

The Effect of Moral Disengagement and Online Disinhibition Effect on Cyberbullying in Adolescent Social Media Users

Annisa Asy Syakira¹, Rahmi Putri Rangkuti², and Rahma Yurliani³

^{1,2,3}Departement of Developmental Psychology,
Faculty of Psychology, University of Sumatera Utara
Medan, Indonesia



Abstract – This study aims to determine whether there is effect of moral disengagement and online disinhibition effect on cyberbullying behavior in adolescent social media users. The sampling technique was conducted using accidental sampling. The participants of this study were 384 adolescents (\bar{x} =15.46 and SD = 1.9). The research measurement tools used three scales, namely the Cyberbullying Offending Scale adapted from Hinduja and Patchin (2015), the Moral Disengagement scale developed by researcher based on Hymell et al (2005) and the Online Disinhibition Effect scale developed by researcher based on Suler (2000). The data analysis technique used is simple regression analysis and multiple regression. The results showed that there was a positive effect of moral disengagement on cyberbullying behavior in adolescent social media users with an effective contribution of 23.4%. In addition, there is a negative effect of online disinhibition effect on cyberbullying behavior in adolescent social media users with an effective contribution of 8.4%. Furthermore, there is an effect of moral disengagement and online disinhibition effect together on cyberbullying behavior in adolescent social media users with an effective contribution of 23.7%. The results of this study can be a reference for further research related to cyberbullying, moral disengagement, and online disinhibition in adolescent social media users.

Keywords – Cyberbullying, Moral Disengagement, Online Disinhibition Effect, Adolescents, Social Media.

I. INTRODUCTION

Cyberbullying has become a major problem in adolescences [1]. Cyberbullying is seen as a new form of traditional bullying behavior. Previously, traditional bullying could occur within the scope of school. Traditional bullying is carried out with physical interaction so that a victim appears. Traditional bullying no longer occurs with the increasing prevalence of the internet, computers and smartphones [15]. The phenomenon of cyberbullying also occurs in Indonesia. A survey conducted by UNICEF on 2,777 Indonesian adolescents found that 66% of adolescents aged 13-17 years were involved in cyberbullying. The most common forms of cyberbullying are harassment through chat applications on social media (45%), distribution of personal photos or videos without permission (41%), and other types of harassment (14%) [21].

The rise of cyberbullying appears on various social media platforms that are accessed in everyday life. Research conducted by the Center for Digital Society, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Gajah Mada University or abbreviated as CfDS entitled Teenager-Related Cyberbullying Case in Indonesia on junior and senior high school students aged 13-18 years in 34 provinces in Indonesia states that 1182 students became perpetrators of cyberbullying on various platforms that are often used in cyberbullying cases, namely Whatsapp, Instagram and Facebook [5].

Cyberbullying has a negative impact physically, psychologically and socially. Physically, cyberbullying causes adolescents to be at risk of excessive online activity and tend to experience insomnia [8;24] Psychologically, cyberbullying can also cause emotional problems, psychosomatics, frustration, depressive symptoms, suicidal ideation and attempts in adolescent cyberbullies

[3;6;17]. Socially, cyberbullying perpetrators have lower social skills than those who are not involved, feel uncomfortable and unsafe at school due to engaging in cyberbullying behavior, and experience social rejection [3;12].

According to Kowalski et al. there are two factors that cause perpetrators to commit cyberbullying, namely individuals and situational. First, individual factors influenced by gender, motive, low empathy, low self esteem, socioeconomic status is in the high category, higher technology use, high moral disengagement, traditional bullying. Second, situational factors influenced by the environment, namely provocation of friends to commit cyberbullying, lack of support from family, poor friendship quality and online disinhibition effect [11].

Moral disengagement is an important predictor that individually affects perpetrators of cyberbullying [11]. According to Gini et al. cyberbullying is carried out closely related to deviant moral reasons, and justification of this behavior to minimize guilt [7]. Another finding from Ouvrein et al. who conducted a study on 1,255 adolescents viewed that negative comments on peers and celebrities did not include cyberbullying behavior. They considered the comments as personal opinions [13]. Various cyberbullying behaviors that are seen as justifying behavior and are appropriate by the perpetrator, namely for jokes, wanting revenge, being angry with the victim, and feeling that they have not caused harm to the victim [17].

Factor situational that influences cyberbullying is the online disinhibition effect [20]. The use of online media supports cyberbullying perpetrators to be different when in the online world compared to the real world. The situation of an online environment that can reach a large number of users gives perpetrators the freedom to share aggressive messages [22]. Perpetrators of cyberbullying perceive an absence of rules or authority and a decrease in psychological control that serves to regulate behavior in online social environments [23]. According to Suler the online disinhibition effect is a difference in the way individuals behave in the online world and the real world. Such behavior would not normally be done in person or face-to-face. In various messages, individuals become different by sharing personal things about themselves openly. They reveal certain emotions, fears and desires. In addition, they also express various messages with harsh language, harsh criticism, anger, hatred, and threats [18].

Based on previous research that has been presented, there are various conditions faced by adolescents, so that they are involved as perpetrators of cyberbullying. This cyberbullying behavior is a natural thing as a justification for behavior that is not morally appropriate and the lack of self-control to behave on social media compared to the real world. Therefore, the researcher views that cyberbullying behavior needs to be studied further by raising the title "The Effect of Moral Disengagement and Online Disinhibition Effect on Cyberbullying in Adolescent Social Media Users".

II. PURPOSE AND METHODS

This study aims to determine the effect of moral disengagement on cyberbullying behavior in adolescent social media users. Then, to determine the effect of online disinhibition effect on cyberbullying behavior in adolescent social media users. In addition, to determine the effect of moral disengagement and online disinhibition effect together on cyberbullying behavior in adolescent social media users.

Participants in this study involved 384 adolescent social media users. Sampling in this study used incidental sampling technique. Data collection used three scales. First, the Cyberbullying Offending Scale adapted from Hinduja and Patchin with confirmatory factor analysis and reliability of 0.7 [16]. Second, the Moral Disengagement Scale developed by the researcher based on Hymell et al which refers to Bandura's theory with exploratory factor analysis and reliability of .9 [10]. Third, the Online Disinhibition Effect Scale developed by researchers based on Suler with exploratory factor analysis and reliability of .74 [18].

Cyberbullying Offending Scale of this research uses a likert scale with total of 4 items consisting of four answer choices, namely often 3, several times 2, once 1 and never 0. Moral Disengagement Scale uses a likert scale with total of 13 items consisting of four answer choices, namely strongly agree score 4, agree score 3, disagree score 2 and strongly disagree score 1, and Online Disinhibition Effect Scale with total of 11 items consisting of four answer choices, namely strongly agree score 4, agree score 3, disagree score 2 and strongly disagree score 1. The analysis technique used in this study is simple and multiple regression analysis.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results of statistical analysis on the first hypothesis, the influence of moral disengagement on cyberbullying behavior. This hypothesis was tested and analyzed through simple linear regression using JASP .16.

Table 1. Analysis of the Effective Contribution of the influence of moral disengagement on cyberbullying behavior

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	RMSE	Durbin-Watson	
					Autocorrelation	Statistic
H ₁	.484	.234	.232	.736	.469	1.051

Based on the table above, the correlation coefficient (R) value is 0.484 which shows that the effect given is in the medium category. Then, the coefficient of determination (R²) is 0.234. This value indicates that the effective contribution of the effect of moral disengagement on cyberbullying behavior is 23.4%.

Table 2. P and F Values

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
H ₁	Regression	63.302	1	63.302	116.706	< .001
	Residual	207.198	382	0.542		
	Total	270.500	383			

Base on the table above, F statistic value (1,382) is 116.706, with a significance value of $p < .001$ ($p < .05$), so H₀ is rejected. This shows that there is a significant effect of moral disengagement on cyberbullying behavior.

Table 3. Analysis of the Direct Role of Moral Disengagement on Cyberbullying Behavior

Model		Unstandardized	Standard Error	Standardized	T	P
H ₁	(Intercept)	1.749	.782		2.236	.026
	MD	.180	.017	.484	10.803	< .001

Based on the table above, the standardized value is .484 with a t of 10.803 and a significance value of .001 ($p < .05$). The regression equation obtained $Y = 1.749 + .180 X_1$, meaning that every moral disengagement increases by 1 unit, cyberbullying behavior will increase to 1.749. This shows that moral disengagement has a positive effect on cyberbullying.

Then, the results of statistical analysis on the second hypothesis, the influence of online disinhibition effect on cyberbullying behavior. This hypothesis was tested and analyzed through simple linear regression using JASP .16.

Table 4. Analysis of the Effective Contribution of the influence of Online Disinhibition Effect on cyberbullying behavior

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	RMSE	Durbin-Watson	
					Autocorrelation	Statistic
H ₁	.290	.084	.082	.805	.486	1.021

Based on the table above, the correlation coefficient (R) value is 0.290 which shows that the effect given is in the small category. Then, the coefficient of determination (R²) is 0.084. This value indicates that the effective contribution of the effect of online disinhibition effect on cyberbullying behavior is 8.4%.

Table 5. P and F Values

Model		<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
H ₁	Regression	22.798	1	22.798	35.159	1.000
	Residual	247.702	382	0.648		
	Total	270.500	383			

Based on the table above, the statistical value of F (1,382) is 35.159, with a significance value of p of 1.000, so H₀ is accepted. This shows that there is no positive effect of online disinhibition on cyberbullying behavior.

Table 6. Analysis of the Direct Role of Online Disinhibition Effect on Cyberbullying Behavior

Model		<i>Unstandardized</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>Standardized</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>P</i>
H ₁	(Intercept)	11.577	.238		48.661	< .001
	OD	-.047	.008	-.290	-5.930	< .001

Based on the table above, the Standardized value is at -.290 with a t of -5.930 and a significant value of .001 (p < .005). The regression equation is obtained $Y = 11.577 - .047 X_2$, meaning that every online disinhibition effect decreases by 1 unit, cyberbullying behavior will decrease to 11.577. This shows that the online disinhibition effect has a negative effect on cyberbullying.

Then, the results of statistical analysis on the third hypothesis, the effect of moral disengagement and online disinhibition effect together on cyberbullying behavior. This hypothesis was tested and analyzed through multiple regression using JASP .16.

Table 7. Analysis of the Effective Contribution of the influence of moral disengagement and online disinhibition effect together on cyberbullying behavior

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	RMSE	Durbin-Watson	
					Autocorrelation	Statistic
H ₁	.486	.237	.233	.736	.460	1.068

Based on the table above, the correlation coefficient (R) value is 0.486 which shows that the effect given is in the medium category. Then, the coefficient of determination (R²) is 0.237. This value indicates that the effective contribution of the effect of moral disengagement and online disinhibition effect together on cyberbullying behavior is 23.7%.

Table 8. P and F Values

Model		<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
H ₁	Regression	64.017	2	32.008	59.061	< .001
	Residual	206.483	381	0.542		
	Total	270.500	383			

Based on the table above, F statistical value (2,381) is 59.061 with a significance value of $p < .001$ ($p < .05$), so H₀ is rejected. This shows that there is a significant effect of moral disengagement and online disinhibition effect together on cyberbullying behavior.

Table 9. Analysis of the Direct Role of Moral Disengagement on Cyberbullying Behavior

Model		<i>Unstandardized</i>	<i>Standar Error</i>	<i>Standardized</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Status</i>
H ₁	(Intercept)	2.564	1.056		2.4	.016	
	MD	.168	.019	.453	8.7	<.001	Significant
	OD	-.010	.008	-.060	-1.1	.252	Not Significant

The standardized value of the moral disengagement variable is .453 and the regression coefficient of moral disengagement is .168 with a significance value of $p = .001$ ($p < .05$). However, the standardized value of the online disinhibition effect variable is -.060 and the online disinhibition effect regression coefficient is -.010 with a significance value of $p = .252$ ($p > .05$). This shows that only the direct role of moral disengagement variables affects cyberbullying behavior. Meanwhile, the effect exerted directly by the online disinhibition effect on cyberbullying is not significant.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of research conducted on 384 adolescent social media users, the main results of the data analysis showed that the first hypothesis was rejected with R value = .484, R square = .234, F value (1,382) = 116.706, and p value <.001 ($p < .05$). This means, moral disengagement has a positive and significant effect on cyberbullying behavior which is in the moderate category with an effective contribution of 23.4%. Previous research, Zhao and You conducted a meta-analysis study on 31,524 adolescents found that there was a positive effect of moral disengagement on cyberbullying behavior in the moderate category with a correlation coefficient (R) of .319. The results of the study found that adolescents did not take cyberbullying behavior seriously as a dangerous act so that the consequences received did not cause negative feelings for the perpetrator such as guilt, shame, lack of empathy and responsibility for the victim [25]. Another study conducted by Bussey et al. on 540 adolescents (11-15 years) found a positive effect of moral disengagement on cyberbullying behavior with a correlation coefficient (R) level in the moderate category of .47. This study found that moral disengagement acts as self-defense and revenge for adolescents to commit cyberbullying. Adolescents have the belief that cyberbullying behavior is normal. Adolescents compare themselves with others. Adolescents conclude that others are physically, verbally, or relationally stronger than themselves, so that if they do not hurt others, they will still be victimized [4].

The results of data analysis show that the second hypothesis is accepted with R value = -.290, R square value = .084, F value (1,382) = 35.159, and p value = 1.000. This means that there is no positive influence of the online disinhibition effect on cyberbullying behavior in adolescent social media users. The direction of influence provided by the online disinhibition effect is negative with a small category and an effective contribution of 8.4%. Meanwhile, previous research conducted by Tanrikulu and Erdur-Barker on 395 adolescents with different levels of education found that there was a negative influence of online

disinhibition effect on cyberbullying behavior with a correlation coefficient in the small category of .11 with an effective contribution of 12%. Adolescents with a higher online disinhibition effect tend to be more open to interacting in the online or virtual world so that the possibility of cyberbullying is low. However, this is difficult to explain further. The results of this study explain that adolescents are exposed to cyberbullying as a negative impact of internet use. Adolescents engage in cyberbullying behavior when they feel embarrassed by the cyberbullying behavior they receive. Therefore, adolescents have a desire for revenge to carry out cyberbullying behavior so as to direct adolescents to behave more aggressively, more boldly when in the online or virtual world [19].

The results of data analysis show that the third hypothesis is rejected with an R value = .486, R square value = .237, F value (2,381) = 59.06, p value <.001 (p <.05). That is, there is an effect of moral disengagement and online disinhibition effect together affecting cyberbullying behavior in adolescent media users classified as moderate with an effective contribution of 23.7%. Previous research examines various factors that influence cyberbullying. One study conducted by Kowalski et al found that there are significant risk factors that lead to cyberbullying behavior with a level of correlation coefficient (R) from small to medium, namely traditional bullying (R = .45), anger (R = .20), moral disengagement (R = .27), risky online behavior (R = .23) and frequency of internet use (R = .20). Furthermore, the results of the study also found significant protective factors affecting cyberbullying behavior with a low correlation coefficient level, namely school climate (R = -.11), school safety (R = -.22) and support from family (R = -.08) [11].

REFERENCES

- [1]. Anderson, M., & Jiang, J. (t.t.). *Teens, Social Media & Technology* 2018. 10.
- [2]. APJII. (2023). *Survei Penetrasi dan Perilaku Internet 2023*. Asosiasi Penyelenggara Jasa Internet Indonesia, 1–146. <https://apjii.or.id/survei>
- [3]. Bottino, S. M. B., Bottino, C. M. C., Regina, C. G., Correia, A. V. L., & Ribeiro, W. S. (2015). Cyberbullying and adolescent mental health: Systematic review. *Cadernos de Saúde Pública*, 31(3), 463–475. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-311x00036114>
- [4]. Bussey, K., Luo, A., Fitzpatrick, S., & Allison, K. (2020). Defending victims of cyberbullying: The role of self-efficacy and moral disengagement. *Journal of School Psychology*, 78, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2019.11.006>
- [5]. CfDS. (2021). *Teenager- Related Cyberbullying Case in Indonesia*. Center for Digital Society, 1-24.
- [6]. Donegan, R. (t.t.). *Bullying and Cyberbullying: History, Statistics, Law, Prevention and Analysis*. 10.
- [7]. Gini, G., Pozzoli, T., & Hymel, S. (2014). Moral disengagement among children and youth: A meta-analytic review of links to aggressive behavior: Moral Disengagement and Aggressive Behavior. *Aggressive Behavior*, 40(1), 56–68. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21502>
- [8]. Görzig, A., & Ólafsson, K. (2013). What Makes a Bully a Cyberbully? Unravelling the Characteristics of Cyberbullies across Twenty-Five European Countries. *Journal of Children and Media*, 7(1), 9–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17482798.2012.739756>.
- [9]. Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2010). Bullying, Cyberbullying, and Suicide. *Archives of Suicide Research*, 14(3), 206–221. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13811118.2010.494133>
- [10]. Hymel, S., Rocke-Henderson, N., & Bonanno, R. A. (2005). *Moral Disengagement: A Framework for Understanding Bullying Among Adolescents*. 11.
- [11]. Kowalski, R. M., Giumetti, G. W., Schroeder, A. N., & Lattanner, M. R. (2014). Bullying in the digital age: A critical review and meta-analysis of cyberbullying research among youth. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140(4), 1073–1137. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035618>
- [12]. Lapidot-Lefler, N., & Dolev-Cohen, M. (2015). Comparing cyberbullying and school bullying among school students: Prevalence, gender, and grade level differences. *Social Psychology of Education*, 18(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-014-9280-8>

- [13]. Ouvrein, G., Vandebosch, H., & De Backer, C. J. S. (2017). Celebrity critiquing: Hot or not? Teen girls' attitudes on and responses to the practice of negative celebrity critiquing. *Celebrity Studies*, 8(3), 461–476. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19392397.2017.1307126>
- [14]. Ouvrein, G., Vandebosch, H., & De Backer, C. J. S. (2019). Celebrities' Experience with Cyberbullying: A Framing Analysis of Celebrity Stories in Online News Articles in Teen Magazines. Dalam H. Vandebosch & L. Green (Ed.), *Narratives in Research and Interventions on Cyberbullying among Young People* (hlm. 181–198). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-04960-7_12
- [15]. Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2006). Bullies Move Beyond the Schoolyard: A Preliminary Look at Cyberbullying. Dalam T. Lomand, *Social Science Research* (0 ed., hlm. 28–41). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315265841-8>
- [16]. Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2015). Measuring cyberbullying: Implications for research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 23, 69–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2015.05.013>
- [17]. Pornari, C. D., & Wood, J. (2010). Peer and cyber aggression in secondary school students: The role of moral disengagement, hostile attribution bias, and outcome expectancies. *Aggressive Behavior*, 36(2), 81–94. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20336>
- [18]. Suler, J. (2000.). *The Online Disinhibition Effect*. 6.
- [19]. Tanrikulu, I & Erdur-Barker. (2019). Motives Behind Cyberbullying Perpetration: A Test of Uses and Gratifications Theory. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518819882>
- [20]. Udris, R. (2014). Cyberbullying among high school students in Japan: Development and validation of the Online Disinhibition Scale. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 41, 253–261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.09.036>
- [21]. UNICEF. (2020). Bullying in Indonesia. Diunduh dari <https://www.unicef.org/indonesia/media/5606/file/Bullying>
- [22]. Voggeser, B. J., Singh, R. K., & Göritz, A. S. (2018). Self-control in Online Discussions: Disinhibited Online Behavior as a Failure to Recognize Social Cues. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 2372. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02372>
- [23]. Wright, M. F., Harper, B. D., & Wachs, S. (2019). The associations between cyberbullying and callous-unemotional traits among adolescents: The moderating effect of online disinhibition. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 140, 41–45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.04.001>
- [24]. Wright, M & Pendergrass, W.S. (2014). Cyberbullied To Death: An Analysis Of Victims Taken From Recent Events. *Issues In Information Systems*. https://doi.org/10.48009/1_iis_2014_132-140
- [25]. Zhao, L & Yu, J. (2021). A Meta-Analytic Review of Moral Disengagement and Cyberbullying. *Frontiers Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.681299>