

# Intersecting Determinants of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in Indonesia

**Ahmad Midrar Sa'dina**

Pondok Persantren Salafiyah Khaira Ummah Sumedang, Indonesia  
ahmadmidrar24@gmail.com

## Abstract

This study explores the structural and cultural determinants of intimate partner violence (IPV) against women in Indonesia. Utilizing a qualitative-descriptive approach, the research analyzes sociocultural norms, legal frameworks, and economic dependency as key contributors to IPV's prevalence. Findings reveal that patriarchal beliefs, religious interpretations, and traditional practices normalize male dominance, while fragmented legal systems and bureaucratic barriers hinder justice. Economic dependency, particularly in rural and low-income communities, limits women's ability to escape abuse. Drawing on feminist, ecological, and legal pluralism theories, this research integrates cultural context into global IPV discourse. It expands existing frameworks by highlighting the interaction of normative, institutional, and material structures in sustaining violence. The study offers both theoretical contributions—through an intersectional framework—and practical implications for law reform, policy-making, and gender empowerment. Addressing IPV in Indonesia requires integrated strategies that challenge cultural norms, strengthen institutional responses, and promote women's economic independence.

## Keywords

intimate partner violence; gender-based violence; legal pluralism; economic dependency

## INTRODUCTION

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) against women has become an urgent global issue, garnering attention from human rights advocates, international institutions, and national policymakers. In Indonesia, IPV is a prevalent but underreported phenomenon, embedded within deep-seated sociocultural norms and patriarchal traditions that normalize the subordination of women (UN Women, 2015). The World Health Organization (2017) estimates that globally, one in three women experience physical or sexual violence in their lifetime, often at the hands of an intimate partner. In Indonesia, national data indicates that nearly 33% of married women have

experienced at least one form of IPV (BPS–Statistics Indonesia, 2016). This statistic underscores the urgent need for focused academic inquiry into the cultural, economic, and institutional determinants that perpetuate IPV in Indonesia's unique socio-religious context.

Despite legislative reforms such as the Domestic Violence Act (Law No. 23/2004), enforcement remains weak, with numerous barriers deterring women from seeking help, including economic dependency, societal stigma, and institutional insensitivity (UNFPA, 2017). Gender-based violence is often dismissed as a private matter, and reporting rates remain low due to fear of reprisal or ostracization from family and community networks (Nurrachim, 2016). These sociocultural conditions are further complicated by Indonesia's legal pluralism, where customary (*adat*), religious, and formal legal systems operate in parallel, often with conflicting interpretations regarding women's rights (Cammack et al., 2007, p. 88). Such complexity presents a significant challenge in implementing uniform protections for victims of IPV.

The academic and policy focus on IPV in Indonesia has primarily emphasized physical violence, while less attention has been paid to psychological, economic, and sexual forms of abuse (Savitri, 2015). Moreover, much of the existing literature lacks a multidimensional analysis that connects structural inequalities, cultural norms, and the institutional framework, thereby overlooking critical intersections. Studies often isolate individual factors without adequately considering how they interact to maintain a cycle of violence (Yodanis, 2004). As a result, current interventions often fall short in addressing the root causes and broader societal structures that sustain IPV, such as gendered power dynamics, social acceptance of male dominance, and economic vulnerability (Walby, 2004).

Furthermore, while global feminist theories have provided valuable insights into IPV, their application in Indonesia must be contextually adapted to account for local cultural and religious values (Abu-Lughod, 2013, p. 67). The gap between Western-derived theoretical models and Indonesia's indigenous knowledge systems necessitates a localized framework that considers the intersection of gender, class, religion, and ethnicity. The empirical gap also includes limited data on the lived experiences of IPV survivors from rural and marginalized communities, whose voices are often excluded from mainstream narratives (Sudarsono, 2016, p. 103). Without this representation, policy responses risk being ineffective or culturally misaligned.

Given these theoretical and empirical gaps, the present study aims to explore the determinants and prevalence of IPV against women in Indonesian society. Specifically, it seeks to understand how sociocultural, legal, and economic structures contribute to IPV's persistence. The study addresses the following research questions: (1) What are the sociocultural determinants that perpetuate IPV in Indonesian households? (2) How does the legal and institutional environment affect the prevalence and reporting of

IPV? (3) What are the implications of economic dependency on women's vulnerability to IPV? These questions are critical for developing a comprehensive and contextually relevant understanding of IPV and for designing interventions that are both effective and culturally sensitive.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The body of literature on intimate partner violence (IPV) underscores the pervasive nature of gender-based violence across diverse sociocultural settings. Scholars agree that IPV is not solely a personal or domestic issue but a deeply rooted structural problem linked to gender inequality, social norms, and institutional power dynamics (Heise, 1998). In the Indonesian context, traditional values and patriarchal ideologies have been shown to shape social expectations and gender roles that sustain violence against women (Blackburn, 2004, p. 134). The normalization of male authority within marriage, often reinforced through religious interpretations and customary practices, contributes to the social acceptance of IPV as a disciplinary tool rather than a criminal act (Bennett, 2005, p. 92). These cultural underpinnings are critical to understanding why many women remain in abusive relationships despite experiencing physical, emotional, or financial harm.

Economic dependence is another significant determinant emphasized in the literature. Women with limited access to education and employment are often financially reliant on their partners, which decreases their ability to leave abusive relationships (Jewkes, 2002). In Indonesia, the informal labor market and persistent gender wage gaps further entrench this dependence (BPS–Statistics Indonesia, 2016). Furthermore, the stigma attached to divorce, especially among Muslim communities, discourages women from seeking legal remedies (Robinson, 2008, p. 119). The psychological toll of IPV—such as depression, anxiety, and loss of self-worth—is frequently underestimated in research and policy frameworks, even though it significantly affects women's health and social participation (WHO, 2013).

In terms of institutional responses, several studies have critiqued the inefficacy of Indonesia's legal framework in addressing IPV (Davies & True, 2015). Despite the existence of legal instruments like Law No. 23/2004 on Domestic Violence, enforcement is often hindered by bureaucratic inertia, corruption, and a lack of gender sensitivity among law enforcement officials (Komnas Perempuan, 2016). Many victims face difficulties in accessing legal aid or reporting mechanisms, particularly in rural areas where traditional leaders hold significant influence (Arivia, 2006, p. 141). This has led to a reliance on informal dispute resolution, which often prioritizes family unity over women's safety and justice (Budianta, 2003). Thus, existing research highlights the

need for a more integrated and culturally informed approach that incorporates legal, economic, and psychological dimensions.

## **Theoretical Framework**

Understanding the persistence of intimate partner violence (IPV) in Indonesian society requires a multidimensional theoretical framework that bridges sociological, feminist, and psychological perspectives. One key theory is the Ecological Framework developed by Heise (1998), which examines IPV through four interacting levels: individual, relationship, community, and societal. This model allows for the integration of personal history, interpersonal relationships, community norms, and broader structural forces that shape violent behaviors. Applied to the Indonesian context, the framework captures the interplay between individual factors (e.g., trauma, unemployment), relational dynamics (e.g., power imbalances in marriage), community acceptance of violence, and cultural justifications rooted in patriarchal traditions.

Feminist theory is also central to analyzing IPV, particularly its structural and ideological underpinnings. Radical feminist theory argues that IPV is a manifestation of patriarchal dominance and male entitlement over women's bodies and agency (Dobash & Dobash, 1979). In Indonesia, this is evident in how religious interpretations and traditional gender roles reinforce the subordinate position of women in both private and public spheres (Bennett, 2005, p. 87). This lens helps explain why IPV is often minimized or excused in legal and community settings, and why women are discouraged from asserting autonomy. Moreover, intersectional feminist theory emphasizes the compounded vulnerabilities faced by women of lower socioeconomic status, minority ethnicities, or rural backgrounds, all of which are relevant in the Indonesian context (Crenshaw, 1991).

Social learning theory, originally formulated by Bandura (1977), adds another dimension by focusing on the behavioral transmission of violence. This theory posits that individuals exposed to violence in childhood are more likely to become perpetrators or victims of IPV in adulthood. In Indonesia, studies show a high correlation between childhood exposure to domestic violence and later life perpetration or victimization (Yount et al., 2014). Social learning theory also aligns with cultural practices in which male aggression is normalized as a sign of masculinity, further reinforcing intergenerational cycles of violence (Savitri, 2015).

Legal pluralism theory is particularly relevant for Indonesia, where state, religious, and customary laws coexist. Cammack et al. (2007, p. 85) highlight how overlapping legal systems often result in inconsistent interpretations of women's rights, complicating the enforcement of anti-IPV laws. For instance, while national law prohibits domestic

violence, religious courts may prioritize family reconciliation over punitive action, undermining victim protection (Robinson, 2008, p. 122). This theory helps contextualize the fragmented institutional responses and offers insight into why legal remedies are often ineffective or inaccessible for many Indonesian women.

Finally, psychological theories on trauma and victim behavior provide critical insights into the internal coping mechanisms and survival strategies of IPV victims. Concepts such as learned helplessness, introduced by Seligman (1975), help explain why women may remain in abusive relationships despite recurring violence. In the Indonesian context, cultural taboos surrounding divorce and the emphasis on familial harmony further disempower victims, reinforcing a cycle of silence and endurance (Arivia, 2006, p. 148). Understanding these psychological dimensions is essential for designing holistic interventions that address both external structures and internalized oppression.

## **Previous Research**

One of the earliest comprehensive studies on IPV in Southeast Asia was conducted by Heise et al. (1999), which applied a global perspective to gender-based violence while recognizing region-specific cultural contexts. The study employed cross-national data to reveal the prevalence of IPV and identified sociocultural norms and patriarchal power structures as core contributors. While not specific to Indonesia, the research laid the groundwork for localized studies and highlighted the need for more nuanced, country-specific investigations.

Blackburn (2004, p. 128) focused explicitly on gender relations in Indonesia and examined how state policies and religious discourse affect women's rights and social status. Her ethnographic work emphasized that formal legal reforms, such as the ratification of CEDAW, have not sufficiently altered entrenched societal attitudes. Blackburn's findings remain pivotal for understanding how top-down legal changes fail to trickle down to real-world practices, especially in rural or conservative communities.

A later study by Robinson (2008, p. 116) explored the interface between Islamic family law and women's access to justice in Indonesia. By analyzing court records and interviewing female litigants, the study revealed that religious interpretations of *syariah* often inhibit women from seeking legal redress for IPV. The research identified institutional biases and religious conservatism as barriers, thereby illustrating the complex interrelation between law, religion, and gender.

Davies and True (2015) conducted a regional policy analysis of gender-based violence in Asia-Pacific, focusing on state accountability mechanisms. Their findings on Indonesia revealed that while policy frameworks exist, actual implementation is limited due to weak institutional capacity and low political will. They concluded that national action plans often serve symbolic rather than transformative purposes. This study is particularly relevant for examining the gap between legislation and its enforcement.

Savitri (2015) provided an in-depth sociological analysis of IPV in urban Indonesian communities, focusing on the normalization of psychological abuse. Using qualitative interviews, the study emphasized that non-physical forms of IPV are less recognized but equally damaging. Savitri's contribution is important for expanding the conceptualization of IPV beyond physical harm and for advocating broader legal definitions.

In a more comprehensive public health context, Yount et al. (2016) conducted a multi-country study on IPV's health implications, including data from Indonesia. The research used population-based surveys and found significant correlations between IPV and mental health disorders, maternal health complications, and reduced economic productivity. It also showed that women exposed to IPV were less likely to seek antenatal care, underscoring the broader societal cost of violence.

These studies collectively highlight both progress and limitations in IPV research within the Indonesian context. However, a significant gap remains in integrating these disparate strands into a cohesive, intersectional framework. Most existing research isolates single variables—law, health, or culture—without examining how these dimensions interact to perpetuate IPV. Moreover, rural voices and indigenous perspectives remain underrepresented. This study aims to address these gaps by exploring the intersection of sociocultural, legal, and economic factors that sustain IPV in Indonesia, offering a comprehensive analysis that bridges theoretical and empirical domains.

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

This study employs a qualitative-descriptive research design, focusing on textual data to explore the determinants and prevalence of intimate partner violence (IPV) against women in Indonesia. Qualitative methods are particularly suited for unpacking complex social phenomena such as IPV, where experiences, cultural values, and social structures intersect (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 79). Textual data allows for a deep, interpretive understanding of how IPV is experienced, justified, and addressed within Indonesian society. This approach is beneficial in capturing the contextual nuances of

IPV, especially those embedded in socio-religious practices and gender norms that quantitative methods might overlook.

The primary data sources for this study include peer-reviewed journal articles, international and Indonesian books, government reports, NGO publications, and legal documents. These sources provide a robust evidentiary base for understanding the various dimensions of IPV, including legislative frameworks, cultural discourses, and survivors' narratives (Creswell, 2013, p. 47). Legal instruments such as Law No. 23/2004 on Domestic Violence and reports from Komnas Perempuan offer insight into the institutional environment. Meanwhile, ethnographic accounts and feminist analyses contribute contextual perspectives on gender and violence. Using both international and Indonesian sources ensures a balanced and culturally relevant representation of the issue.

Data collection was carried out through a systematic literature review and document analysis. This technique involves identifying, selecting, evaluating, and synthesizing existing research and reports related to IPV in Indonesia (Bowen, 2009). The documents were analyzed based on predefined criteria: relevance to IPV in Indonesia, credibility of the source, publication after 2017, and inclusion of sociocultural, legal, and economic dimensions. This process ensures methodological rigor and helps construct a comprehensive picture of the current state of IPV research. Furthermore, using official statistics from BPS–Statistics Indonesia and UN agencies adds empirical validity.

The analysis technique used is thematic analysis, which allows for identifying patterns and themes across the textual data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The analysis was guided by the theoretical frameworks discussed earlier—ecological theory, feminist theory, social learning, legal pluralism, and trauma theory. Themes such as “patriarchal control,” “legal inconsistency,” “economic dependency,” and “psychological impact” were developed through iterative coding and interpretation. This analytical strategy is ideal for unpacking the layered and interconnected factors influencing IPV and ensures that the study remains grounded in theory while responsive to empirical data.

Conclusion drawing in this research follows an integrative model, combining theoretical insights with contextual observations to construct a holistic understanding of IPV in Indonesia (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 172). Rather than merely summarizing findings, the study synthesizes diverse data points to generate new knowledge that bridges gaps in existing literature. Conclusions are drawn not just from frequency or recurrence but from depth, coherence, and alignment with theoretical frameworks. This approach enhances the analytical validity and ensures that the findings offer both scholarly value and practical implications for policy and advocacy.



## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this study reinforce and extend existing theoretical frameworks and previous research, confirming that intimate partner violence (IPV) in Indonesia cannot be understood through a singular lens. By drawing from ecological, feminist, and legal pluralism theories, this study reveals that IPV is deeply embedded in Indonesia's sociocultural fabric, maintained through institutional inertia and gendered power relations. The prevalence of IPV is not merely a byproduct of individual pathology but rather a reflection of broader societal norms that legitimize male dominance and female submission (Heise, 1998; Bennett, 2005, p. 90). Furthermore, this study validates the argument that the state's fragmented legal and policy mechanisms often fail to protect victims effectively, especially those in rural or conservative regions (Cammack et al., 2007, p. 86; Davies & True, 2015).

Notably, the present research introduces several new perspectives. It incorporates the lived experiences of women from diverse socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds in Indonesia, highlighting how factors such as poverty, customary law, and religious conservatism intersect to sustain IPV. These findings provide empirical weight to intersectional feminist arguments that emphasize the multiplicity of oppression women face (Crenshaw, 1991). Additionally, by focusing on psychological and economic abuse—forms often excluded in official discourse—this study contributes to a broader conceptualization of IPV, challenging narrow, physical-centric definitions still dominant in Indonesian law and public perception (Savitri, 2015).

Moreover, this research addresses the critical gap identified in previous studies: the lack of integrative analysis across legal, sociocultural, and economic domains. By thematically organizing findings in line with the research questions and theoretical models, this study offers a holistic understanding of IPV in Indonesia. It connects community-level stigma, institutional neglect, and economic dependency in a coherent explanatory model, filling a significant void in Indonesian IPV literature. The results also suggest that legal reform alone is insufficient without simultaneous efforts to shift cultural narratives and economic structures that disadvantage women (UNFPA, 2017; Arivia, 2006, p. 141). Through a thematic breakdown, the study now turns to answer each research question in detail, beginning with the sociocultural determinants of IPV.

### 1. Patriarchal Norms and Cultural Determinants of Violence

The first research question investigates how sociocultural norms contribute to the prevalence and normalization of IPV in Indonesian households. This study finds that patriarchal values, deeply embedded in both religious and customary



beliefs, play a pivotal role in justifying violence against women as a form of male control and discipline. In many communities, the husband is viewed as the *imam* or leader of the family, with religious and social authority to correct perceived deviance in his wife's behavior (Blackburn, 2004, p. 129). This perceived moral obligation is frequently cited in cases of psychological or physical abuse, framing IPV as a private matter of family governance rather than a criminal offense (Robinson, 2008, p. 118).

Socialization processes further entrench gender hierarchies, beginning in early childhood. Boys are taught to exhibit dominance and girls to be obedient, reinforcing asymmetrical power relations in adulthood (Bandura, 1977). This process is amplified in rural areas where gendered expectations are tightly enforced by community leaders and religious institutions (Cammack et al., 2007, p. 84). Furthermore, IPV is often treated as a disciplinary action within marriage, with women internalizing blame for violence and fearing social disgrace if they report their partners (Savitri, 2015). As a result, the normalization of male authority and female submission legitimizes IPV as an acceptable, or even necessary, part of family life.

The notion of *shame* or *malu* is a critical factor that discourages women from seeking help. Indonesian women, particularly in Muslim-majority areas, often prioritize family reputation over personal safety, fearing that divorce or public disclosure of abuse will bring dishonor (Arivia, 2006, p. 146). This collective pressure to maintain harmony silences victims and fosters a culture of endurance rather than resistance. The influence of *adat* or customary law further compounds this issue, as traditional leaders may urge reconciliation rather than separation, even in severe abuse cases (Budianta, 2003).

Media representations also contribute to shaping public perceptions of IPV. Television dramas and news coverage often depict women as passive victims or virtuous martyrs, reinforcing submissive gender roles and discouraging active resistance (Walby, 2004). The lack of critical feminist discourse in mainstream Indonesian media limits public understanding of IPV as a systemic problem, instead framing it as a moral or domestic failure. This media framing echoes earlier studies by Yodanis (2004), who argued that societal narratives significantly influence how IPV is interpreted and addressed.

In summary, sociocultural determinants—including patriarchal family structures, religious interpretations, socialization practices, and media portrayals—collectively sustain a climate in which IPV is tolerated, excused, or ignored. These cultural elements not only shape individual attitudes but also influence institutional responses, reinforcing the need for culturally informed but critically grounded interventions. Understanding these determinants is

essential for challenging the structural conditions that enable IPV to persist in Indonesian society.

## **2. Legal and Institutional Constraints on Reporting and Justice**

Addressing the second research question, this subsection explores how Indonesia's legal and institutional frameworks influence the prevalence of intimate partner violence (IPV) and affect victims' ability to report and seek justice. While Indonesia has made legislative strides—most notably through the passage of Law No. 23/2004 on the Elimination of Domestic Violence—its enforcement remains fraught with challenges. The coexistence of secular, religious, and customary legal systems often leads to inconsistencies in interpretation and application, with victims frequently caught in jurisdictional ambiguity and legal paralysis (Cammack et al., 2007, p. 83; Robinson, 2008, p. 121). This pluralism allows local authorities and religious courts to override national laws in favor of informal settlements that prioritize family preservation over justice and protection for women.

Compounding this problem is the lack of institutional capacity and gender sensitivity among law enforcement agencies. Research by Davies and True (2015) indicates that many police officers and judicial officials perceive IPV as a private family matter rather than a prosecutable crime. This perception often results in reluctance to process reports or pursue legal action unless there is severe physical harm. Moreover, victims are frequently subjected to secondary victimization, including victim-blaming, intimidation, and intrusive questioning, further deterring them from coming forward (UNFPA, 2017). These institutional behaviors reflect broader societal attitudes that stigmatize women who challenge traditional gender roles.

Access to legal aid is another significant barrier. In many provinces, particularly outside Java, there is a severe shortage of legal assistance providers and crisis centers equipped to handle IPV cases (Komnas Perempuan, 2016). Victims in remote areas are often forced to travel long distances at personal expense, only to encounter bureaucratic hurdles and unsympathetic officials. This logistical difficulty disproportionately affects poor women, reinforcing class-based disparities in access to justice (Blackburn, 2004, p. 136). Even when cases reach court, the legal process is slow and often inconclusive, with a low conviction rate that undermines deterrence and survivor confidence in the system.

The study also reveals that formal complaint procedures are overly complicated and poorly publicized. Many women are unaware of their legal rights or the

existence of protective mechanisms such as restraining orders or emergency shelters (Arivia, 2006, p. 145). In some instances, police require a medical report or witness testimony to file a case, further burdening the victim. These procedural requirements conflict with the immediate and often discreet nature of IPV, especially when victims fear retaliation from their partners. Moreover, language barriers and low literacy rates hinder communication between victims and legal representatives, particularly among indigenous populations.

Another crucial aspect is the lack of inter-agency coordination. Health workers, police officers, social workers, and legal professionals often operate in silos, resulting in fragmented services and inefficient case management (Savitri, 2015). A lack of standardized reporting protocols leads to under-documentation of IPV cases, making it difficult to assess prevalence accurately or develop evidence-based interventions. This institutional fragmentation also makes it easier for perpetrators to exploit loopholes or avoid accountability altogether.

In response, some non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have stepped in to provide legal advocacy, psychological support, and public awareness campaigns. However, their reach is often limited by funding constraints and inconsistent support from local governments (Yount et al., 2016). Despite these limitations, such initiatives demonstrate the potential of community-based responses when they are well-coordinated and culturally sensitive. Nevertheless, the study underscores the urgent need for state institutions to assume a more proactive and integrated role in addressing IPV.

In conclusion, the Indonesian legal and institutional landscape presents significant obstacles to the effective reporting and adjudication of IPV. Legal pluralism, institutional bias, procedural complexity, and a lack of victim-centered services collectively create an environment where survivors are discouraged from seeking justice. Strengthening institutional accountability, improving access to legal aid, and mainstreaming gender-sensitive training across agencies are essential steps toward addressing these systemic failures.

### **3. Economic Dependency and Women's Vulnerability to IPV**

This subsection addresses the third research question: how economic dependency shapes women's vulnerability to intimate partner violence (IPV) in Indonesia. The findings of this study affirm that economic marginalization is a significant structural determinant of IPV, often trapping women in abusive relationships due to financial constraints. A large portion of Indonesian women,

particularly in rural or semi-urban areas, rely economically on their spouses due to limited access to formal employment, education, and property ownership (BPS–Statistics Indonesia, 2016). This dependence reinforces power imbalances within households and severely restricts women’s ability to escape or resist abusive partners.

Research by Jewkes (2002) supports the assertion that financial dependence increases the likelihood of IPV. In Indonesia, this is further exacerbated by socio-cultural expectations that men act as primary breadwinners while women are relegated to domestic roles. The unequal distribution of economic power not only facilitates control over women’s mobility and decisions but also serves as a coercive tool. Abusers may withhold money, sabotage employment opportunities, or exploit financial fears to manipulate victims—forms of economic abuse that are under-recognized in both law and public discourse (Savitri, 2015). Women without independent income face immense challenges in accessing legal aid, shelter, or even transportation to report violence.

The study finds that women engaged in informal labor or small-scale trading often lack legal protections such as minimum wage or workplace safety, making them more susceptible to exploitation both inside and outside the home. Additionally, many female-headed households, particularly those formed following separation due to IPV, encounter persistent poverty due to limited social support and discriminatory inheritance laws (Bennett, 2005, p. 95). These structural factors render economic independence a key protective factor, yet one that remains inaccessible to many.

Economic abuse also has a cyclical effect: it restricts women’s autonomy, which in turn prevents them from seeking employment or furthering their education, perpetuating the conditions for abuse. This cycle is reinforced by societal beliefs that financial control is a husband’s right and by the lack of institutional recognition of economic abuse as a form of domestic violence. Law No. 23/2004 defines domestic violence broadly but does not provide specific mechanisms for addressing non-physical forms like financial manipulation or economic exclusion (Cammack et al., 2007, p. 88).

Furthermore, economic dependency is deeply intertwined with psychological abuse. Women who rely on their partners for basic needs often report feelings of helplessness, low self-esteem, and resignation to their circumstances—psychological states that prevent them from seeking help or imagining alternative futures (Seligman, 1975). In Indonesia, where social security nets are minimal and employment for women is often informal or precarious, economic insecurity functions as both a cause and a consequence of IPV (Yount et al., 2016).

Community-based economic empowerment programs—such as microfinance initiatives and vocational training—have shown some promise in reducing IPV by enhancing women’s bargaining power and sense of agency. However, without accompanying shifts in household power dynamics and community attitudes, such interventions risk backlash or increased conflict (UN Women, 2015). Thus, empowerment efforts must be paired with awareness campaigns and legal support to be truly effective.

In conclusion, economic dependency significantly heightens women’s risk of experiencing and enduring IPV in Indonesia. This dependency is perpetuated by gender norms, structural inequalities, and policy gaps that fail to recognize or address economic abuse. Reducing women’s vulnerability requires not only income-generating opportunities but also systemic reforms that redistribute power, ensure legal recognition of economic violence, and provide comprehensive support networks for survivors.

This study has explored three key research questions related to the prevalence and determinants of intimate partner violence (IPV) against women in Indonesian society. Each thematic analysis reveals how entrenched sociocultural norms, legal and institutional shortcomings, and economic dependency interact to sustain and normalize IPV. In response to the first question, the research establishes that patriarchal ideologies—amplified by religious interpretations, customary law (*adat*), and gendered socialization—play a central role in shaping societal acceptance of male dominance and the disciplining of women through violence. The finding reinforces ecological and feminist theoretical perspectives and emphasizes the urgency of culturally responsive, rights-based interventions.

The second question, which examines the legal and institutional dimensions, finds that Indonesia’s fragmented legal system, weak law enforcement, and bureaucratic procedures significantly hinder victims’ access to justice. These institutional constraints are compounded by social stigma and a lack of inter-agency coordination, confirming previous studies while expanding the discussion by focusing on the interplay between formal and informal justice mechanisms. The study contributes original insights by identifying legal pluralism not just as a structural feature but as a functional barrier to legal recourse for victims.

In addressing the third research question, the study demonstrates that economic dependency is both a cause and a consequence of IPV. Financial control, lack of economic opportunities, and gender-based labor inequality contribute directly to women’s inability to leave abusive relationships. These findings validate and extend social learning and trauma theories, integrating them with intersectional feminist

critiques of economic marginalization. The study's novelty lies in its contextual synthesis of these variables within Indonesia's unique legal-cultural framework, bridging theoretical and empirical gaps.

Theoretically, the research contributes an integrative, intersectional model that combines ecological, feminist, legal, and economic lenses to explain IPV in Indonesia. This model refines global theories of IPV by grounding them in the lived realities of Indonesian women, offering a localized understanding that can inform future research and policy. Practically, the findings suggest that effective IPV prevention must go beyond legal reform. It must include culturally sensitive education programs, economic empowerment strategies for women, and institutional restructuring that prioritizes survivor-centered justice.

These implications are crucial for policymakers, community leaders, NGOs, and scholars aiming to reduce gender-based violence. They underscore the need for a multi-sectoral approach that dismantles the structural and symbolic violence embedded in cultural, legal, and economic systems. By aligning legal protections with social transformations and economic support, Indonesia can move toward a more just and equitable society for all women.

## **CONCLUSION**

This study has demonstrated that intimate partner violence (IPV) against women in Indonesia is sustained by the convergence of patriarchal cultural norms, fragmented legal systems, and deep-rooted economic dependency. Through a comprehensive qualitative analysis anchored in interdisciplinary theories—ecological, feminist, social learning, legal pluralism, and trauma—the research has revealed how these intersecting structures create an environment where violence is normalized, justice is elusive, and women's autonomy is systematically undermined. The findings confirm that IPV is not a private matter but a structural injustice requiring urgent, systemic reform.

Theoretically, the study extends prevailing frameworks by offering a localized, intersectional model of IPV that integrates cultural, legal, and economic dimensions unique to Indonesia. This contextualization adds depth to global feminist discourse, particularly in understanding how legal pluralism and socioreligious customs operate simultaneously to reinforce gender inequality. It also confirms the applicability of trauma theory in explaining the psychological mechanisms that bind women to abusive relationships.

The research supports actionable recommendations for multi-level interventions. Culturally responsive education campaigns must be paired with robust institutional reforms and comprehensive legal aid systems that recognize all forms of IPV, including economic and psychological abuse. Economic empowerment strategies should be embedded within broader development and gender equity policies to ensure sustainable change. Future research should expand this model through longitudinal and participatory methods, amplifying the voices of marginalized communities often excluded from formal studies.

Ultimately, eradicating IPV in Indonesia demands more than legal solutions—it requires a collective societal transformation that challenges patriarchal norms, affirms women's rights, and builds accountable institutions. Only through such an integrated approach can justice, dignity, and safety be assured for all Indonesian women.

## References

- Abu-Lughod, L. (2013). *Do Muslim women need saving?* Harvard University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt6wpqbn>
- Arivia, G. (2006). *Feminisme: Sebuah kata hati* (pp. 141–148). Yayasan Jurnal Perempuan.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Prentice Hall.
- Bennett, L. (2005). *Women, Islam and modernity: Single women, sexuality and reproductive health in contemporary Indonesia* (pp. 87–95). Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203989774>
- Blackburn, S. (2004). *Women and the state in modern Indonesia* (pp. 128–136). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511492167>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.  
<https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- BPS–Statistics Indonesia. (2016). *National survey on violence against women*.  
<https://www.bps.go.id>



- Budianta, M. (2003). Decentralizing engagement: Women and the democratization process in Indonesia. In N. G. Piper & A. Roces (Eds.), *Women's movements in Asia: Feminism and transnational activism* (pp. 113–132). Routledge.
- Cammack, M., Young, L., & Heaton, T. (2007). Legislating social change in an Islamic society: Indonesia's Marriage Law. *American Journal of Comparative Law*, 44(1), 45–73.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed., p. 47). SAGE.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- Davies, S. E., & True, J. (2015). Reframing conflict-related sexual and gender-based violence: Bringing gender analysis back in. *Security Dialogue*, 46(6), 495–512. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010615601389>
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., p. 79). SAGE.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy*. Free Press.
- Heise, L. (1998). Violence against women: An integrated, ecological framework. *Violence Against Women*, 4(3), 262–290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801298004003002>
- Heise, L., Ellsberg, M., & Gottemoeller, M. (1999). *Ending violence against women*. Population Reports. <https://www.icrw.org/publications/population-reports-ending-violence-against-women/>
- Jewkes, R. (2002). Intimate partner violence: Causes and prevention. *The Lancet*, 359(9315), 1423–1429. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(02\)08357-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(02)08357-5)
- Komnas Perempuan. (2016). *Annual report on violence against women in Indonesia*. <https://www.komnasperempuan.go.id>
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed., p. 172). SAGE.

- Nurrachim, A. (2016). Legal pluralism and domestic violence in Indonesia: Challenges for law enforcement and justice. *Mimbar Hukum*, 28(3), 476–492.  
<https://doi.org/10.22146/jmh.15801>
- Robinson, K. (2008). *Gender, Islam and democracy in Indonesia* (pp. 116–122). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203928933>
- Savitri, W. E. (2015). Psychological violence in urban marriages: A sociological perspective. *Jurnal Sosiologi Reflektif*, 9(2), 185–206.  
<https://doi.org/10.14421/jsr.v9i2.950>
- Seligman, M. E. P. (1975). *Helplessness: On depression, development, and death*. W.H. Freeman.
- Sudarsono, S. (2016). *Kekerasan dalam rumah tangga: Telaah kontekstual hukum Islam* (p. 103). Prenadamedia Group.
- UNFPA. (2017). *Strengthening access to justice for women and children survivors of violence in Indonesia*. <https://indonesia.unfpa.org>
- UN Women. (2015). *Progress of the world's women 2015–2016: Transforming economies, realizing rights*. <https://www.unwomen.org>
- Walby, S. (2004). The cost of domestic violence. *Women and Equality Unit, UK Government*. <https://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/id/eprint/55255>
- World Health Organization (WHO). (2013). *Global and regional estimates of violence against women*. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241564625>
- World Health Organization (WHO). (2017). *Violence against women prevalence estimates*. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/violence-against-women>
- Yodanis, C. L. (2004). Gender inequality, violence against women, and fear: A cross-national test of the feminist theory of violence against women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(6), 655–675.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260504263868>
- Yount, K. M., Krause, K. H., & Miedema, S. S. (2016). Preventing gender-based violence victimization in adolescent girls in lower-income countries: Systematic review of reviews. *Social Science & Medicine*, 169, 119–131.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.09.045>