THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION AND TOXIC RELATIONSHIPS IN ADOLESCENTS IN CIMANGGIS SUB DISTRICT DEPOK CITY

Hanifa Insyiradeasti
Pakuan University

hanifainsyiraa01@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The basis of a successful relationship is communication, so if the communication carried out by the sender and receiver of the message is not successful, then the relationship will not run well, which is likely to arise a toxic relationship. Toxic relationships occur a lot among teenagers, the number of violence against women is increasing every year. But not only women are victims, men can also be victims of toxic relationships. The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between interpersonal communication and toxic relationships in adolescents in Cimanggis District, Depok City. This research was conducted in Cimanggis sub-district, Depok City. This research uses quantitative method. This study has 2 variables, namely Interpersonal Communication Barriers with Signs of Toxic Relationship. The data collection technique used by researchers is Non-Probability sampling with an accidental sampling approach. The data collection technique in this study used a questionnaire. The results of this study indicate that there is a significant relationship between Interpersonal Communication Barriers and Toxic Relationship in Adolescents in Cimanggis sub-district, Depok City. Indicators with the strongest correlation are Physical Barriers with Violence to bind partners, as well as Emotions and Aggressive. When they are in the long distance relationship phase, the perpetrator does not hesitate to commit acts of violence, threats, and control the victim because of the fear of excessive loss experienced by the perpetrator. They also often fight, because they are at a distance so that communication is sometimes unsuccessful, so negative emotions often arise.

Keywords: *characteristics; depok city; interpersonal communication; toxic relationship*

1. INTRODUCTION

Humans will not be separated from social life, interact with each other and communication, need each other, and always live in groups. Communication is what can make it easier for humans to achieve their goals, because it can fulfill the need to interact with others. This is what makes us as social creatures to establish a relationship with others starting from our closest environment, namely family and then to the surrounding environment such as friends, coworkers, and partners (Rahimah, 2022).

Communication is one way or tool to interact between fellow humans. In our daily lives, we will not be separated from communication. Communication really helps a person in improving social interactions with others. Specifically, interpersonal communication is very important in human life and intersects with other disciplines that study human behavior, and research in communication contributes to the fields of psychology, business, sociology, anthropology, and counseling (Irawan, 2017).

Interpersonal communication between adolescents aged 10-24 years according to the Population and Family Planning Agency (BKKBN) in an environment of the same age can usually affect the mental health of a teenager. Adolescence is indeed a vulnerable age because of low self-control, unstable emotions, and a growing sense of independence and maturity that is still being formed maturely. This often triggers a toxic relationship (unhealthy relationship) that occurs in adolescent interpersonal communication with their peer environment. The role of toxic relationships in adolescent interpersonal communication in the peer environment has a significant impact on the adolescent development process (Praptiningsih & Putra, 2021). Especially in the formation of interpersonal communication skills that will be a provision for the future. Toxic Relationship as an unhealthy relationship does have an impact on internal conflict. This unhealthy relationship is prone to making the sufferer unproductive, mentally disturbed, and can trigger an emotional explosion that leads to violence (Praptiningsih & Putra, 2021).

Establishing relationships or interacting in adolescence is very valuable because at this time there are many demands of growth that must be met, especially physical, psychological and social growth. For adolescents, the need to interact with other people outside the family area is in fact very large, most notably the need for interaction with their peers (Fatnar & Anam, 2014). Research conducted by Generational White Paper, adolescents tend to be more impatient, difficult to focus, less determined than previous generations, individualistic, independent, more demanding, greedy, materialistic and feel they are a very entitled generation (Rachmawati, 2019).

A teenager definitely needs his own adaptation when he is in an unfamiliar environment. Communication also helps in their efforts to adjust to their environment. These characteristics possessed by adolescents can make them vulnerable to being in an unhealthy or toxic relationship. Toxic Relationship is an unhealthy bond that can damage physically and emotionally. Dr. Lillian Glass (Ducharme, 2018) defines toxic relationship as a relationship that does not support each other, one party seeks to have great control over the other party.

Supported by the findings of (Christie et al., 2022) Even though they realize that the relationship is unhealthy, there are still many victims who are reluctant or worried about getting out of the relationship so they choose to survive with all the consequences. Through the process of getting to know and establishing romantic relationships, many are trapped in unhealthy relationships or what is known as toxic relationships.

Based on data collected from the Ministry of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection of the Republic of Indonesia (KemenPPPA), more than 42.07 percent of single women have experienced violence. A total of 10,847 perpetrators of violence, 2,090 of whom were boyfriends of the victims. The number is increasing from year to year.

The news.detik.com page on December 02 (2021) reported on the case of violence against Novia Widyasari (23) who downed poison because her lover Bripda Randy Bagus forced an abortion. Deputy Chief of East Java Police Brigadier General Slamet Hadi Supraptoyo explained that the victim and this Polri member had been acquainted since October 2019. The two of them then had frequent relations as husband and wife from 2020 to 2021 at boarding houses or hotels in Malang and Batu. It was also discovered that during their courtship, which

began in October 2019 until December 2021, the victim had a joint abortion which was carried out in March 2020 and August 2021. Bripda Randy is charged with Article 348 of the Criminal Code juncto 55 of the Criminal Code, namely intending to abort or kill a fetus with a sentence of 5 years in prison. This case in Mojokerto is one of the many cases of toxic relationships that occur in adolescents in Indonesia. The interpersonal communication that was established in the Mojokerto case did not produce positive communication, instead it gave rise to a setback that made boundaries restrictive to oneself and others. Toxic relationships will affect communication in relationships and the development of potential in a person if it continues.

This high rate of violence has become a public concern. Dating violence is an act of violence against couples who are not yet married, which includes physical, emotional, economic violence and activity restrictions. This violence is a case that occurs after domestic violence (KDRT), but still does not get much attention, so sometimes it is still overlooked by victims and perpetrators. According to the Ministry of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection of the Republic of Indonesia, there are many factors that cause violence against women in dating, including a low level of education, the persistence of patriarchal understanding, bad habits such as using drugs, drinking alcohol, arguing unable to control emotions, infidelity, temperamental nature, level of economic welfare, and location of residencein urban areas which causes the effects of promiscuity that is familiar with violence. Another supporting factor is that women who become victims tend to be weak, lack confidence, and lovetheir partners too much.

Depok City is one of the areas directly adjacent to Jakarta, which is a metropolitan city. The flow of globalization that occurs is very fast and intersects. In 2018, CNN released news about Jakarta, which was ranked seventh in the list of major cities with the highest cases of sexual violence in the world. The Depok City Statistics Agency has also released data showing an increase in the number of cases of rape, child protection (obscene, seductive and violent), anddomestic violence in 2020 to 2021. Based on data from detik.com released in February 2023, there have been around 37 complaints of cases of violence against children and women, this also makes Depok one of the cities with the highest cases of violence against children and women in West Java, this case has increased since the last 3 years. Depok City itself has an adolescent population aged 16-24 years of 263,605 thousand people.

Cimanggis Sub-district is one of the largest sub-districts in Depok City, among the 11 sub-districts included in Depok City, West Java. Cimanggis is the third largest sub-district after Tapos and Sawangan. According to data obtained from Disdukcapil in 2020, the total population in Cimanggis sub-district is 211,205 people. 107,283 males, and 103,922 females. In the age range of early adolescents 13-15 years, there are 9,813 people, while middle adolescents 16-18 years are 9,217 people, and late adolescents 19-24 years are 20,057 people. This figure is expected to help researchers collect the data needed in this study. The number of schools and campuses in Cimanggis Subdistrict is also the reason why researchers chose this location, because teenagers do a lot of activities and socialize at school and campus, so their tendency to experience toxic relationships is higher.

Research conducted by (Rihandita, 2018) shows that men who experience violence in dating types of emotional verbal and relational aggression from their partners with 48 participants. It was found that 23 or 47.9% of participants often received violence from their partners. Men

who experienced violence interpreted it in the form of love, wanting to protect and expressing their partner's jealousy. Men who experienced it did not realize that it was dating violence.

Although some findings suggest that women who adopt gender inequality are exposed to higher rates of dating violence compared to men, data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Youth Risk Behavior Survey and the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (2022) show that:

1. Almost 1 in 11 female students and about 1 in 14 male high school students reported experiencing physical dating violence in 2019.
2. About 1 in 8 female high school students and 1 in 26 male students reported having experienced dating violence in the past year.
3. 26% of women and 15% of men who were victims of sexual violence, physical violence, and or stalking by a partner, experienced such violence before they turned 18 years old

These findings show that dating violence is not only experienced by women, men can also experience it. Some findings show that women have higher rates of dating violence than men. A comparison of perspectives of toxic relationships in dating experienced by men and women needs to be analyzed further.

The author is interested in taking research on toxic relationships because it is considered very important to do, especially in an adolescent environment that tends to be weak and is still in the vulnerable stage. In addition, this research is also useful to get an overview of the relationship internal communication and toxic relationships in dating experienced by male and female adolescents. So that preventive action can be taken on toxic behavior in dating, which is expected to be treated more accurately. A toxic relationship will have many adverse effects on a person, such as being unable to think logically, disrupted social interactions, unhealthy social relationships, and affect the mental and physical health of the victim.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that most victims of a toxic relationship are unstable teenagers, based on their failure to communicate with their partners. Of course there will be differences in the way of communication between people who are in a toxic relationship, and people who do not experience it. This led researchers to conduct a study that aims to determine the relationship between interpersonal communication and toxic relationships in adolescents in Cimanggis District, Depok City.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

This research was conducted in Cimanggis Sub-district, Depok City, West Java Province, chosen because it is a strategic area directly adjacent to Jakarta, facilitating access to globalization. Cimanggis Sub-district became the focus because it has a large adolescent population, recorded at 29,274 people in the age range of 16-18 years and 19-24 years according to data from the Depok City Disdukcapil in 2020. The existence of quite a lot of schools and campuses in this area is also a consideration because adolescents often move and socialize in educational environments, increasing the potential for toxic relationship experiences. The research was conducted from January 2023 to June 2023.

This research method adopts a quantitative approach with a descriptive research design. The quantitative approach aims to identify the relationship and influence between variables, while the quantitative descriptive design is used to describe, examine, and explain a phenomenon with numbers. This study took the population of late adolescents aged 19-24 years who live in Cimanggis District, Depok City.

The sample was drawn using Non-Probability sampling method, specifically using Accidental sampling approach. A total of 395 respondents were selected using the Slovin formula based on a population of 20,057 late adolescents in Cimanggis District. Primary data was obtained through an online questionnaire distributed through Google Form through social media and short message applications.

The instrument validity test was carried out using the Pearson Product Moment correlation technique, adjusting the instrument questions and statements based on relevant theories. The results showed an adequate level of validity. Reliability tests were conducted using the split-half method, resulting in highly reliable Cronbach's Alpha values for both variables X (0.944) and Y (0.953).

The data collection technique used a questionnaire with a Likert scale. Mean scores were used to measure respondents' perceptions, which were then interpreted within a specific range of criteria. Data analysis involved descriptive analysis to identify respondent characteristics and inferential statistical analysis (nonparametric) with Pearson Product Moment correlation test.

This correlation test was conducted to determine the relationship between interpersonal communication (variable X) and toxic relationship (variable Y). By using the correlation value and relationship strength criteria, this study aims to assess the extent to which interpersonal communication variables affect the existence of toxic relationships in adolescents in Cimanggis District, Depok City.This research uses a quantitative approach with descriptive methods. This approach is designed to understand human or social phenomena thoroughly and complexly, describe them in words, and report detailed views from informant sources in a natural setting (Fadli, 2021). Quantitative descriptive methods are used to describe existing phenomena, both natural and man-made, with a focus on activities, characteristics, changes, relationships, similarities, and differences between phenomena.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Variable (X) Interpersonal Communication Barriers which are respondents in this study consist of 4 indicators which include: process barriers, physical barriers, semantic barriers, and psychological barriers. Variable (Y) signs of toxic relationship in this study have 5 indicators, namely: lack of trust in the partner, emotional and aggressive, self-manipulation, lying to the partner, committing violence to bind the partner to always be together. Each of these variables will be connected to find out how the value of the relationship (correlation) between the two.

Tabel 1. Data of Relationship Test Values of Interpersonal Communication Barriers (X) with Signs of *Toxic Relationship* (Y)

Interpersonal Communication Barriers (X)	Correlation Test	Signs of Toxic Relationship (Y)				
		Lack of trust in partner	Emotional and Aggressive	Manipulation Self	Lying to your partner	Commiting violence to bind a partner
Process Barriers	X^2	0,534**	0,551**	0,594**	0,481**	0,598**
Physical Barriers	X^2	0,588**	0,612**	0,609**	0,551**	0,688**
Semantic Barriers	X^2	0,502**	0,562**	0,523**	0,436**	0,570**
Psychological Barriers	X^2	0,554**	0,541**	0,465**	0,559**	0,490**

Source: Primary data, processed in 2023 with the SPSS version 27 program

3.1. Correlation between Process Barriers (X_1) and Signs of Toxic Relationship (Y)

From table 1 above, it can be concluded that the process barriers indicator when linked to the indicator of lack of trust in a partner tested with the Pearson correlation formula produces a value of 0.534, which means that there is a relationship between the two indicators. The data shows that process barriers can affect a person's trust in their partner. Process barriers in a relationship such as no openness between parties, tend to make the other party feel that their partner is doing it on purpose because their relationship is still too early, or because of past trauma that makes their partner unwilling to communicate feelings or tell their partner (Samsinar & Kaddi, 2020). The level of relationship between the above indicators falls into the medium correlation category.

If the process barriers indicator is connected to the emotional and aggressive indicators, it produces a value of 0.551, meaning that there is a relationship between the process barriers indicator and the emotional and aggressive indicators. The data shows that process barriers such as couples who like to solve problems via chat rather than meeting, tend to often say harsh words and swear at their partners when there is a problem. Respondents also agreed that they were often accused or slandered by their partners even without real evidence. The level of correlation between the indicators above falls into the medium correlation category.

If the process barriers indicator is connected to the self-manipulation indicator, it produces a value of 0.594, meaning that there is a relationship between the process barriers indicator and the self-manipulation indicator. The data shows that process barriers such as partners who do not provide reciprocity also make respondents feel unappreciated by their partners, this is what makes the partner's tendency to control the victim's self without wanting to listen to what their partner wants. The level of correlation between the indicators above falls into the medium correlation category.

If the process barriers indicator is connected to the indicator of lying to a partner, it produces a value of 0.481, meaning that there is a relationship between the process barriers indicator and the indicator of lying to a partner. The data shows that process barriers such as

the absence of openness to the partner, instead of covering up something so that the partner is not angry. In toxic relationships too, the term "lying for good" is normal, they tend to hide behind the sentence to survive their partner's anger rather than they have to tell the truth (Muammar, 2018). The level of correlation between the indicators above falls into the medium correlation category.

If the process barriers indicator is connected to the indicator of committing violence to bind the couple to always be together, it will produce a value of 0.598, meaning that there is a relationship between the process barriers indicator and the indicator of committing violence to bind the couple to always be together. The data in table 1 shows that there are process barriers such as couples in a closed toxic relationship lacking mutual openness, tending to be possessive of their partners because they do not express what they like or dislike. This disrupts the respondents' interaction with their social environment. Respondents also agreed that their partners often threaten self-harm when they make mistakes, also known as playing victim. They make it looklike they are the victim, when in fact the respondents are being threatened. Some of the respondents had also been forced to have sex, or experienced physical violence from their partners. This level of correlation between the above indicators falls into the medium correlation category.

3.2. Correlation between Physical Barriers (X_2) and Signs of Toxic Relationship (Y)

From table 1 above, it can be concluded that the indicator of physical barriers when linked to the indicator of lack of trust in a partner tested with the Pearson correlation formula produces a value of 0.588, which means that there is a relationship between the two indicators. The data shows that physical barriers can affect a person's trust in their partner. Physical barriers here in a toxic relationship such as a long distance relationship, tend to make the other party feel more vulnerable feeling lonely, overthinking, so their communication is often unsuccessful. This often triggers arguments that result in a lack of trust in the partner (Aurelie, 2022). It could be that the couple has previously been given trust, but when circumstances have to separate them with distance, one party cannot hold the trust that has been given. This leads to past traumas that take root, such as worrying excessively when your partner is unavailable, and not picking up phone callson purpose. The level of relationship between the above indicators falls into the medium correlation category.

If the physical barriers indicator is linked to the emotional and aggressive indicators, it produces a value of 0.612, which means that there is a relationship between the two indicators. The data shows that physical barriers can affect a partner's emotions and aggression. Physical barriers here in a toxic relationship such as a long distance relationship, there will be more interaction through indirect communication through communication aids. This is prone to many misunderstandings, if these toxic relationship couples have to solve problems through communication media, many respondents answered that their partners tend to get emotional easily, such as expressing sentences or harsh words (Wongpy, 2021). However, on the one hand when they meetoften, not a few respondents also agreed that they will often fight when they meet too often. Many respondents agreed that they experienced physical violence from their partner several times. The level of relationship between the above indicators falls into the

strong correlation category. The direction of the relationship between physical barriers and emotions and aggression is positive, meaning that the longer the couple is in the Long Distance Relationshipphase, the higher the level of emotions and aggressiveness of the partner. They cannot control each other's emotions.

If the physical barrier indicator is connected to the self-manipulation indicator, it produces a value of 0.609, which means that there is a relationship between the two indicators. The data shows that physical barriers can affect a person's self-manipulation. Physical barriers here in a toxic relationship such as a long distance relationship or commonly called a Long Distance Relationship, tend to make partners more often overthinking, and excessive jealousy. So the toxic partner, will manage or control their partner more. They feel they have power over others. In toxic relationships, many respondents have unsuccessful communication with their partners because their partners often accuse them without listening to their explanations (Cantika, 2022). The level of relationship between the indicators above falls into the strong correlation category. In this sense,toxic relationships occur a lot due to the failure of a relationship to communicate, and the willingness of one party to control the other.

If the physical barrier indicator is linked to the indicator of lying to a partner, it produces a value of 0.551, which means that there is a relationship between the two indicators. The data shows that physical barriers can influence someone to lie. Physical barriers here in a toxic relationship such as long distance relationships or commonly called Long Distance Relationships, rejecting phone calls from partners, some of these factors tend to make couples more often cover up the truth because of their distance so that one party feels free to do anything without their partner's knowledge. This makes toxic relationships have normalized the term "lying for good", when in fact lying is not justified in any situation. In toxic relationships, many respondents do not communicate openly with their partners, which can trigger other lies (Febriana, 2022). The level of relationship between the indicators above falls into the medium correlation category. In that sense, toxic relationships occur a lot due to the failure of a relationship to communicate,and the absence of honesty in the basis on which a relationship is formed.

If the indicator of physical barriers is linked to the indicator of committing violence to bind a partner together, it will result in a value of 0.688, which means there is a strong relationship between the two indicators. The data shows that physical barriers can influence a person to act violently so that their partner feels threatened and does not leave them. Physical barriers here in a toxic relationship such as meeting too often, tend to make partners more often act all over the place, especially when they meet and experience arguments the partner does not hesitate to use physical violence, and if the partner underestimates the feelings of the victim, they do not hesitate to also force kissing, and have sex outside the consent of both parties. In toxic relationships, many respondents have unsuccessful communication with their partners because their partners are too possessive, do not allow respondents to be "themselves", they tend to regulate respondents' social interactions with their environment (Dianawati, 2010). The level of relationship between the above indicators falls into the strong correlation category. The direction of the relationship between physical barriers and violence to bind a partner is positive, meaning that the more often a couple meets or has physical contact, the higher the sense of the

victim's partner to be arbitrary or abusive and make threats to bind his partner so as not to leave the perpetrator,because the perpetrator feels that his partner is under his control.

In a sense, toxic relationships occur because of a relationship's failure to communicate, and one party is too abusive, pushy, and selfish to their partner.

3.3. Correlation between Semantic Barriers (X_3) and Signs of Toxic Relationship (Y)

From table 1 above, it can be concluded that the indicator of semantic barriers when associated with indicators of lack of trust in a partner tested with the Pearson correlation formula produces a value of 0.502, which means that there is a relationship between the two indicators. The data shows that semantic barriers can affect a person's trust in their partner. Semantic barriers here in a toxic relationship such as the selection of words that are less precise in a communication they do, this can occur because their relationships tend to be too early. So that there is fear from the other party to put complete trust in the partner because it is feared that it will cause too much affection. The level of relationship between the indicators above falls into the medium correlation category.

If the semantic barrier indicator is connected to the emotional and aggressive indicators, it produces a value of 0.562, which means that there is a relationship between the two indicators. The data shows that semantic barriers can affect a partner's emotions and aggression. Semantic barriers here in a toxic relationship such as when an argument occurs via chat, a toxic partner cannot sort out words and does not use punctuation. This is prone to many misunderstandings, if this toxic couple has to solve the problem via chat, many respondents answered that their partner is easily emotional, such as expressing sentences or harsh words because of the misunderstanding. The level of relationship between the indicators above falls into the medium correlation category.

If the semantic barrier indicator is connected to the self-manipulation indicator, it produces a value of 0.523, which means that there is a relationship between the two indicators. The data shows that semantic barriers can affect a person's self-manipulation. Semantic barriers here in a toxic relationship such as the use of connotative words when communicating, tend to make the partner feel not understood so that indirectly this can also be a reason for the partner to control the victim's self. The level of relationship between the indicators above falls into the medium correlation category. In this sense, toxic relationships occur a lot due to the failure of a relationship in communicating, and the willingness of one party to control the other party so that a sense of coercion arises.

If the indicator of semantic barriers is connected to the indicator of lying to a partner, it produces a value of 0.436, which means that there is a relationship between the two indicators. The data shows that semantic barriers can influence someone to lie. Semantic barriers here in a toxic relationship such as couples who like to use ambiguous sentences, then their communication will have an impact on their partner's level of trust. The use of ambiguous sentences that confuse couples in between communication carried out in this toxic relationship, will make couples feel safe so that they tend to cover up the truth of what they are feeling more often. This makes toxic relationships have normalized the term "lying for good" (Prayudho, 2022). The level of relationship between the indicators above falls into the medium correlation

category. In this sense, toxic relationships occur a lot due to the failure of a relationship to communicate, and the absence of honesty in the basis on which a relationship is formed.

If the indicator of semantic barriers is linked to the indicator of committing violence to bind a partner to stay together, it will produce a value of 0.570, which means there is a relationship between the two indicators. The data shows that semantic barriers can influence a person to act violently so that their partner feels threatened and does not leave them. Semantic barriers here in a toxic relationship such as when an argument occurs, partners like to use connotative words, but are reluctant to explain what the words mean. This tends to make the partner more emotional and triggered, so that the partner does not hesitate to use physical violence. The level of relationship between the indicators above falls into the medium correlation category.

3.4. Correlation between Psychological Barriers (X_4) and Signs of Toxic Relationship (Y)

From table 1 above, it can be concluded that the indicator of psychological barriers when linked to the indicator of lack of trust in a partner tested with the Pearson correlation formula produces a value of 0.554, which means that there is a relationship between the two indicators. The data shows that psychological barriers can affect a person's trust in their partner. Psychological barriers in a toxic relationship such as often overthinking their partner when their partner is unavailable, tend to make their partner feel anxious, this can be caused by past trauma that has been experienced, so their communication is often unsuccessful. This often triggers arguments that result in a lack of trust in the partner. It could be that the partner has previously been given trust. Worrying excessively when your partner is unavailable, and there is no openness in a relationship, can trigger a toxic relationship. The level of relationship between the above indicators falls into the medium correlation category.

If the psychological barriers indicator is linked to the emotional and aggressive indicators, it produces a value of 0.541, which means that there is a relationship between the two indicators. The data shows that psychological barriers can affect a partner's emotions and aggression. Psychological barriers here in a toxic relationship such as couples who are easily carried away by emotions, tend to say more harsh words when they are arguing. This is prone to differences in arguments that result in unsuccessful communication. The level of relationship between the indicators above falls into the medium correlation category. In this sense, toxic relationships occur a lot due to the failure of a relationship to communicate long and short distances, and cannot control the emotions of each party.

If the psychological barriers indicator is linked to the self-manipulation indicator, it produces a value of 0.465, which means that there is a relationship between the two indicators. The data shows that psychological barriers can affect a person's self-manipulation. Psychological barriers here in a toxic relationship such as differences in opinion and outlook on life, tend to make partners feel more that they are under the control of their partner. They feel they have power over the other person. In toxic relationships, many respondents find that communication with their partners is unsuccessful because their partners often have different opinions, and do not want to listen to their partner's explanations (Ayuningtyas, 2023). The level of relationship between the indicators above falls into the medium correlation category. In this sense, toxic relationships occur a lot due to the failure of a relationship in

communication, and thewillingness of one party to control the other party so that a sense of coercion arises.

If the indicator of psychological barriers is linked to the indicator of lying to a partner, it produces a value of 0.559, which means that there is a relationship between the two indicators. This data shows that psychological barriers can influence someone to lie. Psychological barriers here in a toxic relationship such as a partner who likes to leave their partner when they are arguing, so that their communication has an impact on their partner's level of trust (Sumarjo et al., 2023). One of thesefactors will make partners more often cover up the truth of what they are feeling. This makes toxic relationships have normalized the term "lying for good", in fact lying is not justified in any situation. In toxic relationships too, many respondents whose communication does not runsmoothly with their partners, it can trigger other lies. The level of relationship between the indicators above falls into the medium correlation category. In that sense, toxic relationships occur a lot due to the failure of a relationship to communicate, and the absence of honesty in the basis on which a relationship is formed.

If the indicator of psychological barriers is linked to the indicator of committing violence to bind a partner to stay together, it will produce a value of 0.490, which means there is a relationship between the two indicators. The data shows that psychological barriers can influence a person to act violently so that their partner feels threatened and does not leave them. Psychological barriers here in a toxic relationship such as a partner who is easily carried away by emotions so that they express feelings of annoyance, anger, or sadness to their partner, tend to make their partner more often behave in a violent manner, especially when they meet and experience arguments the partner does not hesitate to commit physical violence. The level of relationship between the indicators above falls into the strong correlation category. In this sense, toxic relationships occur a lot due to the failure of a relationship to communicate, and one party is too rude, pushy, and overly selfish to their partner.

3.5. Strong Correlation Level

In the sub-chapter above, there are 2 correlation indicators that have a strong influence. The first indicator, namely physical barriers, which has a strong correlation level with the indicator of violence to bind a partner, produces a value of 0.688. According to the researcher, this happened because many victims of toxic relationships experienced physical violence committed by their partners. Physical barriers such as long distance relationships, according to the respondents, are very influential on the threats and violence they experience. The fear of long-distance partners, of course, makes them tend to threaten when they are not close together, this is because the fear of excessive loss makes the partner make threats (Putri et al., 2020). The direction of the relationship between physical barriers and violence to bind a partner is positive, meaning that the more often the couple meets or has physical contact, the higher the sense of the victim's partner to be arbitrary or abusive and make threats to bind his partner so as not to leave the perpetrator, because the perpetrator feels his partner is under his control.

The second indicator that has a strong correlation level is physical barriers with one's emotions and aggression, resulting in a value of 0.612. Aggressive behavior can be a behavioral tendency to hurt others both physically and psychologically to express negative feelings so as

to achieve the goals desired by the perpetrator. Based on this, it can be concluded that physical barriers with emotional and aggressive attitudes include negative behavior that intends to hurt or injure others verbally, actively, passively, directly, and indirectly. And aggressive behavior tends to be carried out on a deliberate basis which results in harm, damage to morals, ethics and social. This indicator of physical barriers is included in the strong correlation level because in adolescence there is now an increase in emotions where adolescents are very sensitive and have irritable feelings such as irritability, stubbornness, often quarreling and easily fighting. which value means there is a relationship between the two indicators. The direction of the relationship between physical barriers with emotions and aggression is positive, meaning that the longer the couple is in the Long Distance Relationship phase, the higher the level of emotion and aggressiveness of their partner. They cannot control their own emotions.

The results of this study show, when experiencing toxic relationships, the direction of the positive relationship between long distance relationships with emotions and aggression and violence to bind partners. This means that when someone is at a distance from their partner, unsuccessful communication tends to make the perpetrator easily emotional and violent. Perpetrators also do not hesitate, make threats, be possessive, control their partners, when they are in this long distance relationship phase, because of the fear of excessive loss experienced by the perpetrator.

3.6. Relationship between Johari Window Theory and Research Results

Johari Window theory explains that a person will understand themselves and can be a distance between people around when they realize something. By getting to know oneself using the concept of the Johari Windowohari Window concept can help someone in knowing themselves and improve their ability to solve complex problems. There is a relationship between the Johari Window theory with this research, where there is a meaning that if we already know ourselves then we will easily know how to behave towards others, limit ourselves with others, and will more easily understand the feelings of others.

Based on this research, teenage couples establish a toxic relationship, of course the communication they establish does not always run smoothly, the results show that many couples who are in this toxic relationship have communication barriers. This relates to Johari Window theory quadrant 1 or also called open area, where this concept explains that both parties know and understand the perspective of themselves and others. Many of them actually understand that their relationship is in the toxic relationship phase, but because of the excessive affection between these couples, their toxic relationship is still continued. As for quadrant 2 or the so-called blind self, where outsiders know that this couple is indeed in an unhealthy relationship. However, because of their affection and indifference to what others say, these toxic relationship couples still continue their relationship. These teens may still expect their partner to change for the better. In quadrant 3, it is mentioned that this area is the hidden self, where respondents know that they are in a toxic relationship but not with their partner. Respondents choose to remain silent and continue the relationship out of affection, or they get verbal or nonverbal threats from their partner. This makes their relationship even more toxic because it is done by force, full of fear, and worry. Quadrant 4 or unknown area does not apply to this study, because

researchers only collect data from respondents who really feel their relationship is in a toxic relationship. So that the respondents in this study all at least understand the toxic relationship they are in.

By understanding the Joday Window theory, these teens will understand how they should act towards their toxic partners. Through this study, researchers also understand that communication barriers are very influential in a relationship. If there is no good communication in a relationship, it will have a bad effect on the relationship they are in.

4. CLOSING

Based on the Pearson correlation test conducted, it can be concluded that there is a moderate relationship between the variable Interpersonal Communication Barriers (X) and the variable Signs of Toxic Relationship (Y). The relationship occurs in each indicator. The indicator with the strongest correlation is in physical barriers with violence to bind a partner with a correlation level of 0.688. This shows that, many teenage victims of toxic relationships are unsuccessful in establishing communication when they are in the LDR (long distance relationship) phase, causing more frequent arguments, accompanied by threats not to leave their partner. The second indicator is the emotional and aggressive partner, and violence to bind the partner with a correlation level of 0.612. In essence, during adolescence there will be an increase in emotions where adolescents are very sensitive and have irritable feelings such as irritability, stubbornness, often quarreling and easily fighting. This triggers a lot of arguments when both are emotionally overwhelmed. The toxic partner also does not hesitate to make threats to the victim so as not to leave him.

From the above conclusions, it is recommended that adolescents increase awareness of the signs of relationships that could potentially become toxic relationships. This effort is expected to help them to be more proactive in anticipating and preventing possible negative impacts in the future. In addition, the participation of external parties, such as close friends, family, or school, is also expected to help in identifying and anticipating signs of toxic relationships. Providing advice and support to both victims and perpetrators in these relationships can be the first step to creating awareness and preventing unhealthy relationships among teenagers.

REFERENCES

Aurelie, R. B. (2022). *Toxic Relationship Recovery Dalam Pacaran Di Kalangan Remaja*. UIN Prof. K.H. Saifuddin Zuhri.

Ayuningtyas, I. A. (2023). *Fenomena Abusive Relationship Dalam Komunikasi Antarpribadi (Studi Fenomenologi Pada Hubungan Berpacaran Di Kalangan Remaja)*. Universitas Nasional.

Cantika, B. P. (2022). *Persepsi Pada Hubungan Dalam Film Story Of Kale*. Universitas Islam Indonesia.

Christie, C. E., Lubuk, F. R., Aldiputra, R., Jusuf, V. N., & Hestyanti, Y. R. (2022). Meningkatkan Kesadaran Mengenai Toxic Relationship Pada Emerging Adult Menggunakan Sosial Media Instagram. *Journal of Sustainable Community Development (JSCD)*, *4*(1), 40–48.

Dianawati, A. (2010). *From Single To Couple*. GagasMedia.

Ducharme, J. (2018). *How to Tell If You're in a Toxic Relationship—And What To Do About ItTime*. Https://Time.Com/5274206/Toxic-Relationship-Signs-Help/.

Fadli, M. R. (2021). Memahami Desain Metode Penelitian Kualitatif. Humanika. *Humanika*, *21*(1), 33–54.

Fatnar, V. N., & Anam, C. (2014). *Kemampuan Interaksi Sosial Antara Remaja Yang Tinggal Di Pondok Pesantren Dengan Yang Tinggal Bersama Keluarga*. Universitas Ahmad Dahlan.

Febriana, M. (2022). *"Laki-Laki Budak Cinta (Bucin)" Wacana Maskulinitas dan Relasi Kuasa Pada Pasangan Pra-nikah*. UIN Syarif Hidayatullah.

Irawan, S. (2017). Pengaruh Konsep Diri Terhadap Komunikasi Interpersonal Mahasiswa. *Scholaria: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan*, *7*(1), 39–48.

Muammar, A. (2018). *Character Building (Membangun Pribadi Unggul)*. UMSurabaya Publishing.

Praptiningsih, N. A., & Putra, G. K. (2021). Toxic Relationship Dalam Komunikasi Interpersonal Di Kalangan Remaja. *Communication*, *12*(2), 132–142.

Prayudho, A. (2022). *Perilaku Komunikasi Toxic Relationship Dalam Hubungan Remaja*. Universitas Satya Negara Indonesia.

Putri, R. M., Oktaviani, A. D., Utami, A. S. F., Ni'maturrohmah, Addiina, H. A., & Nisa, H. (2020). Hubungan Pembelajaran Jarak Jauh dan Gangguan Somatoform dengan Tingkat Stres Mahasiswa UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta. *Journal of Health Promotion and Behavior*, *2*(1), 38–45.

Rachmawati, D. (2019). Welcoming Gen Z In Job World (Selamat Datang Generasi Z Di Dunia Kerja). *Proceeding Indonesian Career Center Network (ICCN)*, 21–24.

Rahimah, S. (2022). *Pengaruh Toxic Relationship Dalam Pertemanan Terhadap Psychological Well-Being Pada Mahasiswa UIN Antasari Banjarmasin* [Skripsi]. Ushuluddin dan Humaniora.

Rihandita, G. (2018). Studi Deskriptif Laki-Laki Sebagai Korban Kekerasan Dalam Masa Pacaran. *Calyptra*, *7*(1), 2522–2539.

Samsinar, & Kaddi, S. M. (2020). Self Disclosure Pada Pasangan Suami Istri Hasil Perjodohan Etnik Bugis Di Kota Palu. *KINESIK*, *7*(2), 142–152.

Sumarjo, Tamu, Y., & Hussa, D. A. E. (2023). Komunikasi Antarpribadi Dalam Toxic Relationship Pacaran Pada Mahasiswa Universitas Negeri Gorontalo. *Jambura Ilmu Komunikasi*, *1*(2), 1–19.

Wongpy, N. (2021). *Bunga Rampai Keluarga Tangguh* (2nd ed.). Universitas Ciputra.