JURNAL LOCUS: Penelitian & Pengabdian
Volume 5 No. 11 November 2026, pp 10598-10613
E-ISSN 2829-7334
DOI: 10.58344/locus.v5i11.6569

The Framing Process of GMNI on The Issue of Sexual Harassment in Higher Education Institutions in Malang City

Muhamad Akbar Hadi Firmansyah*, Sarwititi Sarwoprasodjo, Amiruddin Saleh
Institut Pertanian Bogor, Indonesia
Email : hadifirmansyah@apps.ipb.ac.id*, sarwititi@apps.ipb.ac.id,
amiruddinsa@apps.ipb.ac.id

Keywords:
Framing; GMNI; Sexual Harassment; Student Movement; Higher Education.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license.

Copyright © 2026 by Author. Published by Riviera Publishing

ABSTRACT

Sexual harassment in higher education encompasses not only physical acts but also sexual comments, sexist jokes, sexual objectification, and unequal power relations that may hinder victims from seeking assistance. This study examines how members of the Indonesian National Student Movement (*Gerakan Mahasiswa Nasional Indonesia*, GMNI) frame sexual harassment, formulate strategies to address the issue, and draw on organizational values to justify collective action. This study employed a qualitative approach involving interviews with 12 informants, comprising eight GMNI cadres or organizational administrators, three students outside GMNI, and one GMNI network partner within higher education institutions in Malang City. The data were analyzed using qualitative content analysis and subsequently interpreted through Benford and Snow's diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational framing framework. The findings revealed that GMNI cadres perceived sexual harassment as a form of injustice associated with the normalization of sexist behavior, sexual objectification, unequal power relations, and barriers to reporting and addressing incidents. This framing was linked to cadre education, victim assistance, institutional advocacy, and demands for accountability and enforcement within the organization itself. Marhaenism and Kesarinahan served as shared moral and ideological references for justifying support for victims while evaluating the consistency of cadres' behavior with organizational values. This study elucidates the relationship between injustice framing, ideological legitimacy, and the advocacy orientation of student organizations. However, it does not assess the effectiveness of framing in transforming awareness, behavior, or institutional policies.

INTRODUCTION

Sexual harassment can affect students and other members of higher education institutions. It is not limited to physical acts but may also manifest through sexual comments, catcalling, sexist jokes, and behaviors that sexually objectify individuals (Windasari & Fadila, 2025). Previous research has also highlighted the adverse effects of sexual harassment on victims, including mild cognitive difficulties characterized by a decline in the ability to think, remember, or concentrate. Consequently, although victims may continue attending lectures, they may experience difficulties in their learning processes as a result of their experiences of sexual harassment (Rosiana et al., 2023).

Sexual harassment cannot be viewed solely as an individual problem because many cases are closely associated with broader social and structural factors. Sexual harassment has

been linked to unequal power relations, social stigma, and insufficient awareness of its various forms (Hermawati et al., 2023; Hardt et al., 2023). Furthermore, institutional norms and culture within higher education environments can influence how individuals perceive and understand sexual harassment (Palmieri et al., 2026). Victims may also be reluctant to report incidents because of concerns about social repercussions and unequal power relations (Aguilar & Baek, 2020). Therefore, prevention efforts should extend beyond individual appeals to encompass education, victim support, clear institutional regulations, reliable case-handling mechanisms, and other collective interventions (Attala & Nurhaeni, 2024).

The Indonesian government has also recognized the importance of a coordinated approach to addressing sexual violence. Law No. 12 of 2022 on Sexual Violence Crimes (Republik Indonesia, 2022) provides a legal foundation for the prevention and handling of sexual violence. Specifically, within higher education, Regulation of the Minister of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology No. 55 of 2024 (Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia, 2024) regulates the prevention and handling of violence, encompassing education, awareness campaigns, reporting mechanisms, victim assistance, and the involvement of the campus community. This regulation establishes safety within higher education institutions as a shared responsibility that requires effective institutional governance. Nevertheless, student involvement in prevention efforts does not replace the formal authority or responsibilities of institutions mandated to handle cases of sexual violence.

Student organizations also have opportunities to contribute to prevention and advocacy efforts. Article 77 of Law No. 12 of 2012 on Higher Education (Republik Indonesia, 2012) stipulates that student organizations function to develop students' social sensitivity, critical thinking, and social responsibility. Student involvement is particularly important because supportive attitudes among members of the higher education community toward the rights of sexual harassment victims can contribute to creating a conducive institutional environment for prevention efforts (Fatchiya et al., 2024).

One student organization relevant to this study is the Indonesian National Student Movement (Gerakan Mahasiswa Nasional Indonesia, GMNI). GMNI conducts cadre education programs and discussion forums to introduce and disseminate its ideological values and principles, as demonstrated in previous research examining the transmission of organizational values through GMNI's cadre education processes (Wibowo et al., 2020). Another study identifies Marhaenism as one of the organization's ideological foundations for collective action (Pratama et al., 2022). In the context of sexual harassment, Marhaenism and Kesarinahan warrant further examination because cadres may draw upon these values to justify their support for victims. The selection of GMNI as the research subject does not imply that the organization is more successful than other student organizations. Rather, it provides a case through which to examine how a student movement frames and addresses sexual harassment within higher education institutions.

Previous studies have examined student involvement in addressing sexual harassment. Hasna (2022) explored the role of student movements in developing collective awareness of social problems, while Dewi (2025) highlighted the role of the student press in advocating for survivors of gender-based violence. Bovill and Podpadec (2023) placed greater emphasis on

survivors' experiences and the impact of activism. Meanwhile, Attala and Nurhaeni (2024) emphasized the importance of education, institutional policies, and stakeholder collaboration in preventing sexual harassment within higher education institutions. Although these studies provide valuable insights into social movements, victim support, and institutional responses, discussions of prevention activities and advocacy strategies do not necessarily explain how organizational values are employed to justify collective positions and evaluate the behavior of organizational members.

Framing studies offer an alternative theoretical perspective for understanding these processes. Benford and Snow (2000) explain that social movements construct shared meanings through three core framing tasks: diagnostic framing, which identifies problems and their underlying causes; prognostic framing, which proposes solutions and strategies for addressing these problems; and motivational framing, which provides a rationale for collective action. Chaif and Finneman (2024) employed this approach to analyze feminist movement messages disseminated through social media. Similarly, Lindqvist and Lindgren (2023) demonstrated how social movement communication through social media can connect individual experiences with broader social issues. Furthermore, Polletta and Jasper (2001) emphasized the importance of collective identity in understanding the relationship between organizational membership, shared meanings, and collective action. Framing is therefore closely associated with the communication, ideological values, and collective identity of social movements.

However, the relationship between framing processes and student organizations' ideological foundations in addressing sexual harassment remains insufficiently explored. Existing research on activism has predominantly focused on forms of victim support, awareness campaigns, and advocacy, whereas framing studies have generally examined how social movements construct problems, propose solutions, and mobilize collective action. Exploring the intersection of these perspectives is important for understanding how organizational ideology provides a moral foundation for cadres to support victims while simultaneously serving as a reference for critically evaluating members' attitudes and actions when sexist behavior occurs within the organization itself. Accordingly, the research gap concerns not only the ideological values upheld by GMNI but also how these values are mobilized to frame sexual harassment as a form of injustice and demand internal consistency and organizational accountability.

Based on this research gap, this study aims to analyze the framing processes through which GMNI cadres within higher education institutions in Malang City construct sexual harassment as a form of injustice, identify its underlying causes, formulate strategies for education, victim assistance, and advocacy, and employ Marhaenism and Kesarinahan as moral and ideological references. The analysis draws upon the three core framing tasks proposed by Benford and Snow (2000) while examining the relationship between movement ideology and demands for internal organizational accountability. By integrating collective action framing and organizational ideology, this study seeks to contribute to a deeper understanding of how student organizations construct meanings, legitimize collective action, and evaluate the consistency of their members' behavior in addressing sexual harassment. The scope of this study is limited to the meanings, experiences, and action orientations articulated by informants during interviews rather than establishing whether GMNI's framing processes have effectively

changed student behavior or generated institutional policy changes within higher education institutions.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative approach, using interviews as the primary data source to examine how the Indonesian National Student Movement (Gerakan Mahasiswa Nasional Indonesia, GMNI) framed sexual harassment in higher education institutions. The analytical framework drew on Goffman's framing perspective, as discussed by Persson (2019), and Benford and Snow's (2000) social movement framing framework, which encompasses diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational framing. The study focused on understanding the meanings, perspectives, and action orientations articulated by informants regarding GMNI's efforts to prevent and address sexual harassment in higher education rather than evaluating the effectiveness of its programs.

The study involved 12 informants, comprising eight active GMNI administrators serving during the 2025–2026 term, three students outside GMNI, and one representative from the Institute for Community and Development Studies (Lembaga Pengkajian Kemasyarakatan dan Pembangunan, LPKP) in Malang. Informants were selected through purposive sampling based on their relevance to the research objectives (Campbell et al., 2020; Palinkas et al., 2015). The selection prioritized participants' relevant experiences and perspectives rather than statistical representativeness of the broader student population.

Table 1. Summary of Informants or Interview Sources

Institution	Informant	Origin
GMNI	Bung J	Faculty of Agriculture (FP)
GMNI	Bung P	Faculty of Agriculture (FP)
GMNI	Bung MC	Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Sciences (FPIK)
GMNI	Bung S	Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Sciences (FPIK)
GMNI	Sarinah AN	Faculty of Social and Political Sciences (FISIP)
GMNI	Sarinah AS	Faculty of Social and Political Sciences (FISIP)
GMNI	Sarinah I	Faculty of Social and Political Sciences (FISIP)
GMNI	Bung RS	GMNI Malang Raya
General student	B	Faculty of Social and Political Sciences (FISIP)
General student	DR	Faculty of Law
General student	Y	Faculty of Law
LPKP	Ibu T	LPKP Malang

The units of analysis comprised interview transcript segments reflecting informants' interpretations of sexual harassment, identification of its underlying causes and responsible parties, proposed actions, and motivations for taking action. The analysis distinguished between implemented actions, planned initiatives, and normative proposals to avoid interpreting informants' perspectives as evidence of actual implementation or movement effectiveness.

Data were analyzed using qualitative content analysis following Erlingsson and Brysiewicz (2017). The analytical process involved repeatedly reading the interview transcripts, identifying meaning units, condensing them, assigning codes, and organizing

related codes into categories, subcategories, and themes. Microsoft Excel was used to organize the data and maintain analytical traceability throughout the coding process. The resulting categories and themes were subsequently interpreted using Benford and Snow's (2000) three core framing tasks: diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational framing. This approach ensured that the coding process remained grounded in the interview data, while framing theory provided an analytical framework for interpreting the findings. Table 2 presents the analytical framework used to guide the interpretation.

Table 2. Direction of *Framing* Analysis in the Study

Stage	Definition
Diagnostic framing	Defining the problem that needs to be solved and identifying the causes and the parties responsible.
Prognostic framing	The social movement offers solutions, determines steps, and develops strategies to overcome the problems that have been identified.
Motivational framing	What values, moral reasons, or drives cause the action to be carried out?

As an example of analytical tracing, a statement from Sarinah AS of GMNI FISIP explains that some people do not see speech as part of sexual harassment, because some people consider sexual harassment to occur only when it involves physical contact between perpetrator and victim. A brief explanation is given in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Example of the Reading Flow of One Interview Quotation

Step	Example of interview tracing
Meaning Unit	"*What they do is not sexual harassment because they don't really touch the person. They only talk, you know*" Sarinah AS, GMNI FISIP
Condensed Meaning Unit	Speech is not considered a form of sexual harassment
Analytical code	Verbal harassment is not recognized as harassment
Substantive category	A limited understanding of sexual harassment that rests on physical contact.
Framing tasks	*Diagnostic framing*: GMNI questions the restriction of the meaning of harassment to physical acts only.

To maintain the traceability of the analysis, the data processing was documented in worksheets. The interpretation also considered differences between the views of each informant to deepen understanding rather than generalize their views. The diversity of informants was not automatically treated as formal triangulation. The findings are also limited to the meanings and actions conveyed in the interviews, so this study does not draw conclusions about the success of *framing* in changing student behavior or the effectiveness of its programs.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The discussion here focuses on the situation of GMNI in higher education institutions: how the framing process occurs, how GMNI diagnoses the problem and sees the causal factors of the sexual harassment they encounter, what actions GMNI takes to help prevent sexual harassment, and finally what factors ultimately motivate GMNI cadres to make these prevention efforts. However, it should be emphasized that the phenomenon does not describe the situation of GMNI as a whole in every higher education institution in Indonesia, because

each place has its own dynamics. The following is a more in-depth explanation of the process experienced by GMNI in its efforts to prevent sexual harassment.

Causes of the Sexual Harassment Issue

In diagnostic framing, what matters is not only knowing the forms of sexual harassment, but also understanding why such behavior is considered normal, who contributes to it, and who needs to take responsibility. From the field findings, there are four main interrelated problems based on the informants' explanations; these diagnostic findings are described below.

Differences in Understanding: Verbal Harassment Is Not Always Taken Seriously

The differences can be seen in the way informants assess verbal harassment such as catcalling or other sexual remarks. One general student at FISIP saw and acknowledged that catcalling often occurs, but considered it not too serious, while another statement from a GMNI FISIP administrator said that some students they know assume that sexual comments are not part of sexual harassment because they do not involve direct physical contact. These two explanations show two forms of difference: some acknowledge the behavior but downplay its seriousness, and some do not consider speech as harassment at all.

"There is sexual harassment, but it's not serious, bro, not to the point of incidents like that. It's just that sometimes there's a lot of catcalling at FISIP" (Saudara B, FISIP Student).

"They think what they do is not sexual harassment because they don't really touch the person. It's just talk, you know" (Sarinah AS, GMNI FISIP).

Based on the statements above, the problem is not merely whether or not students know the term sexual harassment. Rather, the contention lies in the limits of behavior considered harmful and how seriously such acts are judged. In this case, GMNI cadres question the view that limits harassment to physical contact, and then place demeaning speech as a problem that also needs to be addressed.

However, the interviews are not sufficient to conclude that this difference in understanding is caused only by a lack of education. Several informants also linked it to social habits and closeness between individuals. Students' views are also not uniform, as some informants recognize verbal harassment. This makes the phenomenon interesting to read; the study by Leigh et al. (2021) also discusses differences in perceptions of sexual harassment among students, where the challenge is not only conveying definitions, but also questioning the habits that make certain actions seem trivial.

Normalization: Jokes Justified by the Environment, Including Among Cadres

The next problem is behavior that continues to be considered normal because it repeatedly occurs in social circles. An informant from GMNI FISIP linked the phenomenon of sexual harassment to an environment that normalizes such acts, and also stated that when the environment allows such behavior, perpetrators feel that their actions are not part of harassment. An informant from GMNI FP added that closeness between friends can make those who experience harassment choose to let it go, whether out of reluctance, embarrassment, or indifference. Thus, the causes of normalization are not only related to personal knowledge, but also to group habits and reluctance to question the behavior of people close to them.

"In my opinion, the simplest answer is that they are in an environment that normalizes their behavior" (Sarinah AN, GMNI FISIP).

"They don't realize that they have actually been harassed, because they are close, so they just let it be" (Bung J, GMNI FP).

Another GMNI FISIP informant also noted that students come from different social backgrounds, including the possibility of bringing habits already considered normal from their previous environments. This is a suspected cause conveyed by the informant, and the suspicion is also based on observations of the behavior of several individuals encountered. The problem of normalization was also acknowledged to arise within GMNI itself: an informant from GMNI FPIK recounted sexual jokes made by several GMNI cadres themselves, and some cadres considered them normal.

"Some of our cadres, I don't know, maybe it's a joke but it leads to harassment, they once commented on someone's body, saying something like your butt is small. Actually it's a joke, but it counts as harassment" (Bung MC, GMNI FPIK).

The confession above shows a gap between the values being fought for and the behavior of some cadres. Therefore, what needs to be questioned is not only perpetrators outside the organization, but also internal habits that give room for sexist jokes. This reading is in line with the study by Palmieri et al. (2026) on the influence of norms and humor on the formation of habits in social circles, and the study by Duffy et al. (2023), which shows the possible gap between organizational values and practice.

Objectification and Power Relations: Ways of Viewing Women and Unequal Positions

GMNI cadres also linked harassment to a view that demeans women. A GMNI FPIK informant explained that the view that places women lower can lead to objectification. In his view, harassment occurs when the victim is no longer respected as a human being but is treated as an object to satisfy the perpetrator's desires. Thus, the cause emphasized by the cadres is not merely impolite behavior, but the way perpetrators assess the rights and position of others.

"Sometimes the perpetrator no longer sees the victim as a human being, but only as an object of lust" (Bung S, GMNI FPIK).

In broader social relations, cadres highlighted the position of victims, which is not always equal to that of perpetrators. The informant from LPKP Malang linked this problem to power relations between students and lecturers, as well as gender relations. She also pointed out the possibility that a perpetrator's closeness to decision-makers could influence the handling of a case. Ibu T's explanation needs to be understood as an assessment based on the experiences she recounted, not as evidence that all cases in the higher education institutions studied have the same pattern.

"There are various causal factors, unequal power relations between students and lecturers, and also gender relations... Sometimes when the perpetrator is close to decision-makers or those in power, the cases are closed" (Ibu T, LPKP Malang).

Thus, this phase does not stop at the personal responsibility of the perpetrator. The environment is also questioned when it justifies objectification, while the authorized institutions are expected to ensure that a person's position and closeness do not hinder handling. Ali (2026) discusses how campus policies can be insensitive to power imbalances because policymakers cannot properly understand the situation at the grassroots, while Duffy et al. (2023) examine the experiences of victims when institutions do not provide proper support, which greatly complicates the victims' condition.

Victims Are Reluctant to Report and Handling Is Questioned: Fear and Uncertainty of Protection

Informant Bung MC explained that victims may be confused after experiencing harassment and not know whom to tell. He also mentioned concerns that a report would become known to the family, create social stigma, or disrupt their studies, especially if the perpetrator is close to influential parties. Based on this account, low disclosure does not mean that victims accept the act; rather, victims may weigh the risks they think will arise after speaking out.

"Most victims don't know; first, when they are harassed they must be blank, blank, not knowing who to talk to... Sometimes the victim is afraid, they don't want to report because they fear that, for example, it will reach their parents, that the perpetrator is close to stakeholders in the bureaucracy, that their studies will be threatened, or social stigma" (Bung MC, GMNI FPIK).

The next problem is confidence in case handling. A GMNI FP administrator criticized resolutions that, in his experience, sometimes end at a meeting or mediation between the perpetrator and the victim. The explanation from LPKP Malang also emphasized that if cases are not properly enforced, perpetrators can repeat their actions. Thus, barriers to disclosure and problems of handling are related, but they are not the same problem. The first concerns the victim's sense of safety and access to speak out, while the second concerns follow-up and the responsibility of the parties handling the case.

"It is often just resolved by mediation, the perpetrator meets the victim, okay you two are fine now, done. Because the campus still feels that if this story or news is blown up, it is the campus's name that looks bad" (Bung J, GMNI FP).

Ibu T also reminded that a large number of reports does not necessarily mean that conditions in a higher education institution are worse, especially if the reports are handled well. This view means that assessing the problem of sexual harassment cannot be based only on the number of reports. Aguilar and Baek (2020) explain that harassment in the academic environment can indeed go unreported due to many factors.

Choices of Action to Address the Problem

After explaining the problem and its causes, GMNI cadres put forward several steps considered necessary. These choices relate to the previous diagnosis, such as education and reprimands to challenge normalization, assistance to address victims' fears, advocacy to question institutional responses, and internal firmness to maintain organizational consistency. In discussing them, the actions reported as having been carried out need to be distinguished from plans, possible assistance, and principles stated by the informants.

Cadre Education, Raising the Issue, and Reprimands or Warnings against Sexist Jokes

To respond to the assumption that sexual comments are merely jokes, GMNI cadres position organizational education as a space to discuss the limits of behavior that is acceptable and unacceptable. A GMNI FPIK administrator stated that the Kesarinahan material that cadres receive in basic cadre training (Kaderisasi Tingkat Dasar, KTD), studies, and regular formal or informal discussions is considered part of cadre education. These forums can be understood as the organization's way of offering the perspective that harassment is not limited to physical contact, in accordance with GMNI's own values.

"We firmly reject it, strongly reject it, especially a GMNI cadre who receives Kesarinahan material, at KTD they get Kesarinahan, not to mention studies, not to mention informal discussions" (Bung S, GMNI FPIK).

Outside the education forums, Sarinah AN of GMNI FISIP also recounted direct reprimands when someone made indecent comments about women. These reprimands are actions reported by the informant, while raising the issue in several faculties shows efforts to convey prevention messages. However, the interviews do not explain how widely these messages are received by students outside the organization.

"If, for example, they do anything, make indecent comments about women, we just reprimand them directly, that happens often." (Sarinah AN, GMNI FISIP).

In Vemuri's (2018) discussion, confrontational action in activism needs to be read together with care for survivors. This comparison helps explain that reprimands can be a way of challenging sexist norms, but are not necessarily a safe form of communication for every victim. Moreover, the acknowledgment of sexist jokes within GMNI shows that organizational education has not automatically eliminated such behavior. Thus, education and reprimands are best understood as ways conveyed and reported by cadres to deal with the problem, not as evidence that normalization has ended.

Victim Assistance, Moral Support, and Access to Help

Victims' fear of reporting, confusion about where to talk, and concerns about power relations also encourage cadres to offer assistance. A GMNI FPIK administrator described assistance as a way of helping victims so that they do not face their problems alone and know the help options available.

"Our role as a student movement is to go there to provide assistance, so that they don't get stuck on their own and know where to go" (Bung MC, GMNI FPIK).

"We also facilitate friends if anyone has difficulty doing advocacy or anything else, we accommodate them" (Bung P, GMNI FP).

Several accounts mention that some cadres act as peer counselors and that victims may possibly be connected with legal aid institutions. These two things do not have the same evidentiary status, because the existence of peer counselors is a practice claimed in the interviews, while referral to legal institutions is still mentioned as an option that may be taken. Other cadres also reminded that handling cannot be borne by the student organization alone, because the involvement of the higher education institution and authorized institutions is still needed.

Bovill and Podpadec (2023) invite readers to view student activism also from the experience of survivors, not only from the good intentions of the activists. This is important because the interviews in this study have not explained the cases assisted in detail, the flow of assistance provided, or the victims' assessment after receiving assistance. Thus, what the findings can explain is the existence of an orientation toward initial support and linkage to authorized services, not the effectiveness of the assistance or the safety of its services.

Thus, the solutions framed by GMNI include initial support, assistance, and linkage to authorized institutions, not replacing official handling processes. The data have not detailed the cases assisted, the procedures, or the experiences of survivors after receiving help. This is important because Bovill and Podpadec (2023) highlight the impact of student activism from

the survivors' side, and also expect help to come from within the campus itself, whether from institutions or other student assistance bodies.

Policy Advocacy and Demands for Strengthening Campus Services

The problem does not stop at individual behavior. Power relations and doubts about case follow-up make cadres also question the responsibility of the campus. A GMNI FISIP administrator recounted that she once asked about the follow-up of faculty regulations on sexual harassment, and according to her account, the answers received mostly referred to existing regulations and bodies that had already been formed, even though the informant explained that there was confirmation from the institution regarding the strengthening of regulations and bodies formed for this issue. This was part of the policy brief and audience conducted by GMNI for case advocacy.

"At that time I happened to ask a question regarding the follow-up of the Dean's regulation on the issue of sexual harassment... We made a policy brief, through the Dean's regulation, then we held an audience" Sarinah AS, GMNI FISIP.

This account shows the direction of advocacy, from questioning the follow-up of regulations to encouraging responses from the faculty. However, the data do not detail the contents of the policy brief, the time and participants of the audience, or the decisions produced. Therefore, these steps can be called advocacy efforts recounted by the informant, but they are not sufficient to conclude that GMNI has succeeded in changing policy.

The view from LPKP also helps clarify why advocacy is considered important. In her view, education and public awareness need to be accompanied by a legal umbrella, institutional support, facilities, and networks. The discussions of Attala and Nurhaeni (2024) and Dufour (2024) can be used to question whether policies and services actually work, not merely whether they have been established. In this context, these demands appear from the perspectives of the cadres and partners presented.

"It is not enough with education and public awareness alone, but it must also be followed by a strong legal umbrella, institutions, facilities and infrastructure, and networks" Ibu T, LPKP Malang.

Firmness against Violations within GMNI Itself

There is an explanation that sexist jokes also occur among cadres, so preventive action also needs to be directed toward the organization itself. A GMNI FISIP administrator recounted that there was once a cadre suspected of committing harassment, who, according to her account, was investigated and expelled from the organization. Meanwhile, an explanation from a GMNI FPIK administrator emphasized that closeness to fellow cadres must not be used as a reason to protect perpetrators.

"There was a perpetrator from among the cadres themselves, but they were immediately investigated and immediately expelled" Sarinah AN, GMNI FISIP.

"Don't protect the perpetrator just because they are a cadre, an administrator, or someone close to GMNI, you know, whatever happens our standing position is to stay with the victim" Bung MC, GMNI FPIK.

These two statements need to be read with different evidentiary status. Sarinah AN's story is a report of one incident of internal enforcement, while Bung MC's statement mainly shows the principle of partisanship that they wish to uphold. Without procedural documents or

other information about the handling of existing cases, this study cannot ascertain the stages of examination or state that all violations have been consistently acted upon. Nevertheless, both show that the solutions offered not only demand responsibility from higher education institutions or external parties, but also test GMNI's consistency toward the behavior of its own members.

Moral Reasons and Demands for Movement Consistency

At the next stage, the discussion no longer only explains the problem or the choices of resolution, but the reasons why cadres feel the need to take a stand. The interviews show siding with victims, responsibility, the values of struggle, and the rejection of harassment as the reasons put forward. However, the stated reasons do not necessarily show that all cadres have taken action or that GMNI's messages are widely accepted by students.

Siding with Victims as a Shared Responsibility

When harassment is considered a joke, while victims are afraid to speak or hesitant to seek help, a number of cadres see siding with victims as a reason not to remain silent. Bung J of GMNI FP, for example, emphasized that support for female cadres who take action on this issue is not only a women's matter, but the responsibility of all members.

"When we have a Sarinah who wants to move and is progressive, we help, and it is not only the responsibility of that Sarinah, but becomes a shared responsibility" Bung J, GMNI FP.

The earliest goal to be achieved from this prevention movement is when students already understand what appropriate action looks like; for example, when they see harassment in front of their eyes, they know what to do, or when someone experiences harassment, they already know where to report. This is explained in the statement below.

The statement shows how responsibility that could initially be placed on victims or female cadres is positioned as a shared matter. This direction also appears in other affirmations, for example from GMNI FPIK, which explained that the organization must be on the side of the victim, including when the perpetrator is close to GMNI. The reason for acting is thus not merely pity, but a rejection of the situation that makes victims bear their problems alone. GMNI administrators from other faculties also hope that the organization's activities will build awareness so that students know what to do when they encounter sexual harassment.

Marhaenism and Kesarinahan Are Not the Only Sources of Motivation

The values of Marhaenism and Kesarinahan are used by cadres as moral reasons to reject oppression and defend those who are disadvantaged. Sarinah AN of GMNI FISIP described GMNI as an organization of struggle that sides with oppressed groups. However, the relationship between ideology and motivation cannot be considered simple. Bung S of GMNI FPIK admitted that he rejected sexual harassment before getting to know the concept of Kesarinahan.

"But in my case, before I knew the concept of Sarinah, I already really hated these cases" Bung S, GMNI FPIK.

This statement shows that ideological education cannot be considered the only source of rejection for every cadre. In this case, organizational values are more appropriately understood as a shared moral reference that can clarify and connect personal attitudes with the direction of GMNI's struggle. Polletta and Jasper (2001) explain that collective identity is related to the way a group understands its interests and the limits of its actions; this does not

mean that all members have the same initial experiences and motivations. Therefore, this study does not conclude that Marhaenism and Kesarinahan directly cause every cadre to take action.

Partisanship Is Tested When Violations Arise within One's Own Environment

The demand for consistency becomes important because informants also acknowledged sexist jokes among GMNI cadres. Bung MC of GMNI FPIK recounted comments about the body that were considered jokes, although in his view they already amounted to harassment. On the other hand, he emphasized that friendship or organizational membership must not be used to defend perpetrators.

"Don't protect the perpetrator just because they are a cadre, an administrator, or someone close to GMNI, you know, whatever happens our standing position is to stay with the victim" Bung MC, GMNI FPIK.

Sarinah AN of GMNI FISIP also recounted a cadre who, according to her account, was investigated and expelled from the organization because of a harassment case. This story shows one enforcement action reported by the informant, while Bung MC's statement from GMNI FPIK shows the principle that they wish to uphold. Both are not sufficient to conclude that all cases have been handled in the same way, especially since the internal procedures have not been examined through other documents. Nevertheless, this finding shows an important tension: the value of anti-oppression is not only a basis for criticizing external parties, but is also used to assess the behavior of GMNI's own members.

Anger at Harassment and Vigilance against the Politicization of the Issue

Phenomena in the field also illustrate that the issue of sexual harassment is often used as a vehicle for certain interests such as politics. Bung S of GMNI FPIK openly expressed this rejection.

"Honestly, I'm actually annoyed, feel annoyed, everyone is annoyed and very angry. I mean, rejecting all efforts like that." Bung S, GMNI FPIK.

"Sometimes when the case is blown up, there are people who use the case of sexual violence as a political tool. A politicized tool, which can become attractive material when perhaps campaigning in certain events" Sarinah AN, GMNI FISIP.

This anger helps explain why the issue of sexual harassment is seen as urgent by the informants. The politicization of the issue as described by the informants above can be interpreted to mean that sexual harassment is often used as a momentum to support personal interests, such as in the contest of student general elections (Pemira) in higher education institutions. The message here is not that the issue may not be voiced through political contestation, but that a sense of responsibility in handling the issue is expected, not merely using the issue for momentary interests.

This warning shows that for the informants, merely voicing the issue is not enough, because the purpose and partisanship behind it also need to be questioned. However, this statement is a critique of the possible politicization of the issue, not evidence that GMNI itself has used cases for political interests. Thus, the moral legitimacy of the movement is related to the ability to safeguard the interests of victims so that they are not overridden by the interests of the organization or other parties.

CONCLUSION

The findings revealed that GMNI cadres framed sexual harassment in higher education as a form of oppression attributable not only to individual behavior but also to broader social conditions and perceptions that normalize harassment. From the cadres' perspectives, several underlying factors contributed to sexual harassment, including differences in the understanding of verbal harassment, the normalization of sexist jokes, the sexual objectification of women, unequal power relations, victims' fear of reporting incidents, and concerns regarding the adequacy of institutional case-handling mechanisms. The informants identified several prevention and response strategies, including cadre education, awareness-raising initiatives through critical discussions and campaigns, direct reprimands of sexist behavior, victim assistance, and advocacy aimed at strengthening institutional accountability within higher education institutions. These efforts also extended to the organization itself through demands for individual accountability and the alignment of cadres' behavior with organizational values.

Furthermore, the cadres' motivations for taking action were associated with concern for victims, a sense of collective responsibility, and opposition to injustice. GMNI's ideological values provided a moral foundation that reinforced solidarity with victims, although these values were not the sole motivation for opposing sexual harassment. These findings demonstrate that GMNI's ideological principles served not only as a framework for criticizing injustices within higher education institutions but also as a standard for evaluating the consistency of its members' behavior with organizational commitments. Accordingly, GMNI's framing process illustrates the interconnectedness of diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational framing in identifying problems, formulating response strategies, and establishing rationales for collective action. However, this study was limited to the experiences and perspectives articulated by the informants and, therefore, could not establish the extent to which the identified efforts had effectively changed student behavior, strengthened victim protection, or influenced institutional policies within higher education.

FUNDING

The authors declare that no financial support was received for the conduct of this research and/or the publication of this article.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that this research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

The authors contributed fully to the formulation of the main ideas, the collection of literature data (*library research*), the analysis and interpretation of the primary texts of figures, and the preparation of the manuscript. All authors have approved the final version of the manuscript.

GENERATIVE AI STATEMENT

The authors declare that generative artificial intelligence (AI) was used in the preparation of this manuscript. The authors acknowledge the use of generative AI to help improve language clarity and refine the grammatical structure of the manuscript. Such use was carried out in compliance with applicable ethical guidelines regarding the use and disclosure of generative AI in scientific research. Each author has made a substantial intellectual contribution to this work. The entire content of the manuscript has been carefully reviewed to ensure its accuracy, and the authors take full responsibility for the integrity and final content of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

Aguilar, S. J., & Baek, C. (2020). Sexual harassment in academe is underreported, especially by students in the life and physical sciences. *PLOS ONE*, *15*(3), e0230312. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0230312

Ali, F. (2026). Sexual violence in higher education: A critical discourse analysis of university policies. *Higher Education Policy*, *39*, 226–243. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-024-00384-x

Attala, D. R., & Nurhaeni, I. D. A. (2024). Sexual violence in higher education institutions: Obstacles and strategies in creating safe and comfortable campuses. *JSW (Jurnal Sosiologi Walisongo)*, *8*(2), 163–180. https://doi.org/10.21580/jsw.2024.8.2.19362

Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *26*, 611–639. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.611

Bovill, H., & Podpadec, T. (2023). What is currently understood about the impact of sexual violence activism for higher education student sexual violence survivors? *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *24*(4), 2227–2242. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380221093691

Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: Complex or simple? Research case examples. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, *25*(8), 652–661. https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206

Chaif, R. H., & Finneman, T. (2024). "#My place isn't in the kitchen": Examining feminist Facebook framing of an Algerian social movement. *Social Media + Society*, *10*(3), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051241274657

Dewi, S. (2025). Student journalism as advocacy for gender-based violence survivors: The case of Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Women's Studies*, *31*(3), 337–351. https://doi.org/10.1080/12259276.2025.2541571

Duffy, S., O'Shea, M., & Tang, L. M. (2023). Sexually harassed, assaulted, silenced, and now heard: Institutional betrayal and its affects. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *30*(4), 1387–1406. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12997

Dufour, G. K. (2024). The insidiousness of institutional betrayal: An ecological systematic review of campus sexual violence response literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *25*(5), 3903–3922. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380241265382

Erlingsson, C., & Brysiewicz, P. (2017). A hands-on guide to doing content analysis. *African Journal of Emergency Medicine*, *7*(3), 93–99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.afjem.2017.08.001

Fatchiya, A., Asriwandari, H., Dalimoenthe, I., Puspita, D. R., Heriberta, & Firmansyah, A. (2024). Analisis perbandingan pengetahuan dan sikap civitas academica terhadap kekerasan seksual: Kasus dua perguruan tinggi. *Jurnal Penyuluhan*, *20*(2), 243–250. https://doi.org/10.25015/20202452978202452978

Hardt, S., Stoeckl, H., Wamoyi, J., & Ranganathan, M. (2023). Sexual harassment in low-and middle-income countries: A qualitative systematic review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *24*(5), 3346–3362.

Hasna, S. (2022). Tindakan kolektif masyarakat jaringan di Indonesia: Aktivisme sosial media pada aksi #GejayanMemanggil. *Interaksi: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, *11*(1), 25–34. https://doi.org/10.14710/interaksi.11.1.25-34

Hermawati, Y., Widiyanto, W., Santoso, E., & Nuryanti, N. (2023). The framework of handling sexual violence in Indonesian universities. *Komunitas: International Journal of Indonesian Society and Culture*, *15*(2), 268–282. https://doi.org/10.15294/komunitas.v15i2.47668

Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia. (2024). *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Nomor 55 Tahun 2024 tentang Pencegahan dan Penanganan Kekerasan di Lingkungan Perguruan Tinggi*. https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/305767

Leigh, S., Thomas, A. G., & Davies, J. (2021). The effects of sex and outcome expectancies on perceptions of sexual harassment. *PLOS ONE*, *16*(12), e0261409. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0261409

Lindqvist, L., & Lindgren, S. (2023). Mapping an emerging hashtag ecosystem: Connective action and interpretive frames in the Swedish #MeToo movement. *Feminist Media Studies*, *23*(8), 4089–4106. https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2022.2149604

Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, *42*(5), 533–544. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y

Palmieri, J., Pilgaard, F., & Agardh, A. (2026). Navigating the unspoken: A qualitative study of employees' perceptions of culture and norms surrounding sexual harassment at a Swedish university. *PLOS ONE*, *21*(6), e0351724. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0351724

Persson, A. (2019). *Framing social interaction: Continuities and cracks in Goffman's frame analysis*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315582931

Polletta, F., & Jasper, J. M. (2001). Collective identity and social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *27*, 283–305. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.27.1.283

Pratama, F. F., Asyiah, A. K., & Chandra, D. (2022). Studi analisis konsep ideologi Marhaenisme Sukarno sebagai asas perjuangan bangsa Indonesia. *Jurnal Kewarganegaraan*, *19*(1), 49–65. https://doi.org/10.24114/jk.v19i1.33301

Republik Indonesia. (2012). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 12 Tahun 2012 tentang Pendidikan Tinggi*. https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/39063

Republik Indonesia. (2022). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 12 Tahun 2022 tentang Tindak Pidana Kekerasan Seksual*. https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/207944

Rosiana, D., Wangi, E. N., & Aslamawati, Y. (2023). Hubungan antara fungsi kognitif dengan penyesuaian perguruan tinggi pada mahasiswa korban kekerasan seksual. *Jurnal Konseling dan Pendidikan*, *11*(3), 203–212. https://doi.org/10.29210/197700

Vemuri, A. (2018). "Calling out" campus sexual violence: Student activist labors of confrontation and care. *Communication, Culture & Critique*, *11*(3), 498–502. https://doi.org/10.1093/ccc/tcy021

Wibowo, A. P., Djuyandi, Y., & Agustino, L. (2020). Peran organisasi Gerakan Mahasiswa Nasional Indonesia dalam mentransformasikan nilai-nilai Pancasila di Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang. *Jurnal Civic Hukum*, *5*(2), 191–204. https://doi.org/10.22219/jch.v5i2.13237

Windasari, N., & Fadila, Z. (2025). Sexual violence among university medical students in Sumatera, Indonesia. *Majalah Kedokteran Bandung*, *57*(1), 36–42. https://doi.org/10.15395/mkb.v57.3834