puspita, L. (2023). A qualitative study: Self esteem in relation to dating violence impact. *Jurnal Aisyah: Jurnal Ilmu Kesehatan,* 8(3). https://doi.org/10.30604/jika.v8i3.1775

Barrett, B. J. and Pierre, M. S. (2011). Variations in women's help seeking in response to intimate partner violence: Findings from a Canadian population-based study. *Violence Against Women*, 17(1), 47–70. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801210394273

Carlson, C. N. (2003). Invisible victims: Holding the educational system liable for teen dating violence at school. *Harvard Women's Law Journal*, 26, 351–393.

Chaterine, R. N. and Prabowo, D. (2021, November 11). 21 bentuk kekerasan seksual di permendikbud 30/2021: Memaksa, memperdayai, hingga lakukan tindakan tanpa 'consent' ke korban. *Kompas.com*. Available at: https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2021/11/11/11123021/21-bentuk-kekerasan-seksual-di-permendikbud-30-2021-memaksa-memperdayai?page=all. (Accessed 10 April 2025).

de la Rue, L., Polanin, J. R., Espelage, D. L. and Pigott, T. D. (2014). School-based interventions to reduce dating and sexual violence: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 10(1), 1–110. https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2014.7

Dosil, M., Jaureguizar, J., Bernaras, E. and Sbicigo, J. B. (2020). Teen dating violence, sexism, and resilience: A multivariate analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(8), 2652. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17082652

Dunham, K. and Senn, C. Y. (2000). Minimizing negative experiences: Women's disclosure of partner abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 15(3), 251–261. https://doi.org/10.1177/088626000015003002

Duval, A., Lanning, B. A. and Patterson, M. S. (2020). A systematic review of dating violence risk factors among undergraduate college students. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 21(3), 567–585. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838018782207

Edwards, K. M., Dardis, C. M. and Gidycz, C. A. (2012). Women's disclosure of dating violence: A mixed methodological study. *Feminism & Psychology*, 22(4), 507–517. https://doi.org/10.1177/0959353511422280

Exner-Cortens, D., Baker, E. and Craig, W. (2021). The national prevalence of adolescent dating violence in Canada. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 69(3), 495–502. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2021.01.032

Fanslow, J. L. and Robinson, E. M. (2010). Help-seeking behaviors and reasons for help seeking reported by a representative sample of women victims of intimate partner violence in New Zealand. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25(5), 929–951. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260509336963

Farahdiba, R., Juliansyah, R. and Antara. (2024, September 1). Sejumlah kasus kekerasan seksual di kampus-kampus, berikut para pelaku dan vonisnya. *Tempo*. Available at: https://www.tempo.co/hukum/sejumlah-kasus-kekerasan-seksual-di-kampus-kampus-berikut-para-pelaku-dan-vonisnya-13735 (Accessed 6 April 2025).

Fazny, B. Y., Saputra, R., Aziz, A. and Alfaiz, A. (2024). Survey of sexual harassment to students at Indonesia University. *International Journal of Sociology of Education*, 13(2), 96–119. https://doi.org/10.17583/rise.13950

Gabriela, M., Yandwiputra, R. and Shabrina, D. (2024, December 1). Pelecehan dan kekerasan seksual di kampus-kampus, terakhir terjadi di Universitas Islam Riau. *Tempo*. Available at: https://www.tempo.co/hukum/pelecehan-dan-kekerasan-seksual-di-kampus-kampus-terakhir-terjadi-di-universitas-islam-riau-1175404. (Accessed 10 April 2025).

Goodkind, J. R., Gillum, T. L., Bybee, D. I. and Sullivan, C. M. (2003). The impact of family and friends' reactions on the well-being of women with abusive partners. *Violence Against Women*, 9(3), 347–373. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801202250083

Gulliver, A., Griffiths, K. M. and Christensen, H. (2010). Perceived barriers and facilitators to mental health help-seeking in young people: A systematic review. *BMC Psychiatry*, 10(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-244X-10-113

Khubchandani, J., Clark, J., Wiblishauser, M., Thompson, A., Whaley, C., Clark, R. and Davis, J. (2017). Preventing and responding to teen dating violence: A national study of school principals' perspectives and practices. *Violence and Gender*, 4(4), 144–151. https://doi.org/10.1089/vio.2017.0043

Komnas Perempuan. (2023). *Lembar fakta Catatan Tahunan komnas perempuan tahun 2023 kekerasan terhadap perempuan di ranah publik dan negara: Minimnya pelindungan dan pemulihan*. Available at: https://komnasperempuan.go.id/download-file/949. (Accessed 6 April 2025).

Lasley, C. Y. and Durtschi, J. (2015). The roles of dominance, jealousy, and violent socialization in Chinese dating abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 32(8), 1209–1234. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515588525

Lempert, L. B. (1997). The other side of help: Negative effects in the help-seeking processes of abused women. *Qualitative Sociology*, 20, 289–309. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024769920112

LLDikti7. (2024, March 21). *Edaran tentang kewajiban pembentukan SATGAS PPKS di lingkungan perguruan tinggi*. Available at: https://lldikti7.kemdikbud.go.id/bacainformasi/Pengumuman/edaran-tentang-kewajiban-pembentukan-satgas-ppks--di-lingkungan-perguruan-tinggi. (Accessed 6 April 2025).

Mennicke, A., Bowling, J., Gromer, J. and Ryan, C. (2021). Factors associated with and barriers to disclosure of a sexual assault to formal on-campus resources among college students. *Violence Against Women*, 27(2), 255–273. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801219889173

Mudzakkir, M., Ihya'Ulumuddin, N., Listiyani, R. H. and Sudrajat, A. (2023, December). Competing institutional logics in the policy of prevention and handling of sexual violence in Indonesian higher education, in *Proceedings*

of the International Joint Conference on Arts and Humanities 2023 (IJCAH 2023) (pp. 1640–1650). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-152-4_165

National Commission on Violence Against Women. (2024). *Lembar Fakta. Catatan Tahunan Komnas Perempuan Tahun 2023. "Momentum perubahan: Peluang penguatan sistem penyikapan di tengah peningkatan kompleksitas kekerasan terhadap perempuan".* Available at: https://komnasperempuan.go.id/download-file/1085

Nurdin, N. (2023). Revenge porn in Indonesian higher educations: Gender-based perspective. *Jurnal Ilmiah Global Education*, 4(4), 2227–2239. https://doi.org/10.55681/jige.v4i4.1415

Office on Women's Health. (2021). *Dating violence and abuse.* Available at: https://womenshealth.gov/relationships-and-safety/other-types/dating-violence-and-abuse. (Accessed 6 April 2025).

Padilla-Medina, D., Williams, J., Ravi, K., Ombayo, B. and Black, B. (2021). Teen dating violence help-seeking intentions and behaviours among ethnically and racially diverse youth: A systematic review. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse,* 23(4), 1063–1078. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838020985569

Pambudi, M. H. (2024). *Stop kekerasan seksual di lingkungan kampus! Kementrian Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia.* Available at: https://www.setneg.go.id/baca/index/stop_kekerasan_seksual_di_lingkungan_kampus (Accessed 6 April 2025).

Puspitalova, A. T. (2024, September 2). Kekerasan seksual di kampus, Nadiem Makarim pernah bicara soal sanksi bagi pelaku dan perguruan tinggi. *Tempo.* Available at: https://www.tempo.co/arsip/kekerasan-seksual-di-kampus-nadiem-makarim-pernah-bicara-soal-sanksi-bagi-pelaku-dan-perguruan-tinggi-13498. (Accessed 10 April 2025).

Putri, S. S., Satiadarma, M. P. and Soetikno, N. (2021, December). Prevalence of dating violence in late adolescence, in *Proceedings of the 1st Tarumanagara International Conference on Medicine and Health* (pp. 271-276). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Atlantis Press.

Putri, V. (2023). Jurusan kuliah dengan pertumbuhan mahasiswa terbesar di Indonesia. *RevoU.*

Rickwood, D. J., Deane, F. P. and Wilson, C. J. (2007). When and how do young people seek professional help for mental health problems? *Medical Journal of Australia*, 187(S7), S35–S39. https://doi.org/10.5694/j.1326-5377.2007.tb01334.x

Rubio-Garay, F., López-González, M. A., Carrasco, M. Á. and Amor, P. J. (2017). The prevalence of dating violence: A systematic review. *Papeles del Psicólogo*, 38(2), 135–147. https://doi.org/10.23923/pap.psicol2017.2831

Saimima, I. D. S., Purnama, N. K. D. C. and Yudistira, I. W. A. (2022). Kekerasan seksual di lembaga pendidikan berdasarkan permendikbud no. 30 tahun 2021 dan UU tindak pidana kekerasan seksual tahun 2022. *Abdi Bhara*, 1(1).

Simorangkir, D. N. (2022). Indonesia's elimination of sexual violence bill: A framing analysis of coverage by foreign online media, in *The Paris Conference on Arts & Humanities 2022 Official Conference Proceedings* (pp. 51–61). https://doi.org/10.22492/issn.2758-0970.2022.5

Smith, B. and Johnson, L. (2016). Educational interventions for preventing dating violence: A literature review. *International Journal of Adolescent Health*, 40(3), 278–291.

Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D.* Bandung, Indonesia: PT Alfabet.

Surface, J., Stader, D., Graca, T. and Lowe, J. (2012). Adolescent dating violence: How should schools respond? *Journal of Inquiry and Action in Education*, 4(3), 27–43.

Sylaska, K. M. and Edwards, K. M. (2014). Disclosure of intimate partner violence to informal social support network members: A review of the literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 15(1), 3–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838013496335

Tani, I. T. (2024, October 24). 6 poin perubahan permenristekdikti No.55 tahun 2024 yang baru disahkan. *JawaPos.com.* Available at: https://www.jawapos.com/pendidikan/015232554/6-poin-perubahan-permenristekdikti-no55-tahun-2024-yang-baru-disahkan. (Accessed 6 April 2025).

Trotter, J. L. and Allen, N. E. (2009). The good, the bad, and the ugly: Domestic violence survivors' experiences with their informal social networks. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 43, 221–231. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-009-9232-1

Wahyuni, D. S. and Sartika, R. (2020). Analisis faktor penyebab kekerasan dalam hubungan pacaran pada mahasiswa universitas pendidikan indonesia. *Sosietas: Jurnal Pendidikan Sosiologi*, 10(2), 923–928.

Widyasari, R. and Aryastami, N. K. (2018). Kajian sosiologis perilaku beresiko kesehatan pada kekerasan dalam berpacaran mahasiswa di Yogyakarta. *Buletin Penelitian Sistem Kesehatan*, 21(1), 48–59.

Wincentak, K., Connolly, J. and Card, N. (2017). Teen dating violence: A meta-analytic review of prevalence rates. *Psychology of Violence*, 7(2), 224. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0040194

Wolfe, D. A., Scott, K., Reitzel-Jaffe, D., Wekerle, C., Grasley, C. and Straatman, A.-L. (2001). Development and validation of the conflict in adolescent dating relationships inventory. *Psychological Assessment,* 13(2), 277–293. https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.13.2.277

Wong, J. S., Bouchard, J. and Lee, C. (2023). The effectiveness of college dating violence prevention programs: A meta-analysis. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 24(2), 684–701. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380211036058

Wulandari, R., Yunindyawati, Y. and Lidya, E. (2021). Fenomena toxic relationship dalam pacaran pada Mahasiswa Universitas Sriwijaya. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik, Universitas Sriwijaya*. Available at: https://repository.unsri.ac.id/47942/7/RAMA_69201_07021181722011_0003067503_0024105911_01_front_ref.pdf. (Accessed 10 May 2025).

Citation: Simorangkir, D. N. (2025). Dating Violence Among University Students in Indonesia: Help-Seeking Communication Strategies and Barriers to Disclosure. *Feminist Encounters: A Journal of Critical Studies in Culture and Politics*, 9(2), 32. https://doi.org/10.20897/femenc/16791