

**A Dating Style Student**  
(Study of Symbolic Interaction Style Dating Students Graduate Program,  
University of Padjadjaran Bandung)

Sri Wahyuningsih

Communication Department Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities  
University of Trunojoyo Madura

[naningunijoyo@yahoo.com](mailto:naningunijoyo@yahoo.com)/ 081553088855

**ABSTRACT:**

Everyone in a relationship with someone definitely has a unique style of going out on their own. They interact with each other to know each other. This research took place in the campus of the University of Padjadjaran, in order to determine how the student's style of University Padjadjaran is dating or in a relationship each other with the approach of Symbolic Interaction. Then bring out the constructs of observations and the results of in-depth interviews with four informants as a student of S-2 program who again affair. 1) Construct romance style with sub-constructs: romantic love, love possess, love good friends, love pragmatic, altruistic love, and love messing around. 2) Construct Factors associated with love is as follows rewards, gender differences and jealousy. 3) Construct Satisfaction and Commitment. 4) Construct Ending Relationship.

**Keywords:** *Love Style, Symbolic Interaction, Love, Commitment*

## I. Introduction

This paper suggests the dynamics of interaction styles dating or romantic student at University of Padjadjaran. As far as is known by researchers that a human being needs to love each other.

In the Qur'an, Al Hujuraat statement (room-room) verse 13 said " hi human being! Indeed, we created you from a male and a female and made you nations and tribes to know each other. Verily the noblest among you in the sight of God is the most pious among you. Indeed! Allah is Knower, Aware. "

In the letter, we can take understanding, although we created them different exactly at Student University of Padjadjaran in Bandung are very heterogeneous. Besides, they also have other motivations by themselves that will find a partner / companion for the status of "bachelor" or single. As several stages, of which there are a bunch of people (graduate students), to know each other, connected with each other-know, friendship, friendships, dating, and if it does not encounter a bottleneck relationship or breakup will reach the stage of the marital relationship in accordance with the theory of stairs relation in interpersonal communication.

The question that often arises in interpersonal relationships is what love is? Because of love, human beings have a lot of meaning for life, without love it seem insignificant life. Is a like and a love the same? Is a love just a feeling of deep intense or something else entirely from a sense of love?

The most basic difference is between companionate love (the love of friendship) and a passionate or romantic love (love lust). Companionate love is affection we feel toward someone whose relate with our lives. The difference between the sense of love and companionate love is perhaps the depth of our feelings and the degree of our involvement with someone.

While passionate love is something entirely different. Berscheid, et al (in Brigham, 1191) suggests that passionate love is different from liking a few things: First, a sense of love associated very strongly with the reward, passionate love seems pretty much to stimulate fantasy and gift imaginable that might exceed the rewards are actually received; second, while a sense of love and companionate love is usually in the long term, passionate love otherwise fade with time. For the passionate love is growing rapidly at the time was new and there is no certainty than already known and predictable; Third, a sense of love is consistently associated with positive feelings and thoughts but passionate love is almost always associated with emotional conflict, it is possible to love and hate someone at the same time.

Campus life is very heterogeneous, providing motivation for the students interact by verbal and nonverbal with each other. Knowing to knowing through several stages, from they often met among others established a relationship that has meaning is mutual attraction between the different sex.

In campus life, there is the event of interaction is a relationship between one individual with another individual, in which one individual can affect other individuals so that there is a relationship of mutual reciprocity (Ben Walgito, 1990 in Dayakisni, 2003: 127). Social interaction will not be possible if it does not meet the two requirements, namely (1) the existence of social contact, and (2) the existence of communication. Social contact can occur between individuals, between individuals and groups, and between groups with the group. Contacts can also happen to be primary if it occurs directly or face to face, and secondary if that relationship through an intermediary person or other media. While verbal or nonverbal communication is a channel for conveying feelings or ideas / thoughts as well as the media to be able to interpret or understand the thoughts or feelings of others.

Besides that, their main purpose to increase knowledge as for students of pasca sarjana who are still "single" or singles to find a partner / companion that first relationship in stages. From these assumptions, to become to focus of the problem in this research is "how does the student of University Padjadjaran style make a date or in making relationship with each other?"

## **II. Theory/ approach**

This study used a symbolic interactionist conceptual framework to assess the experience of living informants. To borrow a phrase Mulyana (2004: 230), this study can be considered as EMIC studies to examine the cultural meaning of "in," the analysis is idiographic than nomotetik. So the result will not be quantified and be generalizable to all students at the University of Padjadjaran Bandung.

Theory of symbolic interaction in the context of this study could be a referral to explain the process and the dynamics of the interactions that take place between the students of pasca sarjana in a relationship or dating at University of Padjadjaran. People who are in a relationship to assume to be active in communities and interact with the creativity and dynamics. This assumption work together with the task or goal symbolic interaction theory who studied the nature of social interaction is a dynamic activity of man, the nature of the active, reflective, and creative. Human behavior according to the symbolic interaction is determined by a process of interaction that goes on between them.

Basically symbolic interaction theory is a theory that tried to view an activity as a human activity that is typical form of communication by using (exchange) symbol. Social life in view of the symbolic interaction is defined as a human interaction by using symbols, where the symbol is always used by humans to communicate and interact with each other. In interaction with each other are also reflected efforts to define and interpret the actions of the other (Mulyana, 2004: 71).

According to the theory of symbolic interaction, social life is basically a "human interaction by using symbols." They are interested in how humans use symbols that represent

what they mean to communicate with each other, and also the effect that the interpretation of symbols is the behavior of the parties involved in social interaction. Adherents of symbolic interaction sighted, human behavior is basically the product of their interpretation of the world around them, so it does not recognize that the behavior is learned or determined, as espoused theory behaviorist or structural theory. Instead of behavior chosen as the things worth doing based on how individuals define the situation.

Symbolic interaction is based premises as follows:

1. Individuals responding to a symbolic situation. They respond to the environment, including physical objects and social objects (human behavior) based on the meanings contained components of that environment for them.
2. The meaning is a product of social interaction, because the meaning is not inherent in the object but rather negotiated through the use of language.
3. Interpreted meaning that individuals may change from time to time, in line with the changing situation found in social interaction.

The essence of the theory of symbolic interaction is the theory of the 'self' that can also be traced to Charles Horton Cooley self-definition. Mead also like Cooley assumes that self-conception is a process that comes from an individual's social interaction with others.

For Cooley and Mead, the self arises because communication. Without language, self will not develop. Human unique because they have the ability to manipulate symbols based consciousness. Mead stressed the importance of communication, in particular through the mechanism of vocal cues (the language), although the theory of a general nature. Vocal of the potential to be the set of symbols that make up the language, the symbol is a stimulus that contains the meaning and value are studied for humans, and the human response to the symbol is in terms of its value and its value rather than in terms of physical stimulation of the tools senses.

The meaning of a symbol is not the first physical features, but what can people do about the symbol. In other words, as expressed by Shibutani, "meaning first of all the properties and behavior of both the object properties". So all symbolic objects suggest a course of action (plan of action) and that the reason for behaving in a certain way towards an object, among others implied by such objects.

In human interactions, human beings interpret verbal and nonverbal actions. Verbal action is speech, speech, and words that are commonly understood, whereas nonverbal actions refers to all human behavior is significantly apart from the linguistic mechanisms. Excess vocal cues rather than physical cues, such as facial grimace, as a significant gesture that we hear ourselves, as well as others, whereas when we do physical cues, we cannot see what we do. As a result, vocal cues can affect the speaker as it affects the listener. Another result, we are much better able to control the vocal cues rather than physical cues.

According to Mead, only if we have meaningful symbols, we communicate in a real sense. Vocal cues development, particularly in the form of language which is the most important factor that allows the development of a typical human life. A uniquely human ability to perform symbolic communication is possible because humans have the tools that allow them create vocal sounds in large numbers and diverse and also because humans have a nervous system that is capable of storing millions of symbols of meaning and value.

In addition to verbal communication, which is words, phrases, or sentences spoken and heard, communication also involves non-verbal communication that includes gestures, facial expressions, eye contact, posture, and body movement, touch, clothing, artifacts, silent, temporality, and the characteristics of paralinguistic, the importance of non-verbal signs and symbols should not be underestimated in human communication. Number sign or symbol that

serves as a "language" that is not limited. We interpret other people's behavior when they themselves may not noticed it, are like gaze, body posture and facial expressions.

Goffman stated: "although an individual can stop talking, he cannot stop communicating through body idiom, he should say something right or wrong. He cannot say anything. Paradoxically, the way he gives the least information about himself-though it still can be appreciated-is to adjust and act as people are expected to act like ".

The description above is enough to say that the theory of symbolic interaction theory as a humanist, by recognizing the freedom of man as a being creative and thinking. The constructed symbol instance is claimed as a manifestation of human freedom. Because in that way, one would be able to devise new ideas and strategies. Individuals are symbols that evolved through the interaction of the symbols they created between individuals (Sukidin, 2002: 20). Humans are given the freedom to think and act creatively as possible. Every sentence is a creation of every individual, every speech, telephone conversations, meetings, demonstrations, and the other is a new creativity that made the wearer a symbol that combines and analyzes the symbols with a unique way, so creativity will always appear in every situation (Soeprapto 2002 : 176).

George Ritzer as quoted by Mulyana (2004: 73) to formulate some principles that became the core of the theory of symbolic interaction, as follows: First, humans do not like animals, because humans are endowed with the ability to think. Second, the ability of human thinking shaped by social interaction. Third, the social interaction of people learns the meaning and symbols that allow them to apply thinking skills that are uniquely human ability. Fourth, the meaning and symbols allow people to continue the action and interaction characteristics. Fifth, humans are able to modify or alter the meaning and symbols that they use in the actions and interactions based on their interactions on the situation. Sixth, the ability to modify and change was caused by an individual's ability to interact with itself through a wide range of selectivity up to the election process attitude. Seventh, the patterns of action and interaction in forming group and communities.

Related to the contributions of individual interactions in shaping society, Holstein and Gubrium revealed (in Miller, 2001: 51) that the symbolic interaction oriented to the principle that each individual responds to each other on a meaning that they wake up in every interaction they do. Each individual is actively associated in their social world so that a process of social and cultural interaction or exchange between them. In addition, individuals can also be seen as an instrument for the creation of community and culture.

Symbolic interaction theory pioneered by George Herbert Mead (1863-1931) is focused on the interaction between the individual and the group, in which individuals interact face-to-face (face to face) using the sign, which contains the icons, index, and symbols (Sobur, 2004: 158). Symbolic thought is essentially frees us from the limitations of human experience only for what we really see, hear or feel. Theory makes us constantly think of the object as symbolic (Soeprapto, 2002: 68-70).

Basically the theory of symbolic interaction, including in the area of social psychology that examines how the individual psychological dynamics in interacting with other individuals. Therefore the initial study of this theory should begin with the theory of the self (self) from "the funding father" of symbolic interaction, George Herbert Mead. Self (self) or concept in view of Mead (in Mulyana, 2004: 73) is a process derived from the individual's social interaction with others. Or in another meaning, self (the self) is also a "social object" that we share with others in an interaction (Soeprapto, 2002: 204). Thus, each individual's self-concept is largely determined by how others see or assess themselves when interacting. Cooley (in Mulyana, 2004: 74) says that the concept of the individual is significantly determined by what he thinks about other people's thoughts about him. As a consequence of social life (in groups), the concept of a person is always changing from one group to another group, where group influence is very strong for the interpretation of the person.

In addition, the symbolic interaction is the construction of some notion of self, action, interaction, and object (Soeprapto, 2002: 161-164). In interacting by you, man becomes an object for him. In the form of action, human conduct an internal dialogue in developing concepts and strategies for dealing with the world outside him. Thus, humans are not creatures that react to external environmental influences, but act according to her interpretation of the results. According to Mead that self-conception is a process that comes from an individual's social interaction with others. Mead view of the self lies in taking the role of another person (taking the role of the other). A similar view of "self" is also put forward by Charles Horton Cooley. In theory, "the looking-glass self", Cooley argued that the concept of the individual is determined by what he thinks about other people's thoughts about him.

Interactions in view of Mead can be differentiated between non-symbolic interaction and symbolic interaction. Non-symbolic interaction takes place when people respond directly to the actions and gestures of others, such as exercise, expression and tone of voice. While symbolic interaction is done by humans to interpret their actions and gestures (symbol) of others based on the results of interpretation performed by him. Symbolic Interaction is a formative process that the rights of every individual, which reach common forms of human relationships in general.

Object for Mead is something that can be designated or referred to, whether they are real or abstract. There are five analysis related to the object, according to Mead; (1) natural objects taken from its meaning, which is a creation of those who consider the object. (2) The significance of how one emerges from it is ready to act against him. (3) All objects are social products where in it is formed and transformed with definition process that occurs in the interaction. (4) Someone will act on that object. (5) Because the object is something that is appointed, then one can act according to his will against the object. Soeprapto (2002: 145) formulate the meaning of objects according to the symbolic interaction in the group life. According to him, the theory of symbolic interaction, human group believes that life is a process where objects are created, confirmed, transformed and even discarded. Life and human behavior must change in line with changes occurring in the world of objects they are.

Symbolic interaction gives a lot of emphasis on the individual active and creative in the process of exchange of symbols. In the language of Herbert Blumer (Soeprapto, 2002: 121), the actor is not merely react to other actions, but he interprets and defines each of the actions of others. Response actor directly or indirectly, is always based on an assessment of the meaning. Therefore, human interaction mediated by the use of symbols to find meaning or interpretation of the actions of others.

In establishing communication based on the uniformity of meaning, human social interaction always tries to match what he had in mind with what is happening in the environment. Human in the communication process is not simply the recipient emblems or symbols are seen, heard or she felt passively, but actively tries to hold individual interpretations of the emblem, a symbol or the mark. Efforts interpretation that is part of the interaction that can be done in order to establish effective communication and intensive between the sender and the recipient of the message, and the interaction of interpretation was not only done to the message sent but the interaction interpretation is also done to himself, because people are not only aware of people others but also able to realize himself.

In this process (Mulyana, 2004: 230), an individual to anticipate the reactions of others, are looking for alternatives to speech or action he would do. Individuals imagine how others would respond to their actions. The process of taking the role (taking the role of the other) is hidden an important, though not observable. Therefore, the symbolic interactions recognize and measures in outer action, consider the action outside as further actions in. However, beyond the action does not automatically show the action in it, because outside perhaps just an impression management (impression management) to please a specific audience, or to meet the specific demands that are social, political, economic and so on.

Interaction with the opposite sex. Illustration: when X asks someone out, he delivered interest on that date. Others might interpret such an invitation to the various definitions. We communicate, taking on the role, and if we ask for an explanation did not understand the meaning. We met, each interpret according to clothing, appearance, actions, words, objects and so on. We do this to assure the continuity of interaction, or to avoid other people. Every time we act, there is always a sense analysis, the distribution of larger sense, perspective emerged, knowledge of how to straighten out the action from each other. Kissing and sex is symbolic actions as well. Both retain the past, the future intentions, thoughts and feelings now. In any relationship, we also look at each event dating as symbolic interaction: smile, emotion, kissing, holding, invitation to make love, warmth, affection. All these events mutually decided by the couple making love through interaction, sharing and retrieval roles.

### **III. Research Methods and Procedures**

This research was conducted at the Student of University padjajaran in academic 2015/2016, by interviewing and observing to 'single' students which have a shared interest liver or longer dating. Interviews and observations took place in October 2015 at approximately 1 (one) month. Informans were subjected to this study, people who are in a relationship or dating.

Interview method used in this study were interviews ethnographic or better known as in-depth interviews in order to gather information from informants in a more holistic, whole, and depth. Mulyana (2004: 181) says:

"The interview is not structured like an informal conversation. This method aims to obtain certain forms of information from all respondents, but the wording and order adapted to the characteristics of each respondent. Ethnographic interviews are also important to obtain information under the surface and find out what people think and feel about a particular event. Unstructured interviewing are flexible, the composition of the question and the arrangement of words in each question can be changed at the time of the interview, tailored to the needs and conditions of the interview, including socio-cultural characteristics (religion, ethnicity, gender, age, education level, occupation, etc.) of the respondents are facing. "

Sevilla, et. al., (1993: 206) says the interview is not structured or standardized, more flexible and open. The interviewer can modify, repeat, outlining the questions asked and can follow the origin of respondents not deviate from the purpose of the interview. The advantage is immediate feedback appears. Presented the results of this study with a view EMIC, that is, the description presented in accordance interviews, based on what he thinks, what he feels, and what is done by the subject of research in communication with the majority group, without the slightest modification interpretation especially thinking of researchers.

In an interview with the informant to ask things such as: how does the interactions occur or communication that takes place both verbal and non-verbal with your partner:

1. How does the style of romance happen between them?
2. What the factors are related by love or dating for them to make love?
3. How is the satisfaction and commitment of love relationship between them?
4. Why is the relationship between them that could be ended?

### **IV. Analysis The result of Interview**

In this section the results of the interview presented in the form of an intact corresponding answers informant, not classified or categorized. In the "categorization results of the study" the researcher marks or categorization informant answers to these kinds of statements in accordance with the type of answer, to describe and make it easier to see the views of informants on patterns of interaction dating relationship at among students of University Padjadjaran.

To maintain the safety of informants and to avoid anything that is not desirable, the researchers did not mention his true identity. Researchers put the name is a pseudonym (not her real name), while the answer or statement informant researchers describe what the appropriate answers or statements of informants.

1. The first informant initials "B" was 26 years old, not married status from Java. He has worked on a State Universities has been the employment of civil servants (Civil Service). He is the key informants in this study, he was students of University padjadjaran in academic 2015/2016. Since the high school has had a relationship dating to the lecture bench SI, but in a relationship he never succeeded because it always failed relationship. For he is dating is a separate requirement for every human being. Because without his dating life was colorless. Experienced a failure is very reasonable because humans here have the properties to choose and be chosen so that the best use of the opportunity to determine the choice of who will win her heart or will become his lifelong companion. DATING something exciting because in it there is atmospheres that mutual need to love and be loved, caring for each other, life is meaningless. How is your dating style? As seen in the interviews with informants "I feel when we have someone lovers there is a peace in my heart and he's not the type of person and I like playing women, women are very precious to me as my life partner. Because there is no him, my life feels empty and hollow. "

According to him, we have to believe in the power of love in every human being, because of the power of love, we can live beside with other people. Since he entered the program S-2 at University of Padjadjaran Bandung, he began seriously to seek a companion because of his life that is worthy to be married and hopeful parents said their parents "if you take this program S-2 in Bandung you should get partner life because the mother is old and cannot be patience to wait for her first grandchildren ". Bambang was the first child so there is reasonable if the mother is advised so. Message parents, Bambang always remember it in every step. In Bandung, Bambang finally found someone meaningful in his life, the days walk fast because time is running fast when it alone. As long as she interacts with her lover she always keeps the correct behaviors, actions, words to her lover as if he said his girlfriend careful not to be injured or scratched at all. "When I lived in Bandung and beside to learn, because to remember message mother, so I intended to look for a life partner, after I saw him finally walk away, such as Javanese proverb says "**Tresno jalaran soko kulino**" so I feel comfortable with him and he is a candidate companion of my life. "During the dating of which created a strong commitment to a more serious until marriage later. What commitment your relationship with your lover in the future? "I have an agreement that once I was in a relationship with another person God willing to be his wife and it was a deal the two of us." If there is agreement like that, if there are concerns can be the end of a relationship that has existed? "Everything depends on equally important Allah that we've resigned that we are going into a more serious relationship, and hopefully the relationship does not end just like that."

2. The second informant initials "H" He was 28 years old, coming from Ternate, working on one of the Local Government Agencies in Ternate on the employment already PNS. His hobby was taking walk, spending money as long as the money was still there, dressed, like charisma term jock 'TP-TP' means 'Charm' Status single he still has not had a life partner. Dating is a hobby since he was a teenager in high school. His statement, He was going out on a high school level of the love that exists just puppy love toy until he entered the program University of S-I and S-2. What does the concept of going out on stage that you experience today? Do you own now have a girlfriend? According to him the concept of dating is a relationship of love that exists between two distinct persons, in other words making love without limits of age, which is important there is a match among the top two private hearts is. It could also be courting a tangle of affection that are not permanently flexible or can be changed by following the course of time so there is a relationship that matches or vice versa, when it does not fit "hunting" another. How is your dating style? "I am the man was never seriously in making love, just for fun." At this time he had girl

friend but he thought that girlfriend felt his days in order to be not called single or bujangan by his friends, namely he was not clever to see girl friend or honey. His purpose to get girl friend just "**Gengsi**" to find a status in order that it's still okay in front of opposite sex. Dating today is not to look for a spouse or partner life but to play alone or life 'hedonism' just for fun. According to him his life during his stay in Singapore he will enjoy to live in Bandung only hedonism' it means that not to waste his life with a wide variety of binding rules. He did not care that he's had enough age to get married but returned early goal that she just wants to have fun just is not too dizzy to look for partner life. What factors are there for you dating? "We are getting closer with each other, need each other, there is a jealousy, and I feel our lovers to be noticed more." For him mate it will come naturally without the sought after because he knew that basically every human being created by Him for the couples. So the conclusion that the courtship is a necessity that cannot be avoided in every human life. Because when humans interact with the opposite sex, it will be inevitably lead salient signals that sympathy with each other. Any factors that strengthen your relationship? "Affection, jealousy, and there are some differences between us her more romantic than me." Is there satisfaction and commitment when you are dating? "I feel there is a certain satisfaction when I'm dating and it should be noted that when I was making love with someone else I do not have a clear commitment anyway I am happy he is also happy." From the first glance of sympathy or finally at the stage of introduction and will be established at the stage of commitment to here only or will be forever the relationship that had been built. According to him very simply that life is only once so we need to enjoy the fun without the headache of how our next step. With models such relationships, dating long will you survive? "Could last a long time and could not anyway I enjoy and vice versa, maybe you yourself can conclude."

3. The third informant initials "Hr" he was 27 years old, came from Bandung. He is still single status to work in the field of governance consultant, looks very attractive, handsome, tall, and wise. How is your dating style? "I am more inclined to friendship and companionship, fit and whether or not depending later as he proceeds." According to him courting a stage of interpersonal relationships that must be done because of the presence of media courtship we can know each other's personalities, namely exchange of experience, know the character each of us, and finally there is a certain point is to look for compatibility between them. I currently have a girlfriend but still know each other phase-know among us, God willing, if the God allows being his life companion. He said that he lived a good relationship with this character that prioritizes a pleasant familiarity between each other. There is a kind of commitment by holding the principle of "if a mate is not going anywhere".
4. The informant fourth initials "Dg" her 26-year-old. He was student of University Padjadjaran. From Padang, West Sumatra. Single status, he has not worked. His quiet, sweet and sympathetic. Besides the aim to seek knowledge, he also wants to find a girlfriend or a lover. Although he has not worked but he had dared to commit when he met a girlfriend or lover who according to him ideal for him, he will make it for good lover. It turned out in the course of his life over in Bandung eventually he fell in love with someone very simple girl, and **solehah**. The girls are older than the age. In the course of introduction to the girl he always held a meeting schedule or "make a date" or a date in the sense of a special meeting with a discussion about "you" and "me". For **Nandang** the love he had for his life now is very significant, because during his first time to know a girl who makes her brave commitment clear is that his relationship with the girl will be taken to a more serious relationship is not at the level of playfulness. According to him, a clear commitment from the outset will simplify and streamline the relationship that exists because when we catch signal lovers who like that then it will be believed entirely lover will love from the opposite sex. Love is something so beautiful everyone will have it as long as the person has the feeling that means the opposite sex or girlfriend even love requires sacrifice. In any relationship there must be a conflict, a conflict that could be jealousy of the ordinary even to excess. Of the conflict I could catch that jealous means there is a sense of belonging as if love there cannot be the slightest shared with others.



## **The result of categories research**

Before we will make a categories the observation result in the field or interview to informant, the research allows to reader in understanding about the meaning of love.

### **Definition of love**

Rubin (1983) in Tri Dayakisni, Hudaniah (2003), suggests that the concept of romantic love has three characteristics, namely the presence of physical and emotional attachment, attention (caring), and an intimate relationship (intimacy). Based on this, Rubin made the scale of love and conceptualize love as an attitude toward others, as a set of specific thoughts about a loved one. According to Rubin, there are three themes that are reflected in statements on the scale. The first theme, attachment (attachment) or affection is a sense of need and urgency. Example item: "It's hard for me to live without ...." This statement reflects the consciousness of dependence on others to get valuable rewards. The second theme is the desire to give attention to the person as reflected in the statement, "I want to do everything to ...." This statement reflects the desire to give priority to the welfare of a person and is sensitive to her needs. The third theme emphasizes the sense of trust and self-disclosure. By analyzing the return on a scale of love Rubin, Harold Kelley (1983) identified four main components in love, namely: attention (caring), the sense of need (needing), put the confidence (trust) and fault tolerance to his partner. Kelley even in his research found that students see as the most important factor in caring love, then the next needing. While trust is regarded as less important things in love.

Research the other (Davis, 1985), finding the data that friendship and love has some characteristics that are common, meaning of love as well as in the friendly relations include also the feeling of pleasure (enjoyment) and acceptance (acceptance) of each other, confidence (trust), respect (respect), mutual help (mutual assistance), trust (confiding), understanding (understanding) and spontaneity (spontaneity). But love is more than that, because love has two groups of factors referred to below more characterizes to love than friendship: (1) a group of lust (passion) include feeling fascinating / bowled (paying attention to his partner even when he was involved in some other activities, e.g. because the concentration cannot be thinking of his partner), sexual desire (sex desire in all other relationships in their lives); and (2) caring group includes attention in the form of for example, accompany to do activities together that interest her partner, gave everything).

Another expert is Robert Sternberg (1987) proposed a theory called the Triangular Theory of Love. Sternberg states that love has three main components, which provides a feeling of intimacy that creates the experience of warmth in a relationship (for sharing, mutual understanding, and emotional support), component passion shows impulse that leads to romance and physical attractiveness and sexual behavior. While sexual needs perhaps most important, the needs of others also contribute to the experience of lust is like self-esteem needs, dominant or submissive, and for affiliates. Commitment component involves short-term decisions that a person loves another and agree to maintain love it.

From the results of research conducted through observation and interviews, involving interaction style dating to the students of University Padjadjaran in Bandung, so this study can be drawn a construct associated with symbolic interaction style of dating or romance student of University Padjadjaran in Bandung as follows:

### **Love style**

Based on the results by using observation and interview researchers are CONSTRUCTS style romance in people's lives, especially researcher's focus on students of University Padjadjaran Bandung. Researchers concluded from interviews and direct observations there are six sub-constructs of style romance are as follows:

## **Romantic love**

Love that is characterized by emotional experiences. Usually a love at first sight. What is important in this form of love is the bodily physical attractiveness. Of all the informants that investigators interviewed all of which belonged to the romantic love because they were sympathetic to the first person from the first glance of the eye drop that is prudent.

## **Love has**

Love that is characterized by a strong emotional experience, easily jealous, obsessed with loved ones. Usually highly dependent on loved ones, therefore, fear excluded. Involvement is very easy to change from feeling very happy to despair. Romance style is present in all of the informants interviewed researchers.

## **Love is Good friend**

Researchers from the information captured is a good friend that there is a love that promotes a pleasant familiarity. Love it usually grows slowly and begins a friendship, sharing and reveal themselves gradually. The characteristics of love form are that it is a wise, warm, and filled with a sense of brotherhood. Style romance is contained in the third informant.

## **Love Pragmatic**

Love requires a matching pair and relationships that went well, both sides feel at home in it and are able to satisfy the basic needs or their practical. Usually this form of love involves many considerations in determining logical and more happy couples are looking for satisfaction rather than excitement. Love style is found in the first and fourth informant.

## **Altruistic love**

Love marked for the attention, the desire to always give something, and always ready to forgive the mistakes partner. Love is defined as a task that must be done without *pamrih*. This form of love is expressed through self-sacrifice, patience and trust towards a loved one. This romance style is the first and fourth informant.

## **Love Fooling Around**

Form of love that is characterized by love and enjoy the game to win it. In the form of love, the most important is the strategy, and the attachment is usually avoided. People involved in the form of love usually have more than one relationship love at the time. No relationship can last longer, usually ends when her partner started to get bored or become too serious. This romance style is second informant.

## **Factors Associated with Love**

### **Rewards (reward)**

Although the sense of love and love is different, some of the factors that reward thereby increasing a sense of love and also raise the possibility of a chance on love. For example those factors are the proximity, similarity in attitudes and values, physical attractiveness, and love each other.

### **Gender Differences**

As researchers observe there are differences between women and men. There is a stereotype that is growing in our society that women are more romantic than men even vice versa. Men prefer playing lady love than women. Faster women like to break their love for reasons of lack

of attention from men because men tend to be toying with the nature of love. Romance style men tend to love style romantic, playful or egoistic, while women tend to force love, friendship, and pragmatic. Women are more need intimacy but a little man wants intimacy. Women are more likely to express their feelings about others and their fears but men are more willing to talk about political views and pride in their strength.

### **Jealous**

Jealous, according to Brehm and kassin (1993: 27), namely reaction to a perceived threat to the existence relationship. This threat is not always a reality or not is always limited by reality. Jealousy is usually created by the perception that their partner was attracted to other people. But the threat could be wider, for example feeling jealous about the involvement of her partner time with family and hobby. Nevertheless, more intensely jealous when her partner broke because of interest to others. Jealous of potential emotional consequences at any time / any time a relationship is formed. Losing a spouse or partner creates the possibility of loss of emotions, thoughts and behaviors that can destroy the complex.


### **Satisfaction and Commitment**

To understand why people stay together in the long term, then we must analyze the satisfaction and commitment. Satisfaction refers to when we are satisfied and the perceived rewards outweigh the costs. While the commitment (a feeling of attachment and desire to maintain the relationship) is more complex.

### **Ending a Relationship**

Often the conflict in a relationship is inevitable, like a dating relationship experienced by the informants. Usually preceded a conflict occurs due to a conflict of attribution between the two sides, especially for those who suffer in the relationship. Bradbury & Fincham (1990), found that in couples who have looked at the causes of the events globally negative effect, whereas positive events seen only as a specific incident or coincidence.

**Symbolic Interaction Style of Model DATING / Students love**



**Model I. Love Interwoven Students of University Padjadjaran in Bandung**

**V. Conclusion**

Pattern students of University Padjadjaran interaction shows a reality that is constructed within the individual informants. Indicates that the strength of the relationship dating or romance that they have built a reality happens on campus life where they had been studying the S-2 at the University of Padjadjaran. Besides they have a purpose to seek knowledge as for any other purpose is to look for a life partner and have fun with life Bandung complex "Hedonism".

The processes interaction student of S-2 are very heterogeneous, especially that researchers focus to the students who are still single because it deals with a major theme in this paper is "relationship dating / romance students of University Padjadjaran study to premise a romance style symbolic interaction that exists between them. The results of research finally to delivered some CONSTRUCTS and sub-constructs: 1) Construct style romance with sub-constructs: romantic love, love possess, love good friends, love pragmatic, altruistic love, and love messing around. 2) Construct Factors associated with love is as follows rewards, gender differences and jealousy. 3) Construct Satisfaction and Commitment. 4) Construct Ending Relationship. The fourth categorization of these constructs, determines how the pattern of symbolic interaction style dating / romance students of University Padjadjaran, especially in Academic 2015/2016.

## Bibliography

- Devito, Joseph, A. 1997. **Komunikasi Antarmanusia; Kuliah Dasar**, Penerj. Agus Maulana. Jakarta: Professional Books.
- Dayakisni, Tri & Hudaniah. 2003. **Psikologi Sosial**, Malang: UMM Press.
- Fisher, B. Aubrey. 1986. **Teori-Teori Komunikasi**, Penerj. Soejono Trimono. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mulyana, Deddy. 2005. **Ilmu Komunikasi Suatu Pengantar**. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- , 2004. **Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif: Paradigma Baru Ilmu Komunikasi dan Ilmu Sosial lainnya**. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- , 2007. **Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif: Contoh-contoh Penelitian Kualitatif Dengan Pendekatan Praktis**. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Sobur, Alex. 2004. **Semiotika Komunikasi**. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Soeprapto, Riyadi. 2002. **Interaksionisme Simbolik; Perspektif Sosiologi Modern**. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Spradley. 1997. **Metode Etnografi**. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana.
- Sukidin, Basrowi. 2002. **Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Perspektif Mikro**. Surabaya: Insan Cendekia