Exploring Teachers' Understanding of Psychological Violence in Responding to Indonesia's Violence-free School Climate Policy

Uswatun Qoyyimah[a], Maisarah[b], Yosi Agustiawan[c], Achmad Fanani[d], and Aizun Najih[e]

[a]Faculty of Education, Universitas Pesantren Tinggi Darul Ulum, Jombang, East Java, Indonesia; [b]Faculty of Business and Foreign Language, Universitas Pesantren Tinggi Darul Ulum, Jombang, East Java, Indonesia; [c]Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Pesantren Tinggi Darul Ulum, Jombang, East Java, Indonesia; [d]Faculty of Education, Universitas Pesantren Tinggi Darul Ulum, Jombang, East Java, Indonesia; [e]Faculty of Business and Foreign Language, Universitas Pesantren Tinggi Darul Ulum, Jombang, East Java, Indonesia

*Corresponding author:
Uswatun Qoyyimah
Faculty of Education
Universitas Pesantren Tinggi Darul Ulum
Jombang, East Java - Indonesia
Email address: uswatunqoyyimah@fbs.unipdu.ac.id

Exploring Teachers' Understanding of Psychological Violence in Responding to Indonesia's Violence-free School Climate policy

Abstract— In 2015, the violence-free school climate policy of Permedikbud RI No. 82/2015 was issued by the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture. This policy requires schools to provide a violence-free school climate so that school is an ideal place for nurturing peace and social harmony and a safe place for the school population. This policy outlines that any violent conduct such as physical and verbal bullying, sexual harassment, and other psychological violence should be prevented and banned. However, research on how the violence-free school climate policy has been understood and put in place by educators in schools remains absent. This present study reports on how this official policy informed teachers' understanding of school violence and its prevention. Teachers' conceptual understanding of what is meant by violence at school is explored to assess whether the policy has been effective in terms of its objectives. Literature concerning types of school violence from many different contexts and cultures were reviewed in this paper to illustrate the broader theoretical argument. Four teachers working in two different secondary schools in Medan participated in this study. Semi-structured interview questions were prepared for collecting the data. The interview data were then analyzed deductively based on the themes derived from theories regarding types of violence. The findings indicated that while the policy is aimed at invoking educators' awareness of violent conduct, both physical and non-physical, teachers participating in this study reported more understanding of physical violence but reported less understanding of non-physical violence. This study contributes to the development of knowledge regarding the different types of violence in the literature and in Indonesian schools as well as giving insight on how an official policy should be introduced at school level to make the whole policy effective.

Keywords: official policy, secondary school, psychological violence, teacher understanding, violence-free climate

Introduction

Schools have a social function in terms of developing students' academic and moral capacities. These formal educational institutions should be the ideal place for children to develop these capacities. The acts of violence that obstruct students' capabilities, however, are worrying. A study conducted by the International Research Center for Women (ICRW) in 2015 indicated that 84 per cent of students experienced violence in Indonesian schools (2015). Hence, when violent behavior is evident at school, the function of school as a moral training ground is questioned: how can schools contribute to the nation's competitiveness when they cannot properly educate students?

Violent behavior has a negative impact on both offenders and victims in terms of their physical and psychological development. Victims become traumatized, lack in confidence, and they tend to have difficulties in academic attainment (Sourander, Helstela, Helenius & Piha, 2000). Likewise, offenders will tend to display aggressive and anti-social behavior. Previous studies have identified that offenders are more likely to grow up as abusive wives/husbands and they

are more likely to physically punish their children in the future (Carney & Merrell, 2001; Roberts, 2000; Smokowski & Kopasz, 2005).

Learning from the ICRW's study, the Indonesian government responded to the phenomenon by introducing the violence-free school climate policy. The goal of the policy is to prevent the rising level of violence in schools. This paper explores how school teachers in secondary schools reported their understanding of violent conduct and gives insights on how teachers responded to the 2015 violence-free school climate policy.

The Violence Free-Climate Policy

Recently, there have been growing concerns about the increasing number of violent incidents in Indonesia. Besides the shocking statistical data presented by the International Research Center for Women (ICRW) (2015), Statistics Indonesia (Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia) (2015) also indicate that different types of criminality related to violence such as persecution, coercion, fighting, vandalism or rape occur every minute. Violence could be caused by a variety of complex factors such as family problems, peer influence, poverty or social inequality, and given this range, violence is difficult to erase. Thus, people should be aware of how to prevent recurring violent incidents as well as how to handle them properly.

A comprehensive study of moral curriculum reform in Indonesia has been previously conducted (see Qoyyimah, 2016). This study revealed that the Indonesian government has attempted to prevent violence by introducing the Character Education curriculum in 2013. This national curriculum requires teachers to integrate 18 values in their teaching activities. Also, this curriculum requires teachers to assess students' cognitive and moral development. Such assessments could make students think about the importance of ethical behavior and conduct. Besides, the Ministry of Education and Culture's (MOEC) policy in terms of Permendikbud RI No. 82 /2015 has been issued concerning acts of violence in Indonesian schools. This regulation supports the Law No. 23 of 2002 and the Act No. 20 of 2003 regarding the protection of Indonesian children and the purposes of the national education system (Kemendiknas, 2003). Through Permendikbud RI No. 82/2015, the government outlines notions of what is meant by violent conduct and instructions on how to prevent violence in schools. The definition of violence outlined in this regulation is as follows: School violence is any planned and conscious aggressive act in schools that endangers victims physically or psychologically, or through a network (online) as it causes fear, trauma, damage to property, injury, disability, and even death (Article 1) (Kemendikbud, 2015).

Article 1 of Permendikbud RI No. 82/2015 states that violence is defined as aggressive conduct that is not limited to physical violence but also includes psychological assaults. Both physical and psychological violence are considered dangerous as they could cause damage, trauma and death. Interestingly, the government also reminds educators of the dangers of cyberbullying for school children. This policy helps educators at school level to grasp what is meant by a violent act. In addition to this definition, Article 6 of this regulation also mentions acts of violence such as harassment (bullying and cyberbullying), persecution, extortion, sexual abuse, rape,

hazing and discrimination. Also, a more detailed explanation has been provided for educators. In this regard, the MOEC introduces draft guidance or "pemaparan Permendikbud RI 82/2015" that consists of guidelines on how to implement the policy and how to respond to the types of violence that schools may face (Kemendikbud, 2015). The detailed explanation of physical and psychological violence in the draft guidance is made to help schools and teachers understand different kinds of violence. Such a description is important because the more the teachers understand the types and different forms of violence, the more they are aware of how to anticipate any violent conduct happening in their schools.

Violence in Schools: Terminology and Categories

The term "violence" can be frightening as it is associated with aggressive behavior that can cause injury and damage. Besides violence, the term "bullying" is also used in many works of literature to describe aggressive behavior (Mulu, 2004; Kauppi & Pörhölä, 2012; Smith, Kwak & Toda, 2016), and therefore, both terms are used interchangeably to refer to aggressive behavior in schools. While Kauppi and Pörhölä (2012) suggested that bullying and violence are the same things, Smith et al., (2016) considered bullying as one type of violence. This paper also considers the terms bullying and violence as the same. However, it uses the term violence more often to describe any aggressive behavior, including bullying.

Additionally, different theorists classify types of violence differently. Benbenishty and Astor (2005), for example, categorized violence as verbal violence, physical violence, and sexual violence. Meanwhile, Olweus (1978) classified violence as physical violence, verbal violence, and psychological violence. Despite these different classifications, most theorists agree that violence is generally classified into two categories: physical violence and non-physical violence (Botvin, Griffin & Nichols, 2006). Botvin et al. (2006) regarded verbal violence as psychological violence.

The different classifications of violence should not be seen as competing perspectives. Rather, they should be regarded as alternative ways of comprehending different types of violence. The differences also indicate the changing ideas and the developed interest in researching violence in schools. Following Botvin et al. (2006), this paper classified violent conduct into two categories: physical and psychological violence. Now each category will be elaborated.

A. Physical violence

Physical violence is defined as the intentional use of physical force with the potential for causing disability, injury, or death (Olsen, Parra & Bennett, 2010). It is committed by a person with the intention of hurting other(s). Acts of physical violence can be in the form of throwing objects at the victim as well as kicking, pushing, strangling, and physically hurting any person in an attempt to bring about a feeling of fright, trauma, anxiety, submission or damage to the victim (Stöckl, March, Pallitto & Garcia-Moreno, 2014). Physical violence is usually carried out by people who are physically stronger and more powerful. Thus, the victim is unable to retaliate because she/he worries that something could endanger him/her.

Unfortunately, it is somehow challenging for teachers to detect early signs of violence in schools. To identify a problem in the first place, for example, whether a school boy's behavior is violent or non-violent, is difficult because physical actions such as pushing or throwing things at others are prevalent among teenagers, especially when they are playing or interacting with their peer group. Hence, teachers are less likely to intervene or stop such behavior during this phase. Also, teachers are not trained to manage conflict emerging in a classroom during their pre-service teacher education (DeOrnellas & Spurgin, 2017). As a result, teachers tend to pass on any problematic students to the school's psychologist or consultant.

In many cases, physical violence in schools is harmful and threatens lives (Bingham, 2009; Deveci, Acik & Ayar, 2008). Bingham (2009) stated that "even minor physical violence" (p. 12) can be so frightening and humiliating that around 6 per cent of high school students in the US said they had missed school due to their fear of physical violence. It is also important to note that physical violence is not limited to actions that victimize a person. Swaim and Kelly (2008) argued that one's expression of anger toward objects such as damaging school property, vandalism and shoplifting can be regarded as physical violence. Despite non-human victimization, this action is detrimental to the school, frightening and can threaten people in the surrounding area. More importantly, damaging any public facilities is associated with criminal conduct. Therefore, the perpetrators of physical violence can be thrown into jail.

B. Psychological violence

Psychological violence is regarded as non-physical violence as it does not necessarily involve physical interaction. It is defined as "mental harassment or other acts that seek to leave the victim in a state of intimidation, worry, anxiety, or fear" (Nieves-Rosa, Carballo-Dieguez & Dolezal, 2000). De Olarte and Llosa (1999) suggest that psychological violence includes "any action or omission intended to produce psychological damage or emotional pain to another person, including emotional anxiety, insecurity, disability, despair, guilt, frustration or failure, fear, humiliation, lack of freedom or independence."

Some literature suggests that psychological violence is identical to verbal violence (Litrownik, Newton, Hunter, English & Everson, 2003; Sharpe & Taylor, 1999). However, some others consider verbal violence as one type of an act of psychological violence (Avakame, 1998; Khalil, 2009). Khalil (2009) states that psychological violence includes behaviors such as bullying, verbal abuse, marginalization, gossiping, public humiliation, and all forms of non-physical behaviors that result in emotional discomfort for another person. Likewise, Avakame (1998) suggests that besides verbal aggression, psychological violence includes a "non-verbal act that symbolically hurts or threatens to hurt another person."

Hence, acts of psychological violence are not limited to verbal aggression but can also take the forms of exclusion and neglect, for example ignoring one's presence, laughing to the detriment of someone else, and calling someone a bad name (Boulton & Hawker, 1997). More specifically, Botvin et al. (2006) list different acts of such violence that were reported by respondents in their study: name calling, yelling, cursing, telling someone off, saying mean things, or threatening to hurt someone.

It was evident in many cases that psychological violence does not directly hurt a person physically. Also, we might think that psychological violence is less dangerous than physical violence. However, the harm that is caused by psychological violence could be as dangerous as that of physical violence. Previous studies have indicated that psychological violence can cause mental illness, trauma, and depression (Botvin et al., 2006; Boulton & Hawker, 1997; Khalil, 2009). Further, it can endanger the physical health of the victim and can even lead to death and suicide. In 2010, for example, Sladjana Vidovic, a teenager in Ohio, committed suicide because her classmates mocked her for her non-English name. Her friends called her "slutty Jana." The word "slutty" means prostitute.

Different from physical violence, the psychological aggressor is less likely to be sanctioned by law because psychological violence leaves "invisible" injuries. More importantly, the harm of psychological violence is difficult to detect. However, learning from Sladjana's case, psychological violence is so dangerous and deadly that we should not undermine its adverse effects. Hence, efforts should be made to prevent any violence, including psychological abuse. Learning from theorists and the Permendikbud RI No. 82/2015 policy, this current study suggests that in addition to verbal violence, psychological violence might involve non-verbal violence, such as discrimination, gossiping, persecution, and neglect. These violent conducts do not necessarily involve any physical action or verbal abuse. Considering the characteristics of this type of violence, this study proposes these violent conducts as non-verbal-psychological violence to avoid confusion with other types of violence.

Why Teachers' Understanding is Pivotal

Due to its harmful effects, psychological violence that includes verbal and non-verbal psychological violence should be a concern for educators in schools. In this case, it is so important to increase teachers' awareness so that they can detect early signs of violence, and therefore prevent it. On the other hand, when teachers are less aware of actions associated with psychological violence and its harmful effects, they are more likely to ignore any psychological violent conduct. Such ignorance will lead to the presence of violent acts in school. Furthermore, the teachers themselves can unintentionally even be the perpetrators of psychological violence (verbal or non-verbal violence) when they have a low awareness and understanding of behavior associated with psychological violence.

Hence, teachers' responses and interventions regarding violent behavior are paramount for establishing a safe climate in a school. Mishna, Scarcello, Pepler, and Wiener (2005) argue that teachers' interventions are considered as a key factor in the prevention of violence. Teachers' awareness of the danger of psychological violence needs to be prioritized. Unfortunately, teachers' responses and interventions on violence are not inevitable, but they happen only if the teachers understand what comprises violence. The term "understand" in this study is used to mean teachers' comprehension and perception of the meaning of violence. Such understanding implies teachers' capability to define and identify behavior constituting violence and different categories of violence. Campbell, Whiteford, and Hooijer (2018) suggest that teachers'

understanding of different categories of violence is crucial to intervention efforts, as their recognition of violence impacts on the likelihood of them intervening.

In a similar vein, Novick and Isaacs (2010) state that it is critical in most school-based programs to facilitate the understanding of bullying among all members of the community so that "bystanders," be they peers or adults, can play a role in decreasing the frequency and intensity of bullying.

According to Novick and Isaacs (2010), all the school community, including teachers, need to be given support to develop their understanding of violence or bullying. Such knowledge is pivotal in the prevention of violence since teachers would have more confidence to intervene whenever they witness violence. This quote also implies that if one has a minimal understanding of what comprises violence, she/he tends to remain as an ignorant bystander who allows any violent conduct happen. Likewise, Bradshaw, Waasdorp, O'Brennan, and Gulemetova (2013) and Swearer, Espelage, Vaillancourt, and Hymel (2010) highlight that teachers' abilities to identify behavior associated with violence will in turn inform the way in which they intervene in a critical bullying situation, and more importantly, their willingness to decrease violence in schools. These theorists agree that teachers' understanding of factors that contribute to violence and behavior associated with violence would help them to prevent violence in their schools.

Therefore, this paper aims to examine teachers' understanding of school violence and different types of violence, including their awareness of the dangers of physical and psychological violence. The findings of this research will give an insight to how the Indonesian government should help school teachers to implement the violence-free school climate policy.

Research Design and Method

It is important to note that this study is not meant to blame teachers for their limitations in not understanding different types of school violence. Instead, this study mainly aims to understand how the Permendikbud No.82/2015 has informed the role of teachers in intervening in violent activities in Indonesian schools. For this purpose, a suitable approach for collecting data was prioritized.

This study is designed as qualitative research to understand how the policy helps teachers to develop knowledge regarding different types of violence. It presents reports from four teacher participants who were working in two different secondary schools in Medan. Despite several other schools being nominated, the two schools were selected since the principals gave positive responses to this study's proposal. These four teachers were selected based on purposive sampling. In this case, the process of selecting the teacher participants was based on specific criteria. The criteria include teaching experience, role and the subject they teach. To meet the first criteria, teachers selected for this study should be those who have more than 15 years teaching experience in schools. This criterion enables researchers to explore the professional learning opportunities the teachers attended and their experience in handling students. In terms of role, all teachers in this study should be homeroom teachers or "wali kelas" because

homeroom teachers are supposed to have more time to supervise students. Lastly, this study did not involve teachers of Religion and Citizenship but focused on "general" and non-morally laden subjects such as Math, English and Bahasa Indonesia. Teachers who agreed were then required to sign a consent form for consideration to join in this study. To maintain ethical conduct, all participants' names and the schools in which they work were presented anonymously: Teacher A, Teacher B, Teacher C, and Teacher D.

As it deals with a small number of participants, this study is not necessarily used to generalize all teachers in Indonesia. The small number of participants enables researchers to conduct in-depth interviews to understand teachers' experience as regards the violence-free climate policy. Such a study is critical to examine how the violence-free school climate policy was implemented and recognized by educators in schools that are a long way from the headquarters of the MOEC, in which the educational policy related to school violence was issued.

Semi-structured interview questions were prepared for collecting the data. The interview explores teachers' understanding and beliefs regarding different types of violence, the violence-free school climate policy and how to anticipate the emergence of violence in schools. The interview data were then analyzed deductively based on the themes derived from theories regarding school violence by using NVivo. The themes include a violence-free school climate, types of violence, physical and psychological violence, non-physical and non-verbal violence, teachers' intervention, and the dangers of psychological violence.

To support the validation of the study, data triangulation is provided. In this regard, researchers also analyzed documents such as teachers' lesson plans and school documents including any document representing the schools' anti-violence programs. The document analysis aims to record whether teachers' lesson plans and school documents reflect the educators' awareness of different types of violence. More importantly, the document analysis was useful to assess the extent to which the schools have addressed the anti-violence policy.

Data Analysis

This section consists of data that were collected from the interviews with teachers. Teachers' accounts regarding their understanding of violence are presented first. Following this are their responses as regards the Permendikbud RI No. 82/2015. Then their expectations as regards policymakers are also presented.

When asked about their understanding of school violence, teachers reported different perceptions. Teacher A explains as follows:

Researcher: Tell me what you think about violence in school?

Teacher A: Ummm … school violence is aggressive behavior that is conducted by pupils. I reckon there is much fighting between gangs out there. I know the fighting comes mostly from television and social media like Facebook. However, I have never seen any violent behavior here (in his school) because gangs are not allowed in this school. We are actively ensuring that gangs will not exist in this school.

Teacher A conceptualized violence as something associated with physically aggressive behavior. He did not report any other different types of violence such as verbal and other psychological violence. He also indicated that violent conduct is not evident in this school. According to him, such a violence-free environment was caused purely by the practical approach the school has implemented in preventing violence.

Likewise, Teacher B's account below shows a limited understanding of violence. This teacher described violence as a physical offense.

Researcher: would you please name the different types of violence that may occur in school?
Teacher B: Maybe physically, I mean physical offense. Such offense is caused by inappropriate words said by the victim in advance. These might be in the form of comments uploaded on social media, like Facebook. There are various kinds of inappropriate words that may cause physical offense.

According to Teacher B, physical violence is the only violent behavior that might occur in schools. Besides, she also mentioned verbal aggression in terms of "inappropriate words" in the excerpt. However, she claimed that verbal aggression is merely the cause of violence rather than an act of violence. According to her, verbal aggressions, including cyberbullying, lead to violent conduct.
Different to Teacher B, who considered verbal abuse as one factor preceding violence, Teacher C suggested verbal aggression as violence. She described different types of violence:

Teacher C: In my opinion, violence is not limited to physical, but also mental. Violence usually occurs when students fight with others. There is little evidence that violence happens in this school, almost none.
Researcher: You mentioned psychological violence. Can you tell me about that?
Teacher C: Regarding psychological violence, umm… maybe in the form of saying mean things in Facebook comments, maybe like that.

Teacher C's understanding of violence is broader than that of Teacher A and Teacher B. Teacher C argued that there are at least two different types of violence, physical and psychological violence. This teacher extended their explanation that psychological violence includes verbal violence such as "saying mean things." Unfortunately, she did not extend her description to other different types of psychological violent behavior. In this case, this teacher named verbal bullying as the only type of psychological violence.

Also, Teacher D could describe different types of violence.

Teacher D: school violence is mostly conducted by a student to his friend. An example of students' violent conduct is "Malak" or "ngompas." Ngompas can occur because of social class differences. Some students could not afford food because their parents could not give them

enough money. In the meantime, they see their friend can eat a lot. Teenagers still have such sudden obsessions that they ngompas or seized money from their peers.

Researcher: Can you name other violence that might occur in school?

Teacher D: Bullying, for example, when the seniors haze new students, the senior students made the junior students sad or even cry. Or, when students are bullying someone who is having a birthday by tying her/him tightly on the fence, dousing him with flour and eggs …

Teacher D mentioned different actions in terms of violence. He did not name physical or psychological violence but gave examples of violent behavior such as "ngompas" or "malak," hazing, and outrageous jokes. Ngompas is an activity aimed at seizing money from someone else. The bully usually threatens the victims to get what he/she wants. Another violent conduct mentioned by Teacher C is hazing. It is not clear whether the way his students hazed the juniors involved physical action or not. However, in junior secondary schools in Indonesia, such activity does not involve any physical bullying. Learning from Teacher D's excerpts, "ngompas," and outrageous jokes could be categorized as physical violence since these involve aggressive physical behavior.

From the interview data, it can be assumed that teachers' understanding of violence is limited to physical violence. While the government has adopted broader and more comprehensive theories of school violence in its policy, teachers' understanding of violence is undeveloped. Indeed, only one teacher (Teacher A) considered aggressive verbal behavior as violence. Meanwhile, Teacher B's description of verbal violence claimed that verbal aggression was a precursor to violence, not a violent conduct. Unfortunately, no teacher in this study named non-verbal-psychological violent behavior.

In addition, teachers' strategies to anticipate violence are not evident in their lesson plans. The teachers were also not able to provide documents regarding an anti-violence program in terms of the school program. Hence, it can be concluded from this study that teachers' limited understanding of different types of violence might cause them to overlook any violent behavior in their school. Since some teachers considered physical violence as the only type of violence, they (Teacher A and Teacher C) reported that violence did not exist in their schools. In other words, as these teachers have less awareness of different types of violence, they have less ability to identify and therefore less capacity to prevent any violent behavior in their school.

Limitations

As previously stated, this study does not set out to blame teachers for their limited understanding. Instead, it suggests that teachers' limited understanding does not have to be inevitable as there must be prior factors to explain the teachers' naïve thinking. In this sub-section, therefore, the factors affecting this situation are explored to understand the whole picture of how the violence-free school climate policy has been introduced and implemented in Indonesian schools.

The interview scripts below show teachers' experience regarding the government's violence-free school climate policy of Permendikbud RI No.82/2015.

Researcher: Did you know that our government has issued the Permendikbud 82/2015 regarding the violence-free school climate?

Teacher C: umm no idea. I learned only from TV that there was a teacher who was sentenced to jail for slapping his student. It is so scary for me as a teacher. I need to control myself not to commit any physical violence toward my students. Otherwise I will be put in jail.

According to Teacher C, she was not well informed about the policy. What she understood is that teachers need to avoid any aggressive physical behavior like slapping students because teachers no longer have the freedom to carry out a physical punishment in the name of discipline.

Likewise, Teacher A and Teacher D also reported similar responses. They stated that teachers in their schools were not well informed about the violence-free school climate policy that was issued in 2015 (two years prior to interviews).

Researcher: Have you ever received briefings about violence prevention?

Teacher B: No, I have not. Our school principal only reminded teachers to be aware of violence in a meeting. A special briefing regarding violence has never been provided to us. I wish teachers could be briefed so we could understand what to do and what we should not do.

Teacher A: I don't quite understand if there is a violence-free school climate policy. The government should announce the policy openly to the public so that teachers could understand. I think the government should also check if the policy has been implemented in schools or not. Then guidance to campaign against violence needs to be given to teachers.

The excerpts from the two teachers indicate that despite the introduction of the violence-free policy in 2015, teachers are not well informed about the policy. They have never been briefed and trained to implement the policy and to prevent any violent behavior in their schools. These teachers expected that the government would widely publish the policy so that teachers would learn from the policy and they could develop their understanding of school violence.

Discussion

Despite the introduction of the 2015 violence-free school climate policy and the fast development of theories on different types of violence in schools, teachers who participated in this study could not explain their understanding of different categories of violence. Most of the teachers in this study perceived that violence is purely physically aggressive behavior that victimizes other individuals such as fighting, seizing money, slapping and bullying. Even then, the teacher participants did not describe anything more about violent conduct that harms non-human objects like vandalism and damaging property.

Similarly, these teachers are also less aware of different types of psychological violence. Learning from the works of literature and the Permendikbud RI No. 82/2015, psychological violence is not limited to verbal abuse, but it can also be in the form of non-verbal psychological

violence. Aggressive conduct that is categorized as non-verbal psychological violence include neglect, marginalization, discrimination, gossiping, and persecution. Unfortunately, in the data analysis, we hardly found any teachers who could name such aggressive conduct in the interviews.

This study also implies that teachers' limited understanding of violence will restrict their awareness of such violence that might occur in their school. Despite invisible damage, non-verbal-psychological violence has long-term adverse effects on the future life of students. The lack of teachers' awareness of this type of violence might in fact cause violence to occur in schools without any intention on the part of the teachers. Neglect and gossiping, for example, are mostly apparent among teenagers. As teachers did not recognize neglect and gossiping as violent behaviors, they are more likely to ignore opportunities to intervene when such activities occur within their schools.

Such limited understanding affects teachers' experience regarding school violence. As a consequence, the teachers who participated in this study believed that violence has never happened in their school. Theoretically, as teachers are not aware of different types of violence, they would not have any preconceived notion of how to anticipate any non-physical violence.

Last but not least, this study indicates that teachers' limited understanding of violence is mainly caused by the limited professional learning they received regarding the anti-violence policy. From the teachers' accounts, they had not been briefed about how to enact the Permendikbud RI No. 82/2015 in their schools. In this case, there was no systematic approach given by the Educational Boards to train teachers anticipating violent conduct in their schools. They know a little about the anti-violence school climate policy from mass media like television, after terrible events happened in other schools. Hence, teachers in this study wanted the government to announce the violence-free school climate policy so that all teachers would understand what they should do to anticipate and prevent violence in schools. The government initiative to assist teachers to implement the policy is pivotal for enhancing teachers' professionalism (Qoyyimah, 2018) in preventing school violence.

Conclusion

This paper contributes to the development of knowledge regarding the different types of violence outlined in the related works of literature. Learning from the literature review in this study, it can be concluded that the growing concerns over school violence have informed the Indonesian government in terms of Permendikbud RI No. 82/2015. This policy outlined many different types of violence such as physical violence and psychological violence, including verbal and non-verbal psychological violence. This paper also highlights non-verbal psychological violence such as discrimination and marginalization. Unfortunately, the policy has not been implemented well in Indonesian schools since this study found that teachers were not informed about the policy. This study suggests that the government, as well as school principals, need to actively introduce the policy to teachers in order to ensure its effectiveness.

References

Avakame, E. F. (1998). Intergenerational transmission of violence and psychological aggression against wives. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement, 30*(3), 193-202.

Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia. (2015). *Statistik Kriminal 2015*. Retrieved from https://www.bps.go.id/publication/download.html?nrbvfeve=NDM2NTVmZmYwN2QyMzUxZjIyMjU1Mzcx&xzmn=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuYnBzLmdvLmlkL3B1YmxpY2F0aW9uLzIwMTUvMTIvMTUvNDM2NTVmZmYwN2QyMzUxZjIyMjU1MzcxL3N0YXRpc3Rpay1rcmltaW5hbC0yMDE1Lmh0bWw%3D&twoadfnoarfeauf=MjAxOS0wNy0zMCAxNDo1ODo1NA%3D%3D

Benbenishty, R., & Astor, R. A. (2005). *School violence in context: Culture, neighborhood, family, school, and gender*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bingham, J. (2009). *Taking action against bullying*. New York: The Rosen Publishing Group.

Botvin, G. J., Griffin, K. W., & Nichols, T. D. (2006). Preventing youth violence and delinquency through a universal school-based prevention approach. *Prevention Science, 7*(4), 403-408.

Boulton, M. J., & Hawker, D. S. (1997). Non-physical forms of bullying among school pupils: A cause for concern. *Health Education, 97*(2), 61-64.

Bradshaw, C. P., Waasdorp, T. E., O'Brennan, L. M., & Gulemetova, M. (2013). Teachers' and education support professionals' perspectives on bullying and prevention: Findings from a national education association study. *School psychology review, 42*(3), 280-297

Campbell, M., Whiteford, C., & Hooijer, J. (2018). Teachers' and parents' understanding of traditional and cyberbullying. *Journal of School Violence, 18*(3), 388-402.

Carney, A. G., & Merrell, K. W. (2001). Bullying in schools: Perspectives on understanding and preventing an international problem. *School Psychology International, 22*(3), 364-382.

De Olarte, G. & Llosa, G. (1999). *Does Poverty Cause Domestic Violence: Some Answers from Lima. Too Close to Home: Violence in the Americas*. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank.

DeOrnellas, K. & Spurgin, A. (2017). *Teachers' perspectives on bullying. In Bullying in School*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Deveci, S. E., Acik, Y., & Ayar, A. (2008). A survey of rate of victimization and attitudes towards physical violence among school-aged children in Turkey. *Child: care, health and development, 34*(1), 25-31.

International Center for Research on Women. (2015). *84 Persen anak Indonesia alami kekerasan di sekolah*. Retrieved from http://edupost.id/berita-pendidikan

Kauppi, T. & Pörhölä, M. (2012). Teachers bullied by students: Forms of bullying and perpetrator characteristics. *Violence and Victims*, *27*(3), 396-413.

Kemendikbud. (2015). *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia*. Retrieved from http://simpuh.kemenag.go.id/regulasi/permendikbud_82_15.pdf

Kemendiknas. (2003). *Act of the Republic Indonesia on National Education System*. 20.

Khalil, D. (2009). Levels of violence among nurses in Cape Town public hospitals. In *Nursing Forum, 44*(3), 207-217. Malden, USA: Blackwell Publishing Inc.

Litrownik, A. J., Newton, R., Hunter, W. M., English, D., & Everson, M. D. (2003). Exposure to family violence in young at-risk children: A longitudinal look at the effects of victimization and witnessed physical and psychological aggression. *Journal of Family Violence, 18*(1), 59-73.

Mishna, F., Scarcello, I., Pepler, D., & Wiener, J. (2005). Teachers' understanding of bullying. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue Canadienne de l'éducation, 225*, 2005, 718-738.

Mulu, Y. E. (2004). *Psycho-educational and family factors that contribute to aggression in schools*. Leipziger Universitätsverlag.

Nieves-Rosa, L. E., Carballo-Dieguez, A., & Dolezal, C. (2000). Domestic abuse and HIV-risk behavior in Latin American men who have sex with men in New York City. *Journal of gay and lesbian social services, 11*(1), 77-90.

Novick, R. M. & Isaacs, J. (2010). Telling is compelling: The impact of student reports of bullying on teacher intervention. *Educational Psychology, 30*(3), 283-296.

Olsen, J. P., Parra, G. R., & Bennett, S. A. (2010). Predicting violence in romantic relationships during adolescence and emerging adulthood: A critical review of the mechanisms by which familial and peer influences operate. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *30*(4), 2010, 411-422.

Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the school: Bullies and whipping boys*. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons.

Qoyyimah, U. (2016). Inculcating character education through EFL teaching in Indonesian state schools. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, *11*(2), 109-126.

Qoyyimah, U. (2018). Policy implementation within the frame of school-based curriculum: a comparison of public school and Islamic private school teachers in East Java, Indonesia. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *48*(4), 571-589.

Roberts, W. B. (2000). The bully as victim. *Proffesional School Counseling*, *4*, 148-156.

Sharpe, D. & Taylor, J. K. (1999). An examination of variables from a social-developmental model to explain physical and psychological dating violence. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne des Sciences du comportement*, *31*(3), 165-175.

Smith, P. K., Kwak, K., & Toda, Y. (2016). *School bullying in different cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smokowski, P. R., & Kopasz, K. H. (2005). Bullying in school: An overview of types, effects, family characteristics, and intervention strategies. *Children & Schools*, *27*(2), 101-110.

Sourander, A., Helstelä, L., Helenius, H., & Piha, J. (2000). Persistence of bullying from childhood to adolescence—a longitudinal 8-year follow-up study. *Child abuse & neglect*, *24*(7), 873-881.

Stöckl, H., March, L., Pallitto, C., & Garcia-Moreno, C. (2014). Intimate partner violence among adolescents and young women: prevalence and associated factors in nine countries: a cross-sectional study. *BMC public health*, *14*(1), 751.

Swaim, R. C., & Kelly, K. (2008). Efficacy of a randomized trial of a community and school-based anti-violence media intervention among small-town middle school youth. *Prevention science*, *9*(3), 202.

Swearer, S. M., Espelage, D. L., Vaillancourt, T., & Hymel, S. (2010). What can be done about school bullying? Linking research to educational practice. *Educational Researcher*, *39*(1), 38-47.