Volume 2 Desember - 2018 No. 2

Artikel Penelitian

Association Between Knowledge of Condom Functions and Condom Use among Sexually-Active Unmarried Male Adolescents in Indonesia

Asosiasi Pengetahuan Mengenai Fungsi Kondom terhadap Penggunaan Kondom pada Remaja Laki-Laki Aktif Seksual di Indonesia

Lhuri Dwianti Rahmartania*, Asri Adisasmitaa

^a Department of Epidemiology - Faculty of Public Health, Universitas Indonesia 1 ar Floor Building A Kampus Baru UI Depok 16424, Indonesia

ABSTRAK

Latar belakang: Seks pranikah bukanlah norma umum di Indonesia dan pendidikan tentang kesehatan seksual masih dianggap kontroversial. Ironisnya, Survei Demografi dan Kesehatan Indonesia (SDKI) menunjukkan adanya peningkatan prevalensi perilaku seks pranikah di kalangan remaja, khususnya laki-laki. Sayangnya, penggunaan kondom pada populasi ini terbilang rendah dan tidak diketahui apakah itu berhubungan dengan minimnya pengetahuan kesehatan seksual termasuk penggunaan kondom. Tujuan: untuk melihat apakah ada hubungan antara pengetahuan tentang fungsi kondom dengan penggunaan kondom di kalangan remaja. Metode: Penelitian potong-lintang terhadap 913 lakilaki Indonesia usia 15-24 tahun yang melakukan hubungan seksual pranikah (SDKI Kesehatan Reproduksi Remaja). Variabel independen adalah pengetahuan tentang fungsi kondom sedangkan variabel dependen adalah penggunaan kondom. Analisis statistik dilakukan menggunakan Chi Square dan Cox regression. Hasil: Prevalensi penggunaan kondom sekitar dua kali lebih tinggi pada responden dengan pengetahuan yang cukup tentang fungsi kondom (31%), dibandingkan responden tanpa pengetahuan tersebut (15,1%); adjusted PR 2,38 (95% CI 1,47 - 3,85). Simpulan: Pengetahuan tentang kondom berasosiasi positif dengan penggunaan kondom pada remaja pelaku hubungan seksual pranikah. Pelarangan informasi tentang kondom dapat membuat remaja yang aktif secara seksual melakukan hubungan seksual tidak aman. Pendidikan tentang kesehatan reproduksi dan praktik seks aman diperlukan namun harus disesuaikan dengan nilai-nilai budaya.

Kata kunci: Seks pranikah, kondom, remaja, laki-laki, pengetahuan, perilaku berisiko.

ABSTRACT

Background: Premarital sex is culturally unacceptable in Indonesia and education on safe sex practice remains controversial. Meanwhile, Indonesia Demographic and Health Surveys (IDHS) show gradual increase in the prevalence of sexually-active adolescents nationwide, particularly among unmarried males. Unfortunately, condom use is low among this population and it is unclear whether it relates to inadequate knowledge on safe sex practice including condoms. Objective: to see whether there is an association between knowledge on condom functions and condom use among adolescents. Method: cross-sectional study of 913 Indonesian unmarried males aged 15 - 24 who have had sex (IDHS Adolescent Reproductive Health 2012 dataset). The independent variable is knowledge on condom functions while the dependent variable is the use of condoms. Statistical analysis is performed using Chi Square and Cox regression. Result: The prevalence of condom use is about twice higher in respondents with sufficient knowledge on condom functions (31%), than in respondents without (15.1%); adjusted PR 2.38 (95%CI 1.47 -3.85). Conclusion: Having knowledge about condoms is positively associated with safer sex practice among sexually active adolescents. Banning information on condoms may place sexually-active adolescents into unprotected sex. Education on safe sex practice is needed but should be cautiously tailored to meet cultural values.

Keywords: Premarital sex, condom, adolescent, male, knowledge, risky behavior.

Introduction

Premarital sex, especially in adolescents, is not considered part of Indonesian culture, and even often regarded as a taboo. 1,2 However, Indonesia Demographic and Health Surveys (IDHS) from the past decade show gradual increase in prevalence of sexually-active adolescents nationwide, particularly unmarried males (from 4.9% in 2003 to 8.3% in 2012). 3,4 Unfortunately, this trend is not followed with adequate use of condoms. In 2012, only 27.4% male adolescents wore condom at their last intercourse. 3 While in fact, condom remains the most effective way to prevent both sexually transmitted infections (STIs),

and unwanted pregnancy.⁵ The gap between risky behavior and its specific protection may lead to unwanted pregnancy and STIs, which could bring in more consequences e.g. unsafe abortion and maternal-neonatal complications.

Knowledge on sexual and reproductive health (SRH) is thought to have a role in this phenomenon yet sadly found lacking in Indonesian adolescents. There is no standard comprehensive SRH education

*Korespondensi: Lhuri Dwianti Rahmartani. Department of Epidemiology - Faculty of Public Health, Universitas Indonesia. 1st Floor Building A Kampus Baru UI Depok 16424, Indonesia. E-mail: lhuridwianti@ui.ac.id , Phone: +62-78849031 Jurnal Epidemiologi Kesehatan Indonesia Vol. 2, No. 2, Desember 2018

at school and discussing about condoms is usually frowned upon.^{1, 2} Even basic information regarding condoms are not well-understood by every Indonesian adolescents. Based on IDHS 2012³, almost 30% males and 40% female adolescents in Indonesia do not know that condom can prevent pregnancy. Moreover, more than 30% males and nearly 50% females do not know that condoms can prevent STIs.^{3, 4}

Behaviors are known to be influenced by knowledge.⁶ Likewise, there are many factors that are thought to influence adolescents in making decisions on sexual practice, one of them is their comprehension on sexual and reproductive health.^{7,8} It remains unclear whether inadequate knowledge on safe sex contributes to unsafe sex. Therefore this study aims to see whether there is an association between knowledge on condom functions and the prevalence of condom use, particularly among unmarried male adolescents in Indonesia.

Method

This is a cross-sectional study using secondary data of Indonesia Demographic Health Survey (IDHS): Adolescent Reproductive Health 2012.3 dataset involving 913 unmarried males aged 15 – 24 who have had sex. Sample is collected from all 33 provinces nationwide during the year 2007 - 2012. Data is obtained from an open source public domain (https://dhsprogram.com/Data/). Complete questionnaires are displayed as appendix of IDHS 2012 (special report on adolescent reproductive health) and available for download at https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR281/ FR281.pdf.

In this study, the dependent variable is standard male latex condom use at last sexual intercourse (using condom or not using condom, form no.713-714). Independent variable is knowledge on two basic condom functions, which are 1) to help prevent pregnancy and 2) to prevent STIs (form no. 216). Categories of knowledge are divided into two; 1) sufficient knowledge (know both functions of condoms), and 2) insufficient knowledge (only know one function or not at all). Additionally, we also look for dose-response relationship by comparing condom use among those who know 2 condom functions vs know only one function vs know none of the functions.

Firstly, we use Chi Square test to calculate crude prevalence ratio (PR) for the use of condoms among the two knowledge group. Then Cox regression is used for multivariate analysis to obtain an adjusted PR by taking demographic covariates into consideration. The covariates included in the multivariate analysis are age (form no 103), economic status (form no. 118), zone of residence (identification form), and type of residence (identification form).

Ethical Review

Data from IDHS Adolescent Reproductive Health 2012 is obtained from procedures and questionnaires that comply with standard DHS surveys. All protocols have been reviewed and approved by ICF Institutional Review Board (IRB) and an IRB in the host country, i.e. Indonesia in this case. ICF IRB confirms that the survey conforms to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services regulations for the protection of human subjects (45 CFR 46).

Result

Table 1 shows the general characteristic of the sample. Variables on rows no. 1 - 3 are independent variables, variable on row no.4 is dependent variable, and the rest are demographic characteristics. Asterisk (*) indicates demographic characteristics that are included in multivariate analysis as covariates because they have statistically significant effect in the model analysis. Based on row no.3, about 79% respondents have sufficient knowledge on basic condom functions, while the rest only know either one or not at all (this is defined as having insufficient knowledge on basic condom functions). Data on row no.4 shows that about 72% respondents do not use condoms at their last intercourse.

Tabel 1. Characteristic of respondents

Name		Categories		
condom can help prevent pregnancy Do Not Know 111 1 12.4 100.0 help prevent pregnancy Total 901 100.0 Knowledge that condom can help prevent Know 767 85.1 STIS Mossing (4) Knowledge that condom can help prevent pregnancy and status exual intercourse Know both functions 712 79.1 Knowledge that condom can help prevent pregnancy and status exual intercourse Know none function 131 14.6 6 STIS Missing (4) Condom use at last sexual intercourse Yes 251 27.4 last exual intercourse Age at first 15 - 19 years 308 33.7 lou.0 Age at first 15 - 19 years 308 33.7 lou.0 Age at first 10 - 17 years 461 51.0 lou.0 l	V a ria b le s		n	%
condom can help prevent pregnancy Do Not Know 111 1 12.4 100.0 help prevent pregnancy Total 901 100.0 Knowledge that condom can help prevent Know 767 85.1 STIS Mossing (4) Knowledge that condom can help prevent pregnancy and status exual intercourse Know both functions 712 79.1 Knowledge that condom can help prevent pregnancy and status exual intercourse Know none function 131 14.6 6 STIS Missing (4) Condom use at last sexual intercourse Yes 251 27.4 last exual intercourse Age at first 15 - 19 years 308 33.7 lou.0 Age at first 15 - 19 years 308 33.7 lou.0 Age at first 10 - 17 years 461 51.0 lou.0 l	Knowledge that	Know	789	87.6
help prevent pregnancy Total Missing (4) Knowledge that condom can help prevent Know 767 85.1 Knowledge that condom can help prevent Do Not Know 134 14.9 STIs Missing (4) Knowledge that condom can know both functions 712 79.1 Knowledge that condom can help prevent pregnancy and STIs Know only one function 131 14.6 Missing (4) Condom use at last sexual No missing (4) Condom use at last sexual Yes 251 27.4 Iast sexual No 663 72.6 intercourse Total 913 100.0 Age at first 15 - 19 years 308 33.7 Total 913 100.0 Age at first 10 - 17 years 461 51.0 sexual Total 903 100.0 intercourse Do not remember (6) Missing (5) 5 Level of Below secondary 123 13.6 <		Do Not Know		
Nowledge that Condom can Do Not Know 767 85.1			901	
Knowledge that condom can		M issin a	(4)	
condom can help prevent Do Not Know Total 134 14.9 STIS Missing (4) Knowledge that condom can know both functions 712 79.1 condom can help prevent pregnancy and sTIS Know only one function 131 14.6 Melp prevent pregnancy and STIS Missing (4) Condom use at last sexual intercourse Yes 251 27.4 last sexual intercourse No 663 72.6 intercourse Total 913 100.0 Age at interview* 15 - 19 years 308 33.7 Total 913 100.0 Age at first 10 - 17 years 461 51.0 sexual Total 903 100.0 Intercourse Do not remember (6) Missing (5) Secondary (SMP) or above 784 86.4 Level of Below secondary 123 13.6 education Total 907 100.0 Missing (6) Type of Rural 378 41.4 residence Total 913 100.0 Upper 94 10.0				85 1
help prevent Total Missing 901 (4) Knowledge that condom can help prevent pregnancy and STIs Know none function 131 14.6 Known only one function help prevent pregnancy and STIs Know none 57 6.3 Condom use at last sexual intercourse No 663 72.6 Intercourse Total 913 100.0 Age at interview* 15 - 19 years 308 33.7 Total 913 100.0 18 - 24 years 461 51.0 Age at first 10 - 17 years 461 51.0 51.0 sexual 10 Total 903 100.0 100.0 Missing (5) 50.0 Secondary (SMP) or above 784 86.4 86.4 Level of Below secondary 123 13.6 86.4 education Total 907 100.0 100.0 Missing (6) 70.0 Type of 7 Rural 378 41.4 41.4 residence Total 913 100.0 70.0 Indonesian 2 Central 313 34.2 70.0 Lower 4 Gestern 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10		Do Not Know	134	
STIs M issing (4) Knowledge that condom can condom can help prevent melp prevent pregnancy and STIs Know none function state melp prevent melp				
Knowledge that condom can condom can help prevent pregnancy and STIs Know only one function stored for condom can know only one function stored for condom can help prevent pregnancy and stored for condom use at last sexual for condom use at last sexual stored for condom use at last sexual sexual sexual sexual for condom use at last sexual sexual for condom use at last sexual for condom use at last sexual sexual for condom use at last sexual		M issin q	(4)	
condom can help prevent pregnancy and STIs Know none 57 6.3 Condom use at last sexual intercourse Yes 251 27.4 last sexual intercourse No 663 72.6 Age at interview* 20 - 24 years 60.6 66.3 Age at interview* 15 - 19 years 30.8 33.7 Total 913 100.0 Age at first 10 - 17 years 461 51.0 sexual intercourse Do not remember (6) Missing (5) 66.4 Secondary (SMP) or above Missing 78.4 86.4 Level of education Below secondary 123 13.6 eucation Total Missing (6) Type of residence Urban Missing 535 58.6 Rural residence Total 378 41.4 Upper 94 10.0 Upper 94 10.4 Economic Lower 469 52.1 Total 900 100.0 Upper 94 10.4	Knowledge that		712	79.1
help prevent pregnancy and pregnancy and STIs Know none 57 6.3 STIs Missing (4) Condom use at last sexual intercourse Yes 251 27.4 last sexual intercourse No 663 72.6 intercourse Total 913 100.0 Age at intercourse 20 - 24 years 606 66.3 interview* 15 - 19 years 308 33.7 Total 913 100.0 Age at first 10 - 17 years 461 51.0 sexual Total 903 100.0 intercourse Do not remember (6) (6) Missing (5) (5) Secondary (SMP) or above 784 86.4 Level of Below secondary 123 13.6 education Total 907 100.0 Missing (6) (6) Type of Rural 378 41.4 residence Total 913 100.0 <t< td=""><td>•</td><td>Know only one function</td><td>131</td><td>14.6</td></t<>	•	Know only one function	131	14.6
pregnancy and STIs Total Missing 901 (4) 100.0 Condom use at last sexual intercourse Yes 251 27.4 Iast sexual intercourse No 663 72.6 intercourse Total 913 100.0 Age at interview* 15 - 19 years 30.8 33.7 Total 913 100.0 Age at first 10 - 17 years 461 51.0 sexual Total 903 100.0 intercourse Do not remember (6) Missing (5) Secondary (SMP) or above 784 86.4 86.4 Level of Below secondary 123 13.6 education Total 907 100.0 Missing (6) Type of residence Rural 378 41.4 Total 907 100.0 10.0 Indonesian Central 378 41.4 9.2 zone of Eastern 84 9.2 9.2 residence* Total 913 100.0 Upper 94 10.4 10.0 Economic Status* Lower 469 52.1 Economic Status* Lower 469 52.1 Forcidence 1000000000000000000000000000000000000			5.7	
STIs M issing (4) Condom use at last sexual Yes 251 27.4 last sexual intercourse No 663 72.6 intercourse Total 913 100.0 Age at interview* 15 - 19 years 308 33.7 Total 913 100.0 18 - 24 years 442 49.0 Age at first 10 - 17 years 461 51.0 sexual Total 903 100.0 intercourse Do not remember (6) Missing (5) 5 Evel of Below secondary 123 13.6 education Total 907 100.0 Missing (6) 66 7 Type of Rural 378 41.4 residence Total 913 100.0 Indonesian Western 516 56.5 residence* Total 913 100.0 Upper 94 10.4			901	100.0
Condom use at last sexual last sexual intercourse Yes 251 27.4 Intercourse Total 913 100.0 Age at interview* 20 - 24 years 606 66.3 interview* 15 - 19 years 308 33.7 Total 913 100.0 Age at first 10 - 17 years 461 51.0 sexual Total 903 100.0 intercourse Do not remember (6) Missing (5) 5 Secondary (SMP) or above 784 86.4 Level of Below secondary 123 13.6 education Total 907 100.0 Missing (6) 66. Type of Urban 535 58.6 Rural 378 41.4 residence Total 913 100.0 Indonesian Central 313 34.2 Eastern 84 9.2 Total 913 100.0 <tr< td=""><td></td><td>M issin q</td><td>(4)</td><td></td></tr<>		M issin q	(4)	
No	Condom use at		251	27.4
Age at interview*				
Age at interview* 20 - 24 years and sold sold sold sold sold sold sold sol	intercourse	Total	913	100.0
Age at interview* 15 - 19 years 308 33.7 Interview* Total 913 100.0 18 - 24 years 442 49.0 Age at first 10 - 17 years 461 51.0 sexual Total 903 100.0 intercourse Do not remember (6) (6) Missing (5) 5 Level of Below secondary 123 13.6 education Total 907 100.0 Missing (6) 60 60 Type of Rural 378 41.4 residence Total 913 100.0 Indonesian Western 516 56.5 residence* Total 913 100.0 Upper get 94 10.4 Middle 337 37.4 Economic Lower 469 52.1 Total 900 100.0 Missing (13) 100.0 Receiving		20 - 24 years	606	66.3
No.00				
Age at first sexual 10 - 17 years 461 St.0 sexual intercourse Total Ponot remember (6) Missing (5) Secondary (SM P) or above Ponot	ın te rv ie w *	Total	913	100.0
Age at first sexual 10 - 17 years 461 51.0 sexual intercourse Do not remember (6) 903 100.0 Intercourse Do not remember (5) (5) Secondary (SMP) or above 784 86.4 Level of Below secondary 123 13.6 education Total 907 100.0 Missing (6) 6 Type of Rural 378 41.4 residence Tota 913 100.0 Indonesian Central 313 34.2 zone of Eastern 84 9.2 residence* Total 913 100.0 Upper 94 10.4 Economic Lower 469 52.1 status* Total 900 100.0 Missing (13) 100.0 Receiving education on No/don't know 257 28.4 HIV/AIDS at Total 904 100.0		18 - 24 years	442	49.0
intercourse Do not remember Missing (6) Missing (5) Level of education Secondary (SMP) or above 784 86.4 86.4 Level of education Below secondary 123 13.6 123 13.6 education Total 907 100.0 907 100.0 Missing (6) 60 60 Type of residence Rural 378 41.4 41.4 residence Tota 913 100.0 100.0 Indonesian zone of residence* Central 313 34.2 313 34.2 residence* Total 913 100.0 100.0 Upper 94 10.4 4 9.2 Feconomic status* Lower 469 52.1 37.4 Economic status* Lower 469 52.1 52.1 Missing (13) 7 7 Receiving Yes 648 71.6 648 71.6 648 71.6 education on No/don't know 257 28.4 70.0 100.0	Age at first		461	51.0
Missing (5)	sexual	Total	903	100.0
Secondary (SMP) or above 784 86.4	intercourse	Do not remember	(6)	
Level of education Below secondary 123 13.6 education Total Missing 907 100.0 Missing (6) 100.0 Type of residence Urban 535 58.6 Rural 378 41.4 49.2 Indonesian 20ne of residence* Western 20ne 313 56.5 56.5 residence* Eastern 34 9.2 9.2 9.2 9.2 9.2 9.2 9.2 9.2 9.2 9.2 9.2 9.2 9.0 10.0 0.0		M issin g	(5)	
education Total Missing (6) 907 (6) 100.0 Type of residence Urban 378 41.4 378 41.4 Tota 913 100.0 100.0 100.0 Indonesian zone of residence* Western 21 313 34.2 313 34.2 Lower of residence* Eastern 84 9.2 9.2 Upper 94 10.4 913 100.0 100.0 Economic status* Lower 469 52.1 37.4 Economic status* Lower 469 52.1 100.0 Missing (13) 100.0 100.0 Receiving education on No/don't know 257 28.4 100.0 100.0 HIV/AIDS at Total 90.0 100.0		Secondary (SMP) or above	784	86.4
Missing (6)	Level of	Below secondary	123	13.6
Type of residence Urban Rural Rural 378 41.4 residence Tota 913 100.0 Indonesian Zone of residence* Western 516 56.5 Lower Rusal 313 34.2 Zone of residence* Eastern 84 9.2 Total 913 100.0 Upper 94 10.4 Konomic Status* Lower 469 52.1 Total 900 100.0 Missing (13) Receiving education on No/don't know 257 28.4 HIV/AIDS at Total 904 100.0	e d u c a tio n	Total	907	100.0
Type of residence Rural Tota 378 41.4 Indonesian Zone of residence* Western S16 56.5 Indonesian Zone of residence Eastern 84 9.2 Total 913 100.0 Upper 94 10.4 Middle 337 37.4 Lower 469 52.1 Total 900 100.0 Missing (13) Receiving Yes 648 71.6 education on No/don't know 257 28.4 HIV/AIDS at		M issin g	(6)	
Rural 378 41.4 Tota 913 100.0 Indonesian Western 516 56.5 zone of Central 313 34.2 residence* Total 913 100.0 Upper 94 10.4 Economic Middle 337 37.4 Economic Lower 469 52.1 status* Total 900 100.0 Missing (13) Receiving Yes 648 71.6 education on No/don't know 257 28.4 HIV/AIDS at Total 904 100.0	T (Urban	5 3 5	58.6
Tota 913 100.0		Rural	378	41.4
Indonesian Central 313 34.2 20 20 10 10 10 10 10 1	residence	Tota	913	100.0
Zone of residence* Eastern 84 9.2	Ta da a a sia a	W estern	516	56.5
residence* Eastern Total 84 9.2 91.3 100.0 Upper 91 10.4 91.0 Economic Status* Middle 337 37.4 16.0 Economic Status* Lower 469 52.1 16.0 Missing (13) Total 900 100.0 Missing (13) Company 100.0 Receiving education on No/don't know 257 28.4 HIV/AIDS at Total 904 100.0		Central	313	34.2
Total 913 100.0 Upper 94 10.4 Economic Middle 337 37.4 Etatus* Lower 469 52.1 Total 900 100.0 Missing (13) Receiving Yes 648 71.6 education on No/don't know 257 28.4 HIV/AIDS at Total 904 100.0		Eastern	8 4	9.2
Normal N	residence"	Total	913	100.0
Lower 469 52.1	·	Upper	9 4	10.4
Status* Lower Total 469 52.1 900 100.0 Missing (13) (13) Receiving education on No/don't know 1V/AIDS at Total Yes 648 71.6 90.0	Economic	M id d le	3 3 7	37.4
Total 900 100.0		Lower	469	52.1
Receiving Yes 648 71.6 education on No/don't know 257 28.4 HIV/AIDS at Total 904 100.0	Status"	Total	900	100.0
education on No/don't know 257 28.4 HIV/AIDS at Total 904 100.0		M issin g	(13)	
HIV/AIDS at Total 904 100.0	Receiving	Y e s	6 4 8	71.6
	education on	No/don't know	257	28.4
school* Missing (9)	HIV/AIDS at	Total	904	100.0
	school*	M issin g	(9)	

Tabel 2. Prevalence Ratio of Condom Use

	Condom use		Total		
Knowledge on condom function	Yes	No		PR	
For preventing pregnancy				Crude	
Know	236 (29.9%)	553 (70.1%)	789 (100.0%)	2.57 (1.36 – 4.87%)	
Do Not Know	13 (11.6%)	98 (88.4%)	111 (100.0%)	1.00	
For preventing STIs				Crude	
Know	229 (29.8%)	538 (70.2%)	767 (100.0%)	1.97 (1.21 – 3.21)	
Do Not Know	20 (15,1%)	114 (84.9%)	134 (100.0%)	1.00	
3 categories				Crude	
Know both functions	220 (31.0%)	492 (69.0%)	712 (100.0%)	4.17 (1.97 – 8.83)	
Know either one	24 (17.9%)	108 (82.1%)	131 (100.0%)	2.23 (0.90 - 5.51)	
Know none	5 (8.5%)	52 (91.5%)	57 (100.0%)	1.00	
2 categories with bivariate				Crude	
analysis (Chi Square)					
Know both functions	220 (31.0%)	492 (69.0%)	712 (100.0%)	2.05 (1.32 – 3.20)	
Know only one/none	28 (15.1%)	157 (84.9%)	188 (100.0%)	1.00	
2 categories with multivariate					
analysis (Cox regression)					
Know both functions				2.38 (1.47 – 3.85)	
Know only one/none				1.00	

Table 2 shows the prevalence ratio (PR) of condom use among respondents with varied classifications of knowledge on condom functions. Using crude or adjusted PR, it appears that respondents with better knowledge on condom functions always have higher prevalence of condom use. By two categories, the prevalence of condom use is significantly higher in respondents who know both functions of condoms (31%), than in respondents who only know either function or not at all (15.1%). The crude PR is 2.05; 95% CI 1.32-3.20). When compared in 3 categories, those who know both functions have 4 times higher PR than those who know none.

The last row of Table 2 shows the final model that we use to establish the association between knowledge on condom function with condom use in this study. There are initially several models that result in different values of adjusted PR, ranging from 3.08 to 3.05 (not shown), but the CI remains statistically significant. We include variables of age, economic status, Indonesian zone residency, and Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (HIV/AIDS) education at school because they either produce p value of less than 0.15 or are regarded as substantially important by authors to be included in the final model. After considering covariates, the adjusted is PR 2.38 with 95% CI of 1.47 – 3.86.

Stratification analysis in Table 3 shows the association between knowledge of condom function and condom use in various groups. The PR is ranging from 1.44 to 5.14 and the 95% CI almost always statistically significant in all categories. Knowledge of condoms donot seem to have positive association with condom

condom use among groups with younger age, with lower education, who live in rural area, who live in eastern zone of Indonesia, and without education on HIV/ AIDS at school.

Tabel 3. Association between knowledge on condom functions with condom use using stratification

Stratifying Variables	Categories for stratification	PR	95% CI
Age at	20 – 24 years	2.30	1.34 - 3.94
Interview	15 – 19 years	1.61	0.74 - 3.51
Level of	Secondary (SMP)	2.09	1.26 - 3.46
	or above		
education	Below secondary	1.45	0.60 - 3.47
Type of	Urban	2.12	1.20 - 3.75
residence	Rural	1.91	0.94 - 3.87
Indonesian	Western	1.98	1.10 - 3.58
zone of	Central	2.54	1.45 - 4.46
residence	Eastern	1.59	0.62 - 4.12
F	Upper	5.14	1.06 - 24.99
Economic	Middle	2.13	1.02 - 4.45
status	Lower	2.07	1.25 - 3.43
Receiving			
education on	Yes	2.22	1.23 - 4.00
HIV/AIDS at	No	1.44	0.79 - 2.64
school			

Discussion

Bivariate, multivariate, and stratified analyses demonstrate a consistent association between knowledge on condom function with condom use. It is shown that condom use is always more prevalent in the knowledgeable group. Compared to bivariate analysis, multivariate analysis shows lower association because it considers demographic characteristics that may become a confounding, but the figure is still statistically significant (2.38 times higher). According to bivariate

Jurnal Epidemiologi Kesehatan Indonesia Vol. 2, No. 2, Desember 2018

analyses, there is a dose-response relationship in this association because the more condom functions they know of, the more likely they use condoms.

Behavioral theory by Green⁶ supports our findings and it is obviously logical to explain that if one knows the consequences of having sexual intercourse outside marital status and the preventive measures, he is more likely to attempt to do something to prevent them; in this case pregnancy and getting STIs. We have not found an exactly similar study on these variables, but previous researches¹⁰⁻¹² showed that knowledge on preventive health measures are associated with safer sexual behavior, including using condom.

It is still worth noting that there may be other factors outside knowledge that could eventually lead adolescents to practice unprotected sex. Previous studies found that comfort ^{13, 14} and perception of self-vulnerability ^{14, 15} contributed to the final action for using or not using condom.

In this study, we also propose other reasons for not using condom that may interact with knowledge and need further investigation. One of them is the perception about the consequences or disadvantages from STIs and unwanted pregnancies. Someone might know about safer sex and the importance of condom in preventing STIs and unwanted pregnancies, but he may decide not to use it because he is not aware that STIs and pregnancies are something to worry about. As seen in Table 3, there is statistically significant association between knowledge and condom use among group with older age, but the association is not statistically significant in younger age. That could mean that even if someone has the knowledge about condom, his level of maturity may affect mindset, concerns, and priorities which eventually contribute to his final decision.

Similarly, this situation is observed in HIV/AIDS education stratification. The positive association is statistically significant in group with HIV/AIDS education at school but is not in group without HIV/AIDS education at school. That could mean that having knowledge about condom and HIV/AIDS may motivate someone to use condom because he has something to 'fear'. This finding is in line with study by Wang⁽¹⁶⁾ which found that enhancing education on HIV/AIDS may increase condom use.

Other possibilities may include accessibility and affordability as shown by stratification analysis in Table 3 of this study. Knowledge has smaller association to condom use in group with lower economic status, although it remains statistically significant. It could mean that even if someone has the knowledge of condom, he does not use it because he cannot afford it.

Similarly, stratification analyses in zone and types of residency find that association between

knowledge of condom and condom use is not statistically significant in rural group and eastern part of Indonesia. That could mean that in these area condoms may not always be as accessible as they are in urban or western part of Indonesia, so even if someone has the knowledge about condom, he may not still be able to use it because he couldn't access it. However, further studies are needed to confirm the above reasoning.

The main study limitation is that we do not know the specific reason of the respondents for not using condom. It would be useful to conduct further studies with more detailed approaches to understand why sexually-active adolescents do not wear condoms. If possible, it is also advisable to include both male and females as study sample.

Another limitation includes the possible temporal ambiguity as a consequence of cross-sectional design using secondary data because the questionnaire available for analysis is not intentionally designed for this study. However, this study is simply one efficient way to utilize national data to understand the sexual behavior in general population. Existing studies usually focuses on high-risk groups and use small sample size because of culturally sensitive nature of this topic. It is highly challenging to do a research with large sample that is country-representative for general population.

Our findings suggest that it may no longer be relevant for us to 'hide' the information on what is regarded taboo by the society. We have the evidence that least knowledgeable the respondents, the less likely they are they are to use condoms. Considering remarkably growing number of adolescent premarital sex, we put our generation to risk for getting unwanted pregnancies and STIs. Unwanted pregnancy is a complex condition with both short and long term consequences that in the end will become burden to the country. STIs are also a threat to public health because it includes include human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection that certainly poses a risk for a lifelong disability. Additionally, non-HIV infections are as dangerous because although they may be cured, they can affect pregnancy outcomes such as birth defects that eventually lead to disability and low quality of life.

In addition to social and religious consequences, adolescents need to know the health risk of sexual behavior along with its preventive measures. Education on sexual and reproductive health (SRH) for youths is a critical issue that needs to be addressed. Cultural barrier should not get in the way of the young generations to receive the education they deserve. They are entitled to have balanced information which comprises of moralities, religious principles, and cultural values, as well as science-based health literacy.

Conclusion

Having knowledge about condoms is positively associated with safer sex practice among sexually active male adolescents. Unfortunately, majority of Indonesian young people are not adequately informed about the use of condom as specific protection to unwanted pregnancy and STIs. Banning or hiding information on condoms may place sexually-active adolescents into unprotected sex. Education on safe sex practice is needed but should be cautiously tailored to meet

cultural, moral, and religious values.

Recommendation

We suggest further studies to explore the reasons adolescents do not wear condoms during premarital sexual intercouse. These will help us understand their behavior and formulate well-targeted interventions.

In term of sexual and reproductive health education, we recommend a good balance between morality/religious reasoning and medical consequences. Each mean of protection (i.e. abstinence, faithfulness, and condoms) should be disclosed along with its pros and cons so that adolescents can make well-informed decisions.

Acknowledgment

We thank The DHS Program for the data set. The full reports of Indonesia DHS is available for download at http://www.dhsprogram.com/

Referensi

- 1. Pakasi D, Kartikawati R. Between Needs and Taboos: Sexuality and Reproductive Health Education for High School Students. Makara Journal of Research. 2013;17(2).
- 2. Situmorang A. Adolescent Reproductive Health in Indonesia. Jakarta; 2003.
- 3. BPS, BkkbN, Kemenkes RI, ICF International. Indonesia Demographic Health Survey 2012: Adolescent Reproductive Health. Jakarta; 2013.
- 4. BPS, Macro International. Indonesia Young Adult Reproductive Health Survey 2007. Calverton, Maryland; 2008. **5.** WHO, UNFPA, UNAIDS, FHI360. Male latex condom. Specification, prequalification and guidelines for procurement, 2010 (revised 2013). Geneva; 2013.
- 6. Green L, Kreuter M. *Health Promotion Planning: An Educational And Ecological Approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill. : 2005.
- 7. Stanger-Hall KF, Hall DW. Abstinence-only education and teen pregnancy rates: why we need comprehensive sex education in the U.S. PLoS One. 2011;6(10):e24658.
- 8. Yang Z, Gaydos LM. Reasons for and challenges of recent increases in teen birth rates: a study of family planning service policies and demographic changes at the state level. J Adolesc Health. 2010;46(6):517-24.
- 9. The DHS Program. Protecting the privacy of DHS respondents [Available from: https://dhsprogram.com/What-We-Do/Protecting-the-Privacy-of-DHS-Survey-Respondents.cfm.

- 10. Chandran TM, Berkvens D, Chikobvu P, Nöstlinger C, Colebunders R, Williams BG, et al. Predictors of condom use and refusal among the population of Free State province in South Africa. BMC Public Health. 2012;12:381.
- 11. Rock EM, Ireland M, Resnick MD, McNeely CA. A rose by any other name? Objective knowledge, perceived knowledge, and adolescent male condom use. Pediatrics. 2005;115(3):667-72.
- 12. Camlin CS, Chimbwete CE. Does knowing someone with AIDS affect condom use? An analysis from South Africa. AIDS Educ Prev. 2003;15(3):231-44.
- 13. Kegeles SM, Adler NE, Irwin CE. Adolescents and condoms. Associations of beliefs with intentions to use. Am J Dis Child. 1989;143(8):911-5.
- 14. Kegeles SM, Adler NE, Irwin CE. Sexually active adolescents and condoms: changes over one year in knowledge, attitudes and use. Am J Public Health. 1988;78(4):460-1.
- 15. MacPhail C, Campbell C. 'I think condoms are good but, aai, I hate those things': condom use among adolescents and young people in a Southern African township. Soc Sci Med. 2001;52(11):1613-27.
- 16. Wang YC. Individual, interpersonal, and community predictors of consistent condom use among Taiwanese university students. AIDS Care. 2016;28(3):354-8.