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ABSTRACT

Objective: Based on the results of a complete investigation into teenage promiscuity in Medan, this paper measures the perception of dating styles of high school students.

Method: The research applies a quantitative design with an online survey method via Google Forms. The research was conducted online during November 2023. Research data was obtained through a questionnaire with 25 questions developed based on various expert opinions regarding teenage dating styles. The data analysis applies the dichotomous Rasch model with the consideration that the questionnaire answers were scored 1 for a Yes answer and 0 for a No answer. This research sample consisted of 274 high school students in Medan City, Indonesia (185 women, 89 men) using nonprobability sampling techniques.

Result: The measurement results show that high school students in Medan consider dating a common thing nowadays, and it is getting easier to communicate during dating with the presence of social media.

Conclusion: The results of research on adolescent disagreement are shown in several aspects, such as the presence of negative impacts or indications of violence in dating. A finding that is also quite interesting is the difference between the answers of male and female respondents regarding the acceptance of violence during dating. Based on the respondents’ answers, it was found that the majority of female respondents received violent dating.

Suggestion: Based on the findings of this research, further measurement is needed of the things that influence teenagers’ dating styles, which lead to negative impacts such as violence in dating through education in the school environment.
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MEDINDO A PERCEPÇÃO DOS ESTUDANTES DO ENSINO MÉDIO SOBRE ESTILOS DE NAMORO EM MEDAN CITY, INDONÉSIA

RESUMO

Objetivo: Com base nos resultados de uma investigação completa sobre a promiscuidade adolescente em Medan, este artigo mede a percepção de estilos de namoro de estudantes do ensino médio.

Metodologia: A pesquisa aplica um design quantitativo com um método de pesquisa on-line via Google Forms. A pesquisa foi realizada on-line em novembro de 2023. Os dados da pesquisa foram obtidos através de um questionário com 25 perguntas desenvolvidas com base em várias opiniões de especialistas sobre estilos de namoro adolescente. a análise de dados aplica o modelo dicotômico Rasch com a consideração de que as respostas do questionário foram pontuadas 1 para uma resposta Sim e 0 para uma resposta Não. Esta amostra de pesquisa consistiu em 274 estudantes do ensino médio em Medan City, Indonésia (185 mulheres, 89 homens) usando técnicas de amostragem sem probabilidade.

Resultado: Os resultados das medições mostram que os alunos do ensino médio em Medan consideram namorar uma coisa comum nos dias de hoje, e está ficando mais fácil se comunicar durante os encontros devido à presença das mídias sociais.

Conclusão: Os resultados da pesquisa sobre desacordo entre adolescentes são mostrados em vários aspectos, como a presença de impactos negativos ou indícios de violência na datação. Uma descoberta que também é bastante interessante é a diferença entre as respostas de entrevistados do sexo masculino e feminino em relação à aceitação da violência durante o namoro. Com base nas respostas dos entrevistados, foi constatado que a maioria das entrevistadas do sexo feminino recebeu namoro violento.

Sugestão: Com base nos resultados desta pesquisa, é necessária uma medição adicional das coisas que influenciam os estilos de namoro dos adolescentes, o que leva a impactos negativos, como a violência em namoro através da educação no ambiente escolar.

Palavras-chave: estilos de namoro, percepção dos alunos do ensino médio, cidade de Medan.

1 INTRODUCTION

High school students aged 15-18 are in the teenage phase and experience rapid physical, psychological, and social development (Laras, 2019). Most of the adolescents' development leads to the expression of internal reproductive hormone drives as well as the existence and self-actualization to be accepted in the external environment, especially the adolescent community. One activity that accommodates internal encouragement and external recognition is dating between teenagers. Most teenagers assume that dating is a less serious relationship. Dating couples do not plan to have children, share household budgets, or engage in other activities compulsorily handled by a married couple. Someone who is dating is limited to following their lustful urges and giving vent to sexual desires (Herman & Campbell, 2012a). Perceptions of dating like this encourage sexual violence
in dating and pregnancy out of wedlock (Hellevik, 2019; Ryan et al., 2007; Vuttanont et al., 2006).

In education, sexual violence and out-of-wedlock pregnancy are significant problems among students in the United States and worldwide. In the United States, teenage pregnancy at school age is one of the highest cases due to several factors: ignorance about the reproductive system, psychological problems, welfare, the role of parents, and social norms (Asriani, 2018; Kettrey et al., 2019). A study at Mensiku Community Health Center in Binjai Hulu District District, Sintang Regency, West Kalimantan Province, Indonesia, investigated 60 pregnant teenage respondents aged 12-19; the study revealed that the majority were aged 16-19 (93.3%), held high school education (48.3%), admitted to have engaged in unhealthy dating behavior between teenagers, such as kissing, touching sensitive body parts, and having premarital sex (96.7%) (Septiarum et al., 2019).

One of the factors that causes levels of depression or stress in the younger generation in several Indonesian big cities, including Medan, is socio-economic status (Christiani et al., 2015). High school-age teenagers with poor backgrounds and economic status are classified as poor, are very vulnerable to experiencing depression, and perform negative actions, such as leaving home, cooperating with friends considered deviant by society for causing brawls and trouble, being drunk, taking drugs, having free sex between teenagers, or doing prostitution causing outside-marriage pregnancies, abortions, sexual diseases, such as HIV-AIDS and syphilis (Okumu et al., 2017; Paiva et al., 2011).

The rapid development of information technology, including social media, is the most significant factor influencing millennial generation students' behavior. Social media effectively changes and shapes students' behavior, including emotions, such as pity, sadness, joy, and anger (Sriadhi et al., 2018). Various information technologies, such as YouTube and Telegram, are freely available and accessible, greatly influence students' behavior and perceptions about dating with violence, and trigger students to engage in premarital sex. In the past, some dating relationships led to deeper relationships, such as sexual activity; these activities were initiated through communication technology in the form of telephones (Sarch, 1993). As information technology develops very quickly, there are now mobile dating applications, such as Tinder, that offer and sell sexual activities. The site defines "Tindersluts" as "prostitutes who use the app to sleep with men," and the definition of "Tinderella" ranges from "the girl of your dreams for a one-night rent" to
"very hot girl on Tinder" (MacKenzie A. Christensen, 2021; Duguay, 2017a). This application can catch high school-age teenagers and trap them in an endless cycle of free sex and prostitution. More than that, the viewing of various sexual activities on these applications and various other digital platforms promotes and cultivates an irresponsible dating style that only indulges in the desire to commit sexual violence and premarital sex.

One of the factors causing the rise in sexual relations among high school-aged teenagers is permissiveness. One of the biggest permissiveness that encourages dating with violence and sexual relations is parental permissiveness. Parents with a permissive parenting style to their children with safe and risky dating do not carry out the eight family functions: religious functions, reproductive functions, sociocultural functions, affection functions, protection functions, socialization and education functions, economic functions, and environmental functions (Septiarum et al., 2019). Parents must be aware that neurologically and psychologically, teenagers have frontal lobes that cannot maintain long-term memory; thus, they cannot modify various emotional impulses, such as sexual desire, which can result in conflict or even clash with religious values and social norms (Mukminun, 2022). Therefore, parents must teach and educate their children that premarital sex is an act of adultery, which is a major sin in religion and is contrary to customs and social norms. Moreover, parents should teach that sexual relations can only be carried out after officially getting married and becoming a husband and wife. The permissiveness scale for dating that leads to premarital sexual relations is multiple Guttman scale items, which ask acceptability of sexual behavior for premarital relationships with different emotional levels. The scale of adolescent dating permissiveness that culminates in premarital sex is divided into two: "permissiveness with affection" and "permissiveness without affection" (Sprecher & Hatfield, 1996). Permissiveness with affection (sexual relations) refers to the acceptance of premarital sex in conditions of affection, and permissiveness without affection (or recreational sex) refers to the acceptance of sex under certain conditions of desire or just plain fun (Sprecher & Hatfield, 1996). This article examines the dating styles of high school students in Medan and the factors that cause these styles.

Based on various theoretical and research-based studies, this research will examine several problem formulations:

PF 1 = What is the quality of the questionnaire instrument that measures high school students' perceptions of current dating styles?
PF 2 = What do students perceive dating styles based on demographic differences?

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 SOCIAL CHANGE IN ADOLESCENT LIFE

Basically, society tends to move, develop, and change. These social dynamics occur due to internal and external factors inherent in the community itself (Burski, 2019). One of the studies of sociology is social change. Significant social changes have occurred due to modernization. Modernization tends to disrupt social networks and destroy social institutions, social change, and further modernization without destroying local culture (Atteslander, 2007). Bennetta Jules-Rosette (1978) opines that social change is marked by cultural change. In communication sociology, social change is characterized by changes in technology used for socialization and communication (Sarch, 1993). Henry PF (2018) states that social change constitutes any form of change in social institutions in a society that influences its social system, including values, attitudes, and behavioral patterns of community groups. Wilbert Moore defines social change as a significant change in the social structure. The social structure is the behavior and social interaction patterns obtained from various structural expressions, such as norms, values, and cultural phenomena (Hilmi, 2020).

Various experts' opinions conclude that social changes result in cultural changes, including changes in norms due to modernization. Social values and norms are just a few aspects of social change in society. Good, ideal, essential, and aspired values have changed occasionally. These social values are the source of community dynamics. People's lives never stop and always develop, and values always shift and adjust (Wong, 2012). For example, teenagers in the past believed that dating contained the values of seriousness, commitment, sincerity, and responsibility so that the relationship could continue in society's desired direction, namely a legal marriage bond. However, now, dating is considered only to have recreational or fun values, so it is vulnerable to falling into permissive behavior in the form of sexual exploration activities (Damanik, 2018).

Changes in values also affect the prevailing social norms because norms are formed on social values and are created to maintain social values. If values change, norms will also change. Today's average and practiced values were a deviation (Syam et al., 2020). For example, in the past, chastity (virginity or virginity) was considered a significant value, so social norms did not justify permissive dating behavior. However,
because recreation and pleasure have become very meaningful, some teenagers consider the permissiveness of dating behavior as commonplace. The perpetrators may no longer feel guilty and use various excuses to justify their actions (Damanik, 2018).

Social changes, with their various forms and consequences, are a logical phenomenon in societies that live alongside other societies worldwide. Social change includes social structures, social functions, social relations, and social differentiation. Social changes occur due to technological and economic developments, changes in ideology and politics, competition, and conflicts. In addition, social changes also occur in a complex social system and do not have a single dimension, including changes in values, norms, attitudes, and community behavior patterns. In sociological studies, changes in these dimensions have become a severe phenomenon in academic studies of new civilizations (Samsudin, 2017).

Some people argue that change will not occur, or at least will not be significant if institutions or individuals do not make changes. Others believe that changes in attitudes reflect important changes in social life. In this case, behavior and social interaction patterns occur at various levels, including individual, community, social, cultural, civilizational, and global levels (Umar, 2005). The quite extreme dating behavior among urban students is a phenomenon of social change due to various dynamics within social structures, which culminate in the exploration of sexuality.

McKie (2019) asserts the permissiveness of dating behavior and states that teenagers have made a claim of normalcy and a claim of acceptability. The claim of normalcy states that everyone carries out permissive behavior as times change, so they feel that their behavior is not deviant. A claim of acceptability is permissive behavior in dating and compares an individual's actions with more serious deviations committed by other people in modern society. As a result, he feels that his actions are not wrong. This behavior change occurs due to social changes, such as confirmation or support for the dating behavior of teenagers today. Apart from that, it is closely related to the dynamics, conditions, situations, and culture in the social environment. Various studies and theories presented by sociologists encourage researchers to study further social changes and their impact on the permissiveness behavior of teenagers today.

Social changes are a process that occurs in society and involves changes in values, norms, and behavior. Various studies propose factors causing social changes. The first is modernization, which refers to the process of social change when society moves from
traditional to modernity (Jules-Rosette, 1978). This process involves values, norms, and behavior changes and applies new technologies and more advanced economic systems. One of the impacts of modernization occurred in Medan City. Ekasari et al. (2019) stated that teenagers in Medan performed risky dating behavior; this condition showed a pretty strong influence of modernization. Teenagers' normal dating behavior has become more intimate due to their social environment, transparent digital information sources for all ages, social media, relationships, and friendships. The second is globalization, which refers to the process of social change when society becomes increasingly connected through technology and international trade (Atteslander, 2007). The current influence of cultural globalization has unconsciously influenced the dating behavior of female students in urban areas; most of these students adopt foreign cultures, especially Western cultures, which promote freedom and increasingly permissive romantic relationships with the opposite sex (Herman & Campbell, 2012a). The third is the fourth industrial revolution, which refers to a process of social transformation when society shifts from manual production to automation with the support of digital technology (Pradika, 2022). This process involves values, norms, and behavior changes and applies new and more complex technologies. The influence of the 4.0 revolution has created a high level of curiosity among female students to accept current changes. According to Zis et al. (2021), technology can be accessed by various groups of society in urban and rural areas.

2.2 CHANGES IN STUDENTS' DATING STYLES AND SOCIAL CHANGES

One of the most challenging adolescents' development to control is their adjustment to the social world. High school students, who are mostly teenagers, have to adapt to the opposite sex in relationships they have never experienced before and must be able to adapt to adults outside the home and school environment (Suriani et al., 2016). High school students spend more time with their peers, so peers more significantly influence the students' attitudes, conversations, interests, appearance, and behavior than family do. For example, most teenagers know that if they wear the same clothing style as a popular social group's, they will have greater chances of being accepted as members of that group (Lesteri, 2015).

High school students experience attitude and behavior changes when their dating cannot be separated from the influence of the social environment and rapid growth of information technology. Their dating style is also closely related to puberty. Dennis
(2012) states that biological changes during puberty contribute to the increased integration of sexuality, attitudes, and behavior of teenage girls. Teenage girls will try to be the best women they can be, while teenage boys will try to be the best men they can be. Teenage girls are often affectionate, sensitive, attractive, and soft-spoken, whereas teenage boys often act assertive, arrogant, sarcastic, and very pushy because they realize that this behavior adds to their sexual qualities and appeal (Wong, 2012).

Duguay (2017) states that early adolescence is a very sensitive period to messages about premarital sexual activities or dating situations on television. Currently, television is an inseparable part of society and has influenced people's appearance and behavior. There is a relationship between television viewing time and adolescent sexual attitudes. One of them is the impact of television programs on teenagers' romantic behavior, especially television series, films, or reality shows that feature characters who hug, date, kiss, and have premarital sex while dating; these cause teenagers to imitate them.

Dating styles that involve activities such as being alone, holding hands, and hugging are always the focus of attention when discussing adolescent behavior in the context of relationships. This kind of behavior is risky because it can lead to premature sexual behavior. Teenagers may feel curious about aspects of sexuality, so they want to try out new experiences without sufficient understanding to protect themselves from the risks that may arise in dating relationships. The current dating style of teenagers, which is synonymous with changes from the influence of technological media, has attracted researchers' interest in further investigating how technological media or social media influences teenagers' dating styles.

Many experts hold opinions about dating behavior. Collins (1981) states that dating is an attempt to gain affection from adults. Before the 21st century, dating was done via telephone as a form of interviewing the person they were talking to as their dating partner (Sarch, 1993). Furthermore, dating behavior has been considered one of the drivers of self-confidence (Mayasari & Hadjam, 2000). Lesteri (2015) defines courtship as an individual's action or behavior influenced by a stimulus from outside the individual, leading to good or bad responses and being observed directly. Ekasari et al. (2019) stated that teenagers define a girlfriend as a close friend, someone they like, and someone who also likes them. Meanwhile, Daud (2016), dating is a relationship where two people meet and carry out a series of activities together to get to know each other. Usually, students' reasons for dating are a sense of trust, encouragement, and a means of
socialization. There will be interactions to help each other, exchange stories, and make friends.

Even though they know about sexually transmitted diseases and agree that premarital sex should not be had before marriage, many of them still have premarital sex while dating (Ishii-Kuntz et al., 1990). According to Muthiah Umar (2005), permissiveness is a Western culture that today's teenagers adopt. According to health studies, permissive behavior can cause health problems, especially for women, such as free sex and before-marriage pregnancy (Septiarum et al., 2019). Furthermore, permissiveness potentially results in violent acts during a dating relationship (Hernández et al., 2015).

Sirojammuniro (2020) said that one of the factors causing a permissive attitude toward dating is support from the family who helps match teenagers to date; teenagers are free to date, and parents allow them to date at home. The impact of permissiveness in dating among students can be said to be that those who are in a relationship and have previously been in a relationship have a greater opportunity to engage in risky behavior, such as premarital sex. Agustina (2013) said that dating behavior was supported by mutually supportive behavior between female students and their peers in risky dating behavior.

3 METHOD

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

Figure 1. Research flow in obtaining perceptions of high school seniors in dating
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research findings on high school students' perceptions of dating based on demographic differences
The research applies a quantitative design with an online survey method via Google Forms. The survey method aims to obtain conclusions from the research subject's responses so that they can answer the problem formulation. The research was conducted online during November 2023. Research data was obtained through a questionnaire with 25 questions developed based on various expert opinions regarding teenage dating styles (Houle et al., 2023; Liu & Lin, 2023; Llano-Suárez et al., 2021; Luo & Jiang, 2023). The following is the research process that the writing team has carried out. Figure 1 shows that the quantitative data analysis in this research applies the dichotomous Rasch model, which begins by examining the validity and reliability of the instruments used in the survey process. The dichotomous Rasch model analysis was carried out with the consideration that the questionnaire answers were scored 1 for a Yes answer and 0 for a No answer.

3.2 RESEARCH SUBJECT

This research sample consisted of 274 high school students (185 women, 89 men) in Medan City, Indonesia (Figure 2). The subject selection of this research using nonprobability sampling techniques. Respondent demographics include Farmers/Fishermen, Traders, Private employees, ASN/PNS/BUMN—questionnaire in an online format. Participation was voluntary, and the research objectives were stated in a letter accompanying the online questionnaire.

Figure 2. Map of Medan City

Source: https://petatematicindo.wordpress.com/2016/01/03/administrasi-kota-medan/
Figure 2 maps the Medan City area, including parts of North Sumatra Province, Indonesia. Medan has a very strong local culture known as the Batak tribe. The strength of the Batak tradition in Medan shows a sociological aspect that has also been well maintained from generation to generation. In the Toba Batak community, customs have been important values, views, and daily life goals for generations. The Batak tribe tends to require marriage with the Batak tribe. In the marriage system in Batak culture, there are rules for giving a surname to someone not of Batak descent if they want to marry a native Batak descendant. This rule is known as raising a clan. The clan is a self-identity carried by every descendant born in a marriage to the Batak traditional community. Based on this explanation, it is interesting for researchers who also come from Medan to measure how teenagers today perceive social relationships and dating styles that have begun to be penetrated by Western culture and are starting to leave behind the cultural legacy of politeness that has been maintained for so long.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 ITEM ANALYSIS RESULTS

Figure 3. Results of item reliability analysis

```
SUMMARY OF 16 MEASURED (NON-EXTREME) Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>ERROR</th>
<th>MNSQ ZSTD</th>
<th>MNSQ ZSTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>179.4</td>
<td>263.6</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX.</td>
<td>246.0</td>
<td>274.0</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN.</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>217.0</td>
<td>-2.90</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REAL RMSE .20 TRUE SD 1.65 SEPARATION 8.07 Item RELIABILITY .98
MODEL RMSE .19 TRUE SD 1.65 SEPARATION 8.56 Item RELIABILITY .99
S.E. OF Item MEAN = .43

Item RAW SCORE-TO-MEASURE CORRELATION = -.95 (approximate due to missing data)
4898 DATA POINTS. LOG-LIKELIHOOD CHI-SQUARE: 3231.42 with 3818 d.f. p=1.0000
Global Root-Mean-Square Residual (excluding extreme scores): .3518
Capped Binomial Deviance = .1665 for 4217.0 dichotomous observations
Source: Winsteps Software 3.73 Analysis
```
Reliability is a value that shows the trustworthiness of an instrument when used repeatedly (Yusup, 2018). The Rash model has the advantage of analyzing the reliability of the items or research instruments. An item is considered reliable when the value is more than 0.67 (Mulyanti et al., 2022; Sumintono & Widhiarso, 2013). The analysis results show that the value item reliability is 0.98 (Figure 3). This shows that the respondents' consistency in answering questions is low, but the quality of the questions in the instrument has good, consistent, and stable reliability. The Cronbach alpha value is 0.80, which indicates that the interaction between the person and the instrument items is very good (Sumintono & Widhiarso, 2013). The image above also contains separation values. Separation shows the division of subject groups into persons and items. The analysis above shows that the item separation is 8.07, that score shows that the questionnaire items differentiate well between respondents' perceptions of whether they stated Yes or No (Bond & Fox, 2013; Eckes, 2015; Mulyanti et al., 2022).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. of STANDARDIZED RESIDUAL variance (in Eigenvalue units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total raw variance in observations =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw variance explained by measures =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw variance explained by persons =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw Variance explained by items =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw unexplained variance (total) =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexplained variance in 1st contrast =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unidimensionality explains how the developed instrument can measure what is being measured. The analysis results show that the unidimensional value is 43.1%, which is not far from the model value, namely 42.5%. This shows that the items have very related variables in the same direction. The next data that shows that the item is construct valid is the value of unexplained variance below 15%, namely 13.5% (Bond & Fox, 2013; Sumintono & Widhiarso, 2013).

4.2 RESPONDENTS' ANSWERS ARE BASED ON ITEM MEASURE ANALYSIS

The measure item index shows the respondents' level of agreement with the items in the instrument. When the measure item value is more than 0.00, the respondents tend to disagree with the questions in the instrument (Mulyanti et al., 2022). The results of the analysis in this research are as follows in Tabel 2.
Table 2. Item measure analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Number</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Model S.E.</th>
<th>Item Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Q7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Q15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Q14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Q16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Q12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Q11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>Q13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>Q10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Q8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Q6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>-2.02</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Q5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-2.90</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>Q9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>179.4</td>
<td>263.6</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Winsteps Software 3.73 Analysis

Based on the figure above, items can be grouped into two: approved items and disapproved items.

a. **Approved items**

Approved items can be seen in measurement values less than 0.00 and have a bubble below. Based on the data above, the approved items are Q3, Q13, Q10, Q8, Q2, Q4, Q6, Q1, Q5, and Q9.

1. **Q3**

Item Q3 asks, “Do you feel worried when you are not dating because this shows you do not follow the trend?” The measured value from this research is -0.20. In this item, respondents agreed with the statement that they felt worried when they were not dating because they were afraid of not following the trend. This result is supported by the respondents' statements in the questionnaire, which stated that they felt insecure when their friends were dating but they were not, felt jealous of friends who were dating, were lots of trends about couples on social media, felt left behind, were ridiculed by their friends when not having a girlfriend, feeling lonely, and wanting to look cool (Herman & Campbell, 2012).

2. **Q13**

Item Q13 asks, “Does the social environment influence you in choosing a boyfriend?” The measured value obtained from Rasch analysis is -0.40. This shows that the level of agreement with this item is quite high because many respondents agreed with this statement. This result is supported by the respondents' answers to the questionnaire,
which stated that their partner's criteria were judged by their surrounding environment, they wanted to have a partner with the same frequency, they looked at other people in determining the criteria for a boyfriend, they wanted to have a partner like their father because their father was perfect, they saw equality in partners, and they often applied social norms in the environment set their boyfriend criteria following those social norms (Seth, 2015).

3. Q10

Item Q10 asks, “Does dating make you more recognized in social circles?” Based on the measured value, it is found to be -0.63. This value shows that the respondents' level of agreement with this item is quite high. This finding is supported by their statement that they feel social when having a boyfriend as their friends do. Dating enables them to make more friends, receive more recognition, feel more confident, and be safe from any disturbance and bullying. Dating has become a current trend, and someone will be more recognized in their environment when they have a girlfriend (Luo & Jiang, 2023).

4. Q8

Item Q8 asks, “Does dating increase your motivation to study and work?” The results of the Rasch analysis obtained a measured value of -0.76, indicating that most respondents agreed with this statement. This result is supported by the respondents' statements in the questionnaire, such as getting support for studying, being helped by their girlfriends when studying, wanting to finish assignments quickly to spend time with their girlfriends, wanting to be an intelligent partner, making their girlfriends proud, always being reminded of doing assignments, being more enthusiastic as they can study together with their girlfriends, and being more enthusiastic about improving their grades.

5. Q2

Item Q2 asks, “Do you have a tendency to date based on your social environment?” The measured value obtained from this item is -0.83, which indicates that the respondents' level of agreement with this item is high. This is supported by the respondents' statement in the questionnaire, which states that many people in their surrounding environment are dating, so they have a tendency and desire to date; dating is natural and commonplace, and there are many dating trends on social media that the respondents want to imitate.
6. Q4

Item Q4 asks, “Is dating a method for finding a mate?” Based on the results of the Rasch analysis, the measured value for this item was -0.83, which shows that the level of agreement for this item is high. This finding is supported by the respondents’ answers, which state that many dating couples get married when they find comfort, compatibility, and similarities from their girlfriends and consider their girlfriends as their soul mates because they already know their true nature and behavior; dating will help them get to know their partner better and is the main consideration for marriage.

7. Q6

The item in Q6 asks, “Does dating give you a positive impact?” Based on the picture above, it is known that the measured value for this item is 0.98, which shows that many respondents agreed with this statement. Based on the answers to the questionnaire, it was found that the respondents' dating had positive impacts, such as increasing motivation to study, getting a support system, getting attention, being enthusiastic for the day, and getting support.

8. Q1

Item Q1 asks, “Is dating a common thing for teenagers?” The results of the Rasch analysis show the measured value of -1.14. This result shows that the majority of the respondents agreed with this item. The respondents' answers indicate that dating is common for teenagers, provides a new sensation in socializing, enables people to exchange ideas with their partner, is a form of interaction and communication, is a normal activity as humans need a partner, and is a place to share stories and complaints. Moreover, the respondents stated that the majority of people in the surrounding environment were dating.

9. Q5

Item Q5 in this research is, “Does social media influence a person's tendency to date?” The results of the Rasch analysis show that the measured value is -2.02. This result shows that most respondents agreed with this item's statement. According to the results of respondents' answers, respondents got girlfriends from social media because it contained a lot of content about dating, had a feature to easily like people's posts, and functioned as media to communicate with others. As a result, the respondents imitated dating (Duguay, 2017).
10. Q9

Item Q9 asks, “Do you think there are boundaries for dating couples?” The results of the Rasch analysis show a measured value of -2.90, indicating that the level of agreement on this item is very high. Several respondents answered that boundaries were essential because there were many free-sex cases, they did not like excessive physical contact, each individual had their privacy, they were not yet legally bound by religious or state law, they were not married, limitations to each individual's time and space are needed to protect them, and parents permit their children to date and remind them the limits in dating. Limitations in dating include not allowing holding hands or kisses. The respondents also argued that they should limit time and finances, have commitment, and consider religious and social norms.

b. Unapproved items

Unapproved items are marked with a measured value of more than 0.00 and have a bubble positioned above. Based on the data above, the unapproved items are Q7, Q15, Q14, Q16, Q12, and Q11.

1) Q7

Item Q7 asks, “Does dating give you a negative impact?” The picture above shows that the measured value for this item is 3.86. This result indicates that the majority of respondents disagreed with this statement. The respondents argued that dating enabled them not to feel lonely but to get a support system, feel happy, become more diligent and productive, get attention, increase motivation to study, have a place to confide in, get love to prevent depression, and find their identity.

2) Q15

Item Q15 asks, “Are there any indications of violence in a dating relationship?” The Rasch analysis result shows that this item's measured value is 2.39. This result indicates that the majority of respondents disagreed with the statement that there are indications of violence in dating. The respondents said that because they knew their partner well, they had never experienced violence but received love and attention.

3) Q14

Item Q14 asks, “Do you think dating apps are effective applications to find a girlfriend?” The analysis result shows that the measured value is 1.78, indicating that this item is disapproved. The respondents argued that people mostly use dating apps not to find a soul mate but to find a sex partner, commit fraud, and look for an affair.
4) Q16

Item Q16 asks, “Do you think dating that influences someone's mental health?” The result of the Rasch analysis shows that the measured value is 1.41. This result shows that the respondents disapproved of this item because they did not experience mental disorders during dating but had a good and patient partner and received stable mental during the dating.

5) Q12

Item Q12 asks, “Do you consider the religion/race/ethnicity/culture of someone who is your girlfriend?” The result of the Rasch analysis shows that the measured value is 1.01. This finding shows that respondents disagreed with the statement in this item. They argued that they could look down on a particular ethnicity or race and value someone's personality and heart more as a partner. When they are compatible, they do not pay attention to these differences. Dating must be carried out by accepting each other. The respondents argued that many couples had different ethnicities but still had a good relationship. However, the respondent preferred a partner with the same religion.

6) Q11

Item Q11 asks, “Does dating affect your emotional level?” The measured value for this item is 0.24. This shows that the respondents disapproved of this item and deployed that dating made them happier and enabled them to express their emotions because their partner always provided support and affection, and they never received bad treatment from their partner.

The description above denotes that the most approved item is item Q9, which has the lowest measured value. Meanwhile, the least approved item is item Q7, which has the highest measured value. These results are also presented in the bubble chart, showing that item Q7 is in the top position while Q9 is in the bottom.

Item Q9 asks, “Do you think there are boundaries for dating couples?” The literature postulates that boundaries exist to protect personal information (Mackenzie A Christensen, 2020). Limits are also needed to maintain children's psychology, prevent risky behavior in dating that can make a fragile and less self-confident personality, and reduce children's creativity to prevent children from having low self-esteem (Vuttanont et al., 2006). The respondents argued that they needed boundaries to avoid free sex. They also believed that each individual had their privacy because they were not yet legally bound by religious or state law and were unmarried. Limitations to each individual's time
and space are needed to protect them. When parents permit their children to date, they should remind their children of the limits of dating. Limitations in dating include not allowing holding hands or kisses. The respondents also argued that they should limit time and finances, have commitment, and consider religious and social norms.

Item Q7 asks, “Does dating give you a negative impact?” The literature postulates that dating can have a positive impact, such as increasing motivation to study and providing comfort (Naigaga et al., 2019). The respondents answered that dating had positive impacts, such as not feeling lonely, getting a support system, making happy, becoming more diligent and productive, getting attention, increasing motivation to study, having a place to confide in, getting love to prevent depression, and finding identity.

4.3 BIAS ANALYSIS (DIF) WHICH SHOWS DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTION BASED ON DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

Bias or DIF (Differential Item Functioning) occurs when certain individuals or characteristics are advantaged compared to others. DIF occurs when the Prob value from the analysis results is below 5% or below 0.05 (Sumintono & Widhiarso, 2013). The DIF in this research is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Classes</th>
<th>Summary DIF Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F</th>
<th>Prob</th>
<th>Between-Class Mean-Square</th>
<th>t=ZSTD</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Item Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>-1.5671</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>-1.3997</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1518</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6968</td>
<td>0.0703</td>
<td>-0.7744</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>-1.3997</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>-1.4077</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3862</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0657</td>
<td>1.5753</td>
<td>0.8183</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4244</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0642</td>
<td>1.4797</td>
<td>0.7674</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Q7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8270</td>
<td>0.0213</td>
<td>-1.0621</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Q8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8489</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0277</td>
<td>2.1563</td>
<td>1.0987</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Q9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5535</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4569</td>
<td>0.2523</td>
<td>-0.3096</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Q10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1480</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7004</td>
<td>0.0679</td>
<td>-0.7843</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Q11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4664</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4947</td>
<td>0.2089</td>
<td>-0.3911</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Q12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.4865</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>8.0905</td>
<td>2.6087</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Q13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9299</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3349</td>
<td>0.4090</td>
<td>-0.0753</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Q14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1985</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0073</td>
<td>3.2174</td>
<td>1.4817</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Q15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6803</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0578</td>
<td>1.6273</td>
<td>0.8452</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Q16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Winsteps Software 3.73 Analysis
Figure 3. DIF graph of items on gender

The Prob values in Table 3 above indicate that several items, namely Q9, Q13, and Q15, have biases with Prob values of below 0.05.

a. Q9

Item Q9 in this research is 'Do you think there are boundaries for dating couples?' The graph above shows that the Prob value is 0.0277. This shows different opinions between male and female respondents. Moreover, Figure 3 shows that female respondents tend to answer this question more easily than male respondents. The majority of female respondents stated that there were limits to dating, while the majority of male respondents stated no limits to dating.

b. Q13

Item Q13 in this questionnaire asks: Does the social environment influence your choice of boyfriend criteria? The results of the Rasch analysis showed that the Prob value for this item was 0.000, and the points on the figure were significantly different between male and female respondents. This shows that female respondents tend to answer this question more easily than male respondents. Based on the results of respondents' answers, it was found that the majority of respondents agreed that they had partner criteria based on the conditions of their social environment.
c. Q15

Item Q15 in this research is 'Are there any indications of violence in a dating relationship?' The probability value for this item is 0.0073. Figure 3 shows that male respondents tend to answer this question more easily than female respondents. Based on the respondents' answers, it was found that the majority of female respondents received violent dating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Summary DIF</th>
<th>D.F</th>
<th>Prob</th>
<th>Between-Class Mean-Square</th>
<th>t=ZSTD</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Item Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0541</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5483</td>
<td>0.0874</td>
<td>-2.1243</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5791</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4654</td>
<td>0.1261</td>
<td>-1.8793</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3329</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8557</td>
<td>0.0840</td>
<td>-2.1492</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6139</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8062</td>
<td>0.0231</td>
<td>-2.799</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8675</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7599</td>
<td>0.0791</td>
<td>-2.1855</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3653</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8010</td>
<td>0.0862</td>
<td>-2.1329</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6123</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8064</td>
<td>0.0541</td>
<td>-2.4025</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Q7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6190</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9609</td>
<td>0.0276</td>
<td>-2.7242</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Q8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0691</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1936</td>
<td>0.3783</td>
<td>-0.9384</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Q9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3806</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8475</td>
<td>0.0986</td>
<td>-2.0472</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Q10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1290</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8896</td>
<td>0.0372</td>
<td>-2.5906</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Q11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9429</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9183</td>
<td>0.0185</td>
<td>-2.8843</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Q12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2186</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5214</td>
<td>0.2192</td>
<td>-1.4488</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Q13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9963</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7362</td>
<td>0.0993</td>
<td>-2.0421</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Q14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2908</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0636</td>
<td>0.2906</td>
<td>-1.1969</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Q15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6180</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2290</td>
<td>0.1850</td>
<td>-1.5897</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Q16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Winsteps Software 3.73 Analysis

Figure 4. DIF of items based on parental employment
The image above shows the results of DIF analysis on instruments based on parental occupation. The presence of DIF is indicated by a Prob value below 5% or 0.05. The analysis results show that parents do not influence respondents' tendencies to answer questions on this questionnaire. This can be caused by the geographical location of the Medan City area, which is small and far from sea access. Therefore, the people have identical thoughts. The geographical location of the Medan City is as follows.

5 CONCLUSION

The measurement results show that high school students in Medan consider dating a common thing nowadays, and it is getting easier to communicate during dating with the presence of social media. Dating is also a trend among teenagers today. Moreover, respondents expressed their agreement that there are concerns if they don't date because they don't follow the trend. The respondents also agreed that dating positively impacted their motivation to study, even though they admitted that there were various obstacles in dating. The results of research on adolescent disagreement are shown in several aspects, such as the presence of negative impacts or indications of violence in dating. Respondents also believed that their choice of boyfriend was not influenced by culture or religion. Based on geography, there was no difference in agreement based on parents' occupation, while for gender differences, different results were found on several items. Differences based on gender, including the majority of female respondents stated that there were dating limits, while the majority of male respondents stated no limits. Gender differences are also seen in opinions in choosing a boyfriend; for women, the choice of boyfriend is very influenced by the social environment, and not for male respondents. A finding that is also quite interesting is the difference between the answers of male and female respondents regarding the acceptance of violence during dating. Based on the respondents' answers, it was found that the majority of female respondents received violent dating.
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