Discourse: Indonesian Journal of Social Studies and Education
Vol. 4 No. 1, November 2026, pp. 177-196
ISSN: 3032-6516, DOI: 10.69875/djosse.v4i1.578

The Role of Moral Foundations in Predicting Cyber Aggression among University Students

Ramadhani Arya Laksana[1*], Miftahun Najah[2]

[1,2]Departement of Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Universitas Negeri Semarang

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received: August 24, 2026
Revised: October 19, 2026
Accepted: November 01, 2026

Keywords:
Cyberaggression;
Moral Foundations;
Moral Foundation Theory;
Social Media;
University Student.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license. Copyright © 2026 by Author. Published by PT Citra Media Publishing.

ABSTRACT

College students increasingly use social media to exchange ideas, express opinions, and engage with social and political issues. However, differences in values and political orientations may develop into hostile responses that can escalate into cyber aggression. One psychological factor potentially associated with such behavior is moral foundations, which shape how individuals judge right and wrong. This study aimed to examine the ability of six moral foundations care, equality, loyalty, authority, purity, and proportionality to predict cyber aggression among college students who use social media. A quantitative correlational design was employed involving 208 college students aged 18–25 years, selected through incidental sampling. Data were analyzed using multiple linear regression. The results showed that the regression model explained 47% of the variance in cyber aggression. Care, authority, and proportionality significantly predicted lower levels of cyber aggression, whereas equality significantly predicted higher levels. The positive association between equality and cyber aggression may plausibly be related to moral outrage in response to situations perceived as unjust; however, this explanation remains speculative because moral outrage was not directly measured. Loyalty and purity were not significant predictors. These findings suggest that each moral foundation may relate to cyber aggression through distinct psychological processes, highlighting the importance of examining individual foundations rather than relying solely on broader individualizing and binding categories.

INTRODUCTION

Social media has become an inseparable part of university students' lives, whether for communication, accessing information, or discussing social and political issues. Indonesia has a very high level of social media use, with 143 million active users (Statista, 2025) and 235 million internet users at a penetration rate of 81.72 percent (APJII, 2026). University students, as part of Generation Z, are recorded as the generation with the highest contribution to internet use (39.83 percent) and the third-highest in social media use (25 percent) (APJII, 2026). This makes university students highly exposed to the dynamics of online communication, including discussions of sensitive social and political issues. The phenomenon of unbalanced information exposure between candidate supporters during Indonesia's 2019 election (Maulana & Situngkir, 2021) is consistent with group polarization theory, which states that repeated interaction within an echo chamber can push users' attitudes toward more extreme positions against opposing groups (Sunstein, 2002) as cited in Cinelli et al. (2021), potentially contributing to the emergence of aggressive digital behavior. Moreover, cyber aggression in the digital world is closely linked to politics (Napitupulu & Fatmawiyati, 2025).

Online aggression is often triggered by disagreement rather than occurring without

Corresponding author: Ramadhani Arya Laksana
E-mail addresses: ramadhaniaryalaksana@students.unnes.ac.id

reason, particularly when political conflict and tensions between social groups become involved. Hostility between groups may occurred in the form of intimidation or personal attacks against people with different political views, creating challenges for constructive democratic discourse (Domalewska, 2025; Nurhayati & Suryadi, 2017). Moreover, social media also plays a role by providing access to political issues (Hemay et al., 2026; Setiawati et al., 2023), shaping political preferences (Kusumawardani et al., 2025) and reinforcing political participation (Robiyanti et al., 2024). Hence, political engagement such as demonstrations transforms into different forms of digital activism on social media (Abdurrahman, 2026; Anggraheni et al., 2021). When differences in political views are accompanied by hostility, common interaction can develop into cyber aggression. Several pieces of evidence from Indonesia show that cyber aggression has become increasingly common among university students in the form of verbal attacks such as insults and cyberbullying (Hanika et al., 2021), body shaming and personal mockery (Wahyuningrum et al., 2023), and even cyberstalking with a prevalence of 62.55 percent (Rahmi et al., 2025). These findings indicate that students may expose themselves to aggressive interactions on social media with consequences for their academic and social well-being.

This behavior is commonly described as cyber aggression, which refers to intentional acts carried out through online platforms to harm others, including hostile language, insults, threats, and offensive comments that create discomfort or cause harm to individuals or communities (Mane et al., 2025). Unlike conventional aggression, which usually involves direct contact, cyber aggression occurs through rapid online communication, making it easier to respond impulsively because physical presence and many social restraints found in face-to-face interactions are absent.

Students do not engage in cyber aggression solely because of emotional or social influences. The way they make moral judgments about a situation also shapes how they respond. One concept that helps explain this process is moral intuition, which refers to an immediate judgment of right and wrong that arises before people consciously reason about a situation (Prabhu et al., 2020). This intuitive mechanism enables the actor to respond quickly without deep reflection, so emotion and moral justification can be expressed instantly, particularly in discussions of sensitive issues such as politics, religion, or group identity (Prabhu et al., 2020). This study approaches this process through Moral Foundations Theory, which identifies the specific value domains such as care, equality, and loyalty that shape these intuitive judgments. Differences in moral value orientation make some students more sensitive to issues of fairness and individual protection. In contrast, others place greater emphasis on group interests and adherence to social norms, shaping the direction and intensity of students' reactions when values they consider important are perceived as threatened.

Meanwhile political behavior in Indonesia is commonly focused on social dominance orientation as the predictor (Fitriannisa & Najah, 2026; Napitupulu & Fatmawiyati, 2025), social conformity (Pradika Rakasiwy & Surya Cipta, 2025), cultural identity (Nasir & Asis, 2026), social media and mass media role (Utomo et al., 2026). Moral intuition has been recognized as strong predictor of political behaviors (Marchetti, 2023). One of the most renowned theoretical framework to explain this phenomena is moral foundations theory (Gehman et al., 2021).

On the other hand, research on students' aggressive digital behavior has focused solely on the phenomena of cyberbullying, cyberstalking, online verbal aggression or cyberhate

(Hanika et al., 2021; Nurhadiyanto et al., 2023; Wahyuningrum et al., 2023) or on internal factors such as emotional intelligence, self-control, and moral disengagement (Koroh et al., 2025; Laraswati & Moesarofah, 2025). However, research has not examined moral disengagement in socio-political discussions, even though students are an active group in public debate and are prone to becoming emotionally engaged in digital spaces. Meanwhile, research on moral foundations in Indonesia and abroad has largely focused on general moral development and how moral values shape judgments of public issues (Prabhu et al., 2020; Rianto, 2021), without integrating it with the specific phenomenon of cyber aggression, so that cyber aggression is more often explained merely as an emotional outburst without considering the role of the intuitive moral drive underlying students' defense of values and moral identity in digital discussions.

Cyber aggression can be understood through four motives, namely rage, arising from impulsive drives triggered by intense frustration; revenge, reflecting planned aggression aimed at retaliating against another party; reward, planned aggression carried out to gain some benefit; and recreation, impulsive aggression carried out for personal enjoyment despite harming others (Howard 2011, as cited in Aprillia, 2024).

Theoretically, cyber aggression is often distinguished from cyberbullying. Cyber aggression does not require a power imbalance or repetition, as cyberbullying does, making it better suited to explain student interactions involving spontaneous, mutual verbal attacks in digital debates (Setyoningsih & Srianturi, 2024). This form of verbal aggression frequently appears as flaming, an emotional outburst of comments delivered impulsively when an individual feels offended or provoked in an online discussion (Isabel & Wijaya, 2022), indicating users' tendency to rely on language as a tool of attack due to the intense nature of online conversation (Nofriandi & Mardianto, 2022).

Psychological factors such as the need to defense self-esteem, when students feel their opinions or identity are being attacked in online discussions, plays important role (Nofriandi & Mardianto, 2022). Low self-control further increases the risk of aggressive action, as individuals are unable to restrain their impulses when frustrated (Hanika et al., 2021), while moral disengagement allows students to justify such behavior through particular rationalizations, making it seem morally acceptable (Laraswati & Moesarofah, 2025).

Beyond psychological factors, the nature of digital spaces also strengthen the tendency toward cyber aggression. Online interaction makes students more likely to express negative expression and post comments they might not articulate in a face-to-face situation (Anggoro & Santosa, 2024), while group norms that justify harsh communication styles reinforce students into developing patterns of online aggression (Rahmi et al., 2025), particularly provocative comments on sensitive issues that trigger emotional reactions (Isabel & Wijaya, 2022).

Moral Foundations Theory (MFT) explains that human moral responses are rooted in a set of universal moral foundations that are nonetheless shaped by social experience, culture, and everyday interactional context (Simpson, 2017), and which operate intuitively and automatically when individuals encounter a value violation (Atari et al., 2023). These moral foundations are divided into individualizing foundations, which focus on protecting the individual through care and equality, and binding foundations, which emphasize group cohesion through proportionality, loyalty, authority, and purity (Atari et al., 2023), and recent empirical validation has shown that these moral foundations consistently predict

variation in emotional responses to sensitive public issues (Zakharin & Bates, 2023). Since its construction, this theory has been tested in various context including politic and ethical decision making (Gehman et al., 2021; Kivikangas et al., 2021; Nath et al., 2021; Nilsson et al., 2020; Zakharin & Bates, 2026), demonstrating its applicability in explaining how moral foundations shape judgement and behavior. Previous research has also extended the application of Moral Foundations Theory to online context such as cyberhate (Kim et al., 2022).

In students' digital interactions, these moral foundations form a framework that determines how a person interprets provocation or norm violation, so that when a cherished value is challenged in an online discussion, the resulting response may take the form of a strong defense through digital verbal attacks as a means of preserving their moral and social identity. Research has shown that moral emotions among students operate automatically and outside conscious awareness, and that the resulting responses are strongly shaped by moral orientations already ingrained within the individual (Septiana et al., 2020). Moral foundations do not stop at the stage of judgment but is also reflected in actual behavior, such as empathy, defense of values, or resistance to views considered contradictory, and a strong intuitive commitment to a particular foundation can increase the likelihood of aggressive behavior when an individual feels their moral values have been violated (Atari et al., 2023).

The online disinhibition effect, the tendency for individuals to become more open or aggressive due to reduced social restraint online, particularly when personal identity is not fully visible (Anggoro & Santosa, 2024; Haqie et al., 2024), together with the Social Identity Model of Deindividuation Effects (SIDE), which explains that anonymity strengthens group-based social identity while reducing personal accountability (Olifia et al., 2025; Spears, 2017), help contextualize why moral judgments in digital spaces are expressed more readily and with fewer restraints than in face-to-face settings. However, these frameworks were not directly measured in this study and are presented here only to situate the online context in which moral foundations operate. They do not fully explain the internal motive behind why students choose to respond aggressively, which is why the intuitive moral drive examined through Moral Foundations Theory remains central to understanding why individuals feel their actions can be ethically justified (Rianto, 2021).

This study introduces a new approach by examining the six moral foundations proposed in Moral Foundations Theory as internal factors that may either inhibit or trigger cyber aggression when students engage in digital debates on political and social issues. Students were selected as participants because they are Indonesia's most active social media users and are recognized as critical agents of change on socio-political issues (Syahputri & Katimin, 2024). This approach enriches the understanding of how moral values related to political tendency predict cyber aggression. Based on the discussion above, this study asks whether moral foundations predict cyber aggression among student social media users and whether the six foundations show varying patterns of association with cyber aggression. Accordingly, this study aims to examine the predictive role of the six moral foundations on cyber aggression among student social media users, and to test whether each foundation shows a distinct pattern of association with this tendency.

Prior research suggests that the six moral foundations may relate differently to tendencies associated with hostility and antisocial behavior. Care has been shown to correlate negatively with psychopathic traits and social dominance orientation, consistent

with its basis in empathic concern for others' suffering (Atari et al., 2023). Equality, in contrast, has shown a positive correlation with psychopathic traits despite its individualizing classification, suggesting that a strong equality orientation does not straightforwardly translate into protective behavior (Atari et al., 2023). Loyalty, defined as intuitions about cooperating with ingroups and competing with outgroups, has shown no meaningful association with psychopathic traits or social dominance orientation, suggesting that its relevance to hostile behavior may depend on whether a situation is explicitly framed as intergroup conflict rather than reflecting a general individual-level tendency (Atari et al., 2023). Authority shows a more complex pattern: individuals high in authority tend to value authoritarian submission alongside authoritarian aggression, yet authority is also conceptually tied to self-restraint within an agreed hierarchy (Atari et al., 2023). Purity has been linked to heightened psychopathic traits and social dominance orientation, and operates primarily through aversion and avoidance rather than confrontation (Atari et al., 2023). Proportionality, concerned with rewarding individuals in proportion to their merit or contribution, has likewise shown a positive correlation with both psychopathic traits and social dominance orientation, leaving open whether its emphasis on accountability functions protectively or instead justifies unequal treatment (Atari et al., 2023).

These mixed patterns suggest that the individualizing-binding classification may not consistently predict how each foundation relates to hostile or aggressive tendencies. Although no prior study has directly examined these foundations in relation to cyber aggression, their associations with psychopathic traits and social dominance orientation offer an initial indication that hostility-related tendencies do not necessarily follow this dichotomy either. This study therefore examines each foundation's association with cyber aggression individually rather than assuming uniformity within its broader category.

Based on this rationale, the null hypothesis (H0) states that the six moral foundations, namely care, equality, loyalty, authority, purity, and proportionality, do not jointly and significantly predict cyber aggression among university students who use social media. In contrast, the alternative hypothesis (H1) states that these six foundations jointly and significantly predict cyber aggression in the same population. Beyond this joint test, the study also asks whether the pattern of influence across the six moral foundations follows the individualizing-binding dichotomy, or whether each foundation shows its own distinct direction of association with cyber aggression (RQ1).

METHOD

This study used a quantitative correlational design to examine the relationship between moral foundations (independent variables) and cyber aggression (dependent variable) without manipulating any variable (Sugiyono, 2022). The quantitative approach was used because it allowed variables to be measured objectively through numerical data analyzed with statistical procedures (Sodik & Siyoto, 2015), while multiple linear regression analysis was chosen to examine the direction and magnitude of each moral foundation’s contribution to cyber aggression as a technique that models predictive relationships between variables in correlational studies (Kartiningrum et al., 2022).

The preparation stage involved constructing both instruments, testing initial validity and reliability, and developing a digital questionnaire through Google Forms that included an informed consent sheet stating the purpose, benefits, participant criteria, and assurance of data confidentiality, with inclusion criteria limited to students aged 18 to 25 years who actively used social media. The questionnaire link was then distributed across various social

media platforms to prospective participants who met the criteria until the number of respondents was sufficient for analysis; the collected data were then screened for completeness and conformity with the inclusion criteria and analyzed using Jamovi with multiple linear regression.

Participants in this study were active university students aged 18 to 25 years in Indonesia who used social media regularly, for at least 1 hour per day, and who held active accounts on platforms such as Instagram, X, TikTok, or Facebook, selected because this group shows a high intensity of social media use, frequently engages in public discussions and socio-political issues, and is more exposed to and involved in online interactions that may give rise to cyber aggression (Al-Ra'zie & Apriyanto, 2025; Syahputri & Katimin, 2024). Participants were recruited through incidental sampling, a technique in which anyone who meets the researcher and is deemed suitable as a data source can be included in the sample (Sugiyono, 2022). The minimum number of participants was determined through a power analysis in G*Power using a linear multiple regression fixed model with a single predictor ($f^2 = 0.15$), a significance level of 0.05, and a power of 0.95, yielding a minimum requirement of 146 participants.

Data collection relied on two instruments. The first was the Cyber-Aggression Typology Questionnaire (CATQ) developed by Runions et al. (2017) to identify cyber aggression behavior based on four primary motives, namely rage, revenge, reward, and recreation, which had been adapted into Indonesian by Aprillia (2024) through a standard adaptation procedure comprising forward translation, back-translation, harmonization, readability testing, and psychometric testing, yielding good reliability (Cronbach's Alpha of 0.785-0.884) and good internal structural validity (CFI = 0.95, TLI = 0.99, RMSEA = 0.061, WRMR = 0.905) (Aprillia, 2024; Runions et al., 2017).

The second was the Moral Foundations Questionnaire-2 (MFQ-2) developed by Atari et al. (2023) as a refinement of the original MFQ, consisting of 36 items measuring six moral foundations: care, equality, loyalty, authority, purity, and proportionality. Because it had no official Indonesian-language adaptation, the instrument was adapted for this study. Reliability testing showed Cronbach's Alpha values for each foundation in the acceptable to good range, namely 0.835 for care, 0.773 for equality, 0.776 for loyalty, 0.810 for authority, 0.744 for purity, and 0.837 for proportionality, with item total correlation coefficients across all foundations ranging from 0.346 to 0.714, so that all items were declared valid as they exceeded the 0.30 threshold (Sugiyono, 2022). Structural validity testing through confirmatory factor analysis, conducted separately for each foundation, showed generally good model fit, with CFI ranging from 0.931 to 0.988, TLI from 0.886 to 0.980, and SRMR from 0.031 to 0.050 across all six foundations. In contrast, RMSEA ranged from 0.049 to 0.105, with higher values for loyalty and proportionality most likely reflecting RMSEA's general instability in models with small degrees of freedom rather than indicating a substantial structural problem.

Data analysis was carried out in several stages. Instrument quality testing included a validity test using the item total correlation technique, in which an item was considered valid if its correlation coefficient exceeded 0.30 (Sugiyono, 2022), as well as a reliability test using Cronbach's Alpha, in which a value of α greater than or equal to 0.70 indicated good internal consistency (Sodik & Siyoto, 2015). Classical assumption tests, comprising normality and linearity tests, were then conducted as prerequisites for regression analysis, before multiple linear regression was used to examine the predictive relationship and the

magnitude of each moral foundation's effect on cyber aggression, not to establish absolute causality but to model the functional relationship between variables statistically (Kartiningrum et al., 2022; Sugiyono, 2022). This study used cross-sectional, numerical data from a self-report questionnaire measured on an interval scale, and each analysis stage is presented in tables summarizing descriptive statistics, assumption test results, and regression coefficients.

Before the main analysis, we examined the 239 screened data points for outliers because unusual scores can bias parameter estimates and, to an even greater extent, the standard errors, confidence intervals, and p-values derived from them (Field, 2024). We identified outliers visually using boxplots in Jamovi for all variables included in the analysis: the six moral foundations and cyber aggression. Following the convention described by Field (2024), scores plotted as individual points beyond the whiskers of the boxplot, that is, scores lying more than 1.5 times the interquartile range above the upper quartile or below the lower quartile, were classified as outliers. We removed outlier data points one at a time and re-inspected the boxplots after each removal. This procedure was repeated until no data points remained outside the whiskers of any boxplot, resulting in the removal of 31 cases and a final sample of 208 data points. This exclusion was intended to reduce bias in the model estimates, and the same rule was applied to all variables.

RESULT

Data collection was conducted on 240 subjects, and after the screening process, 239 data points were found to match the research characteristics. In contrast, 1 data point was excluded because the respondent was not an active student and was older than 25 years. Of these 239 data points, 208 were retained for analysis after 31 data points identified as outliers were removed through the boxplot-based procedure described in the Method section.

Table 1. Overview of Research Subjects

Category	Subcategory	Number of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	75	36.1
	Female	133	63.9
Age	18	7	3.4
	19	32	15.4
	20	60	28.8
	21	46	22.1
	22	29	13.9
	23	15	7.2
	24	11	5.3
	25	8	3.8
Average Daily Use	< 1 hour	10	4.8
	1-3 hours	47	22.6
	3-5 hours	82	39.4
	> 5 hours	69	33.2

As shown in Table 1, the research subjects were predominantly female (133 individuals, 63.9%), while male subjects accounted for 75 individuals (36.1%). In terms of

age, the 20-year-old group was the largest (28.8%), followed by the 21-year-old group (22.1%) and the 19-year-old group (15.4%), with the remainder distributed across the 18- to 25-year age range. Based on average daily social media use, the majority of subjects fell into the 3-5 hour category (39.4%), followed by the more-than-5-hour category (33.2%), indicating that nearly three-quarters of the subjects were high-intensity social media users.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics

Variable	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Cyber Aggression	208	36	101	60.00	16.5
Care	208	14	30	23.4	4.12
Equality	208	8	30	20.0	4.53
Loyalty	208	11	30	22.3	3.99
Authority	208	12	30	23.2	4.13
Purity	208	12	30	23.0	4.00
Proportionality	208	12	30	23.5	4.29

The descriptive analysis results in Table 2 show that cyber aggression scores ranged from 36 to 101, with a mean of 60.0 (SD = 16.5), indicating that subjects' overall level of cyber aggression fell within the moderate category, with considerable variation across individuals. For the moral foundations, all aspects showed relatively high and closely clustered mean scores, namely care (M = 23.4), loyalty (M = 22.3), authority (M = 23.2), purity (M = 23.0), and proportionality (M = 23.5), except equality, which had the lowest mean among all aspects (M = 20.0).

Table 3. Normality Test Results

Variable	Statistic	df	Sig.
Unstandardized Residual	0.993	208	0.403

Before conducting the regression analysis, this study verified that the data met the normality assumption. The Shapiro-Wilk test results in Table 3 showed a statistic of 0.993 and a significance value of 0.403 ($p > 0.05$), indicating that the unstandardized residuals were normally distributed and that this assumption was met.

Table 4. Collinearity Test Results

Variable	VIF	Tolerance
Care	2.41	0.415
Equality	1.41	0.711
Loyalty	2.66	0.376
Authority	3.53	0.283
Purity	2.79	0.358
Proportionality	2.90	0.345

In addition to the normality test, a multicollinearity test was performed to ensure that no excessive association existed among the independent variables. Table 4 shows that all variables had VIF values below 10 and tolerance values above 0.10, with the highest VIF values for authority (VIF = 3.53) and proportionality (VIF = 2.90). Although these two values

were relatively higher than the others, both remained within an acceptable range, indicating no serious multicollinearity and allowing the regression analysis to proceed.

Table 5. Model Fit Measures

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2.	F	df1	df2	p
1	0.685	0.470	0.454	29.70	6	201	< 0.001

The model fit results in Table 5 show that the overall regression model was significant, $F(6, 201) = 29.70$, $p < 0.001$, with a coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.470 and an adjusted R^2 of 0.454. This indicates that the six moral foundations jointly accounted for 47.0 percent of the variance in cyber aggression, while the remaining 53.0 percent was attributable to factors outside the research model.

Table 6. Correlations among Study Variables

Variable		Statistic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Cyber Aggression	Pearson's r	—						
		df	—						
		p-value	—						
2.	Care	Pearson's r	-0.574***	—					
		df	206	—					
		p-value	< 0.001	—					
3.	Equality	Pearson's r	-0.105	0.379***	—				
		df	206	206	—				
		p-value	0.132	< 0.001	—				
4.	Loyalty	Pearson's r	-0.383***	0.657***	0.531***	—			
		df	206	206	206	—			
		p-value	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	—			
5.	Authority	Pearson's r	-0.589***	0.701***	0.406***	0.705***	—		
		df	206	206	206	206	—		
		p-value	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	—		
6.	Purity	Pearson's r	-0.533***	0.645***	0.397***	0.662***	0.735***	—	

		df	206	206	206	206	206	—
		p-value	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	—
7.	Proportionality	Pearson's r	-0.602***	0.667***	0.306***	0.568***	0.758***	0.720***
		df	206	206	206	206	206	206
		p-value	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001

*Note. *p < 0.05. **p < 0.01. ***p < 0.001. N = 208*

The Pearson correlation results in Table 6 show that most aspects of moral foundations had a significant negative association with cyber aggression, with moderate to strong correlation strength, namely care (r = -0.574), authority (r = -0.589), proportionality (r = -0.602), purity (r = -0.533), and loyalty (r = -0.383), all significant at p < 0.001. In contrast, equality showed no significant association with cyber aggression at the simple-correlations level (r = -0.105, p = 0.132). This pattern contrasts with the multiple regression results discussed next, in which equality emerged as a significant predictor.

Table 7. Multiple Linear Regression Results

Predictor	**Estimate (β)**	**SE**	**t**	**p**	**Stand. Estimate**	**95% Confidence Interval**	
						Lower	**Upper**
Intercept	121.667	5.754	21.15	< 0.001	-	-	-
Care	-1.181	0.319	-3.70	< 0.001	-0.295	-0.452	-0.138
Equality	0.623	0.222	2.81	0.005	0.171	0.051	0.291
Loyalty	0.529	0.346	1.53	0.128	0.128	-0.037	0.293
Authority	-1.081	0.385	-2.81	0.005	-0.271	-0.461	-0.081
Purity	-0.535	0.354	-1.51	0.133	-0.130	-0.299	0.040
Proportio-nality	-0.889	0.336	-2.64	0.009	-0.231	-0.403	-0.059

The multiple linear regression results in Table 7 show that not all moral foundations significantly predicted cyber aggression when analyzed jointly. Care showed the strongest negative association (β = -1.181, p < 0.001), followed by authority (β = -1.081, p = 0.005) and proportionality (β = -0.889, p = 0.009), indicating that higher levels of these three aspects were associated with a lower tendency toward cyber aggression. In contrast, equality showed a significant positive association (β = 0.623, p = 0.005), indicating that a stronger equality orientation was associated with a higher tendency toward cyber aggression, despite the non-significant association at the simple-correlations level. Meanwhile, loyalty (β = 0.529, p = 0.128) and purity (β = -0.535, p = 0.133) showed no significant association with cyber aggression. Based on the standardized coefficients, the strength of association ranked from largest to smallest was care (β = -0.295), authority (β = -0.271), equality (β = 0.171), and proportionality (β = -0.231). At the same time, loyalty and purity did not contribute significantly to this model.

DISCUSSION

Overall, the regression model was significant (F = 29.70, p < 0.001), with an R^2 of 0.470, so H1 was supported because the six moral foundations jointly and significantly predicted

cyber aggression. Turning to RQ1, whether this pattern follows the individualizing-binding dichotomy or whether each foundation shows its own distinct direction of association, the results point toward the latter. Within the individualizing category, care showed a significant negative association as commonly expected, whereas equality showed a significant positive association, an opposite pattern despite belonging to the same category. Within the binding category, proportionality and authority showed significant negative associations, while loyalty and purity showed no significant association. This pattern indicates that the six moral foundations each carried a distinct direction of association with cyber aggression rather than following a uniform pattern by category, with care showing the strongest protective association.

Care emerged as the strongest negative predictor of cyber aggression in this study ($\beta = -1.181$, $p < 0.001$). Within Moral Foundations Theory, care reflects sensitivity to others' suffering, so individuals with low empathy tend not to feel guilty when attacking others online (Atari et al., 2023; Qolbya et al., 2023). A similar pattern has been found in an age range comparable to this study's participants, in which empathy exerted a significant negative effect on cyberbullying among individuals aged 18 to 25 years (Aini & Rahardjo, 2024). Empathy continues to restrain aggression even though digital spaces reduce emotional cues, because its persistence depends more on relational closeness to the target than on sensory cues alone. Longitudinal research shows that online empathy consistently restrains cyberbullying toward known targets, yet fails to restrain cyberhate toward unfamiliar out-groups (Jiménez-Díaz et al., 2026). Because student debates on social media generally occur within a relatively familiar circle, this closeness keeps the care mechanism active even when communication takes place online.

Another plausible explanation is the developmental role of higher education in fostering social competency and critical evaluation of differing viewpoints. Such exposure may enhance perspective taking and empathy toward others (Jauernig et al., 2026). Consequently, students may be less inclined to engage in cyber aggression when interacting with others on social media (Van Den Broeck et al., 2014).

Authority also exerted a significant negative association on cyber aggression ($\beta = -1.081$, $p = 0.005$). Vecina et al. (2021) explain that commitment to the authority foundations is not merely obedience toward a figure in power, but rather an individual's willingness to restrain themselves according to a hierarchy that has been mutually agreed upon. Digital spaces where students interact generally have minimal formal oversight and rarely carry real consequences for norm violations, so sanction avoidance alone cannot explain why authority is consistently associated with lower levels of cyber aggression; a more plausible explanation points to self-regulation that has already been internalized through earlier socialization processes. This aligns with Paciello et al. (2023) who found that self-regulatory efficacy dampens the effect of moral disengagement on cyberbullying in an online context that similarly lacks external authority oversight. A similar pattern appears in Lee et al. (2021), who noted that children rarely rely on authority-based reasoning or punishment avoidance to justify their moral judgments, so responsibility shifts inward when external oversight is unavailable.

Individuals with greater awareness of legitimate authority may recognize that social media interactions are not entirely anonymous and that online behavior can result in real-world consequences. This perception may be more salient among university students, who are generally more exposed to current social and political issues, academic discussion, and

media consumption (Abdillah et al., 2024). Furthermore, greater respect for legitimate authority may discourage cyber aggression by strengthening students' adherence to social and legal norms in online communication (Faqih et al., 2026).

Proportionality exerted a significant negative association with cyber aggression (β = -0.889, p = 0.009). In the MFQ-2, proportionality relates to the moral foundations that rewards and consequences should be commensurate with the contribution or violation involved, so that any response should ideally proceed through an accountable process rather than an impulsive act (Atari et al., 2023). Verbal attacks driven by rage and revenge in the CATQ are inherently disproportionate, as they arise impulsively without regard for the balance between provocation and response. Hence, individuals with high proportionality tend to avoid forms of aggression they see as inconsistent with this principle. This is consistent with the finding by Gini et al. (2022) that individuals who place moral values at the center of their self-identity are motivated to avoid aggressive behavior in order to preserve consistency between their actions and their moral self-image, although empirical research specifically addressing proportionality in digital behavior remains very limited given that this construct was only recently introduced in the MFQ-2 in 2023.

This association may indicate that university students can regulate their responses during online interactions. Higher education encourages the development of critical thinking and emotional self-regulation (Sahranavard et al., 2018). Consequently, students may be less likely to engage in direct cyber aggression and instead adopt more strategic online communication styles (Adiyanti et al., 2020). Rather than respond publicly to interpersonal disagreements, they may choose to withhold confrontation and express their emotions or opinions within smaller, more trusted social networks where potential social consequences are perceived as more manageable (Popat & Tarrant, 2023).

In this study, equality showed a significant positive association with cyber aggression (β = 0.623, p = 0.005), even though the Pearson correlation between equality and cyber aggression was not significant (r = -0.105, p = 0.132). Equality correlated fairly strongly and positively with care (r = 0.379), authority (r = 0.406), and proportionality (r = 0.306), three foundations that in turn exerted negative associations on cyber aggression, so this overlapping variance masked equality's unique contribution at the level of simple correlation, which only emerged once the other three were held constant in the multiple regression. Horst (1941), as cited in Lai et al. (2025), defines a suppressor variable as a variable with a correlation of zero or close to zero with the outcome variable that nevertheless improves the prediction of that outcome once added as a predictor, because it correlates with other predictors in the model. A suppressor variable strengthens a model's predictive power by removing irrelevant variance from other predictors, thereby increasing the magnitude of their standardized beta coefficients (Lai et al., 2025).

A possible, though untested, explanation is that the mechanism underlying this positive direction differs from that of care, authority, and proportionality. One plausible explanation is that individuals with a strong equality orientation may be more sensitive to perceived social inequality and unequal distribution, which could increase their susceptibility to moral outrage when they perceive a condition as unjust. However, as moral outrage was not directly assessed in this study, this interpretation remains speculative and warrants direct empirical testing in future research. Research by Brady et al. (2021) shows that expressions of moral outrage on social media are reinforced through social learning via feedback and norms within networks that support such expression. If this mechanism

applies here, students with a strong equality orientation might be more inclined toward sharp comments or harsh criticism driven by a desire to defend fairness. However, such expressions are still captured as cyber aggression, consistent with Kassab et al. (2025) who found that perceived injustice heightens aggressive affect, and with Laraswati & Moesarofah (2025) who found that moral disengagement allows individuals to justify their own aggressive actions morally.

The non-significance of loyalty can be understood through the characteristics of binding foundations, which only exert a strong influence when the moral target is clearly framed as an in-group versus an out-group, particularly under conditions of threat or political polarization (Stewart & Morris, 2021). The cyber aggression instrument in this study measures a general form of aggression through the four CATQ motives, all of which are oriented toward the perpetrator's own satisfaction or personal gain rather than group defense, so it is reasonable that loyalty was not significant on its own, even though authority's significance indicates that binding foundations do not operate uniformly. A different pattern emerges for purity, which relates to the emotion of moral rejection, namely an aversion toward something deemed inappropriate, thereby driving avoidance rather than approach (Giner-Sorolla et al., 2018). In contrast, the four CATQ motives are confrontational and driven by anger, an emotion that motivates individuals to approach and attack; empirical findings show that anger is associated with both direct and indirect aggression. In contrast, disgust is associated only with indirect aggression (Fan et al., 2024).

University students are frequently exposed to educational environments that emphasize critical inquiry, intellectual autonomy, and diverse perspectives (Jauernig et al., 2026; Wolgast & Barnes-Holmes, 2022). Such experiences may attenuate the influence of binding moral foundations, particularly loyalty and purity, on everyday online behavior. Students may evaluate online interactions based on contextual reasoning and individual judgement rather than concerns about group cohesion or moral sanctity. However, these findings should be interpreted with caution, as the salience of loyalty and purity likely varies across cultural and educational contexts (Atari et al., 2023). A stronger association may therefore emerge among populations with a more robust collective identity and stronger traditional norms.

Taken together, these findings support H1, as four of the six foundations significantly predicted cyber aggression. In answer to RQ1, the individualizing-binding dichotomy did not adequately capture the direction of these associations; none of the binding foundations showed the positive direction commonly assumed, and the two individualizing foundations moved in opposite directions rather than both acting protectively. This pattern suggests that the individualizing-binding division has implicitly assumed that members within a single category will behave similarly. In contrast, recent research shows that this division is not universal and instead depends heavily on cultural context and individual belief systems, consistent with Atari et al. (2023) own finding that the nomological network of morality varies across cultures and cannot be generalized from WEIRD samples (Vishkin et al., 2025). Accordingly, within this sample, the individualizing-binding dichotomy did not consistently predict the direction of moral foundations' associations with cyber aggression, and each foundation appeared to operate through its own distinct psychological mechanism.

This theoretical implication raises a practical question: how can these cross-foundation patterns of association be used to prevent cyber aggression genuinely? Care,

proportionality, and authority show protective associations through different pathways, calling for interventions that further build these capacities. In contrast, equality, which instead heightens the risk of cyber aggression, requires a different form of intervention if the proposed moral outrage explanation holds; the underlying motivation may stem from a genuinely valid intent to uphold justice rather than merely a negative emotion to be suppressed. Digital literacy programs on campus should therefore distinguish between two approaches, namely strengthening empathy to restrain aggression rooted in indifference, and training students to channel moral anger over injustice into more constructive forms of expression, such as argument-based criticism rather than personal attacks.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the predictive role of moral foundations in cyber aggression among university students. Based on the six moral foundations proposed in Moral Foundations Theory, the findings supported H1: moral foundations jointly and significantly predicted cyber aggression. In answer to RQ1, however, the direction for each foundation did not follow the individualizing-binding dichotomy. Care, equality, authority, and proportionality played a significant role. In contrast, loyalty and purity played no meaningful role, and the two individualizing foundations moved in opposite directions rather than both acting protectively, as the dichotomy would assume. The individualizing-binding dichotomy is therefore insufficient to predict the direction of moral foundations' associations with aggressive digital behavior, indicating that each foundation needs to be explored through its own distinct characteristic rather than being generalized under its broader category. This study therefore offers a new comprehensive understanding that moral foundations play a complex role in shaping students' tendency toward cyber aggression, depending on the specific moral orientation an individual holds.

Based on these conclusions, future research is recommended to investigate each moral foundation through its specific and unique psychological mechanism. The individualizing-binding dichotomy fails to predict the direction of moral foundations' associations within an Indonesian sample; future research could extend this examination to other cultural contexts to confirm whether this pattern reflects a broader cross-cultural tendency or is specific to the Indonesian context. Future research is also encouraged to employ a cyber aggression instrument with a broader scope, considering that the CATQ used in this study only captured four confrontational motives, namely rage, revenge, reward, and recreation, so that more implicit and passive forms of cyber aggression may not have been fully captured. Furthermore, longitudinal or qualitative approaches can provide a useful framework for exploring the dynamics of the relationship between moral foundations and cyber aggression in greater depth. Further research may also focus on more specific digital interaction contexts, such as political conflict or fan wars, as these contexts may trigger different moral foundations than those found in this study. Ultimately, these findings may help develop moral-based digital literacy programs grounded in the mechanism of each foundation, rather than treating all forms of digital aggression as a single, uniform moral problem.

DECLARATION OF INTEREST

The authors declare no financial, personal, or professional relationships that could have inappropriately influenced this study's design, execution, analysis, or reporting.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATION

This study was conducted in accordance with ethical principles for research involving human participants. Before data collection, participants received an informed consent sheet outlining the study's purpose, potential benefits, participation criteria, and assurances of data confidentiality. Participation was voluntary, and all collected data were anonymized and used solely for this research.

REFERENCES

Abdillah, A., Widianingsih, I., Buchari, R. A., & Nurasa, H. (2024). Big data security & individual (psychological) resilience: A review of social media risks and lessons learned from Indonesia. Array, 21, 100336. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.array.2024.100336.

Abdurrahman, A. (2026). Social media and political protest: Framing and agenda-setting in the Indonesian demonstrations, August 2025. Online Information Review, 50(3), 541–563. https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-10-2025-0809

Adiyanti, M. G., Nugraheni, A. A., Yuliawanti, R., Ragasukmasuci, L. B., & Maharani, M. (2020). Emotion regulation and empathy as mediators of self-esteem and friendship quality in predicting cyberbullying tendency in Javanese-Indonesian adolescents. International Journal of Adolescence and Youth, 25(1), 251–263. https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2019.1614079

Aini, S., & Rahardjo, W. (2024). Perilaku Cyberbullying pada Remaja Ditinjau Dari Empati dan Regulasi Emosi. Jurnal Ilmu Perilaku, 7(2), 121–139. https://doi.org/10.25077/jip.7.2.121-139.2023

Al-Ra'zie, Z. H., & Apriyanto, A. (2025). MAHASISWA SEBAGAI KEKUATAN POLITIK DI ERA DIGITAL. Ensiklopedia Sosial Review, 7(2), 81–91. https://doi.org/10.33559/esr.v7i2.3119

Anggoro, M. O., & Santosa, R. P. (2024). Analisis Peran Anonimitas Terhadap Manifestasi Agresi Pada Pengguna Media Sosial Twitter. Jurnal Psikologi Wijaya Putra (Psikowipa), 5(2), 132–149. https://doi.org/10.38156/psikowipa.v5i2.147

Anggraheni, P., Setyowati, N. T., & Harry, H. (2021). SOCIAL MEDIA AND POLITICAL PARTICIPATION IN INDONESIA: RESTRICTIONS ACCESS AT ANNOUNCEMENT RESULTS OF 2019 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION. ASPIRATION Journal, 2(1), 85–123. https://doi.org/10.56353/aspiration.v2i1.23

APJII. (2026). Asosiasi Penyelenggara Jasa Internet Indonesia—Survei. https://survei.apjii.or.id/

Aprillia, M. D. (2024). Adaptasi cyber-aggression typology questionnaire (CATQ) ke dalam bahasa Indonesia. Acta Psychologia, 6(1), 14–26. https://doi.org/10.21831/ap.v6i1.72160

Atari, M., Haidt, J., Graham, J., Koleva, S., Stevens, S. T., & Dehghani, M. (2023). Morality beyond the WEIRD: How the nomological network of morality varies across cultures. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 125(5), 1157–1188. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000470

Brady, W. J., McLoughlin, K., Doan, T. N., & Crockett, M. J. (2021). How social learning amplifies moral outrage expression in online social networks. Science Advances, 7(33), eabe5641. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abe5641

Cinelli, M., De Francisci Morales, G., Galeazzi, A., Quattrociocchi, W., & Starnini, M. (2021). The echo chamber effect on social media. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 118(9), e2023301118. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2023301118

Domalewska, D. (2025). Online Verbal Aggression on Social Media During Times of Political Turmoil: Discursive Patterns from Poland's 2020 Protests and Election. Journalism and Media, 6(3), 146. https://doi.org/10.3390/journalmedia6030146

Fan, L., Molho, C., Kupfer, T. R., & Tybur, J. M. (2024). Moral violations that target more valued victims elicit more anger, but not necessarily more disgust. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 112, 104597. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2024.104597

Faqih, M., Amiruddin Ihsani, F., & Retpitasari, E. (2026). Digital Content Surveillance and Freedom of Expression on Over The Top Platforms in Indonesia. Pancasila: Jurnal Keindonesiaan, 6(1), 103–116. https://doi.org/10.52738/pjk.v6i1.812

Fitriannisa, A. D., & Najah, M. (2026). Peran Aktivisme sebagai Mediator dalam Hubungan Social Dominance Orientation terhadap Niat Radikalisme Mahasiswa. Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, 16(2). https://ojs.fkip.ummetro.ac.id/index.php/bk/article/view/15873

Gehman, R., Guglielmo, S., & Schwebel, D. C. (2021). Moral foundations theory, political identity, and the depiction of morality in children's movies. PLOS ONE, 16(3), e0248928. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248928

Giner-Sorolla, R., Kupfer, T., & Sabo, J. (2018). What Makes Moral Disgust Special? An Integrative Functional Review. In Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol. 57, pp. 223–289). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.aesp.2017.10.001

Gini, G., Thornberg, R., Bussey, K., Angelini, F., & Pozzoli, T. (2022). Longitudinal Links of Individual and Collective Morality with Adolescents' Peer Aggression. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 51(3), 524–539. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-021-01518-9

Hanika, I. M., Witjaksono, A. A., & Pratiwi, S. I. (2021). Fenomena Cyberbullying pada Mahasiswa di Jakarta Selatan. Jurnal Ilmiah Media, Public Relations, Dan Komunikasi (IMPRESI), 2(1), 15. https://doi.org/10.20961/impresi.v2i1.53136

Haqie, D. A., Hapsari, W., & Karsiyati. (2024). Peran Anonimitas Dan Konsep Diri Terhadap Online Disinhibition Effect Pada Remaja. Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan, 10(16), 238–252. https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.13761862

Hemay, I., Muradi, Paskarina, C., & Solihah, R. (2026). Democracy in the face of identity politics: Indonesian citizens' perspectives. Democracy and Security, 22(1), 29–53. https://doi.org/10.1080/17419166.2024.2443854

Isabel, K., & Wijaya, S. C. (2022). Gambaran Cyber Aggression Pada Remaja di Jakarta. Seminar Nasional Psikologi dan Ilmu Humaniora (SENAPIH), 68–78.

Jauernig, J., Frantz, C. M., Boyse-Peacor, A., Bouillon, H., Brehm, P., Petersen, J., Jordan, R., Shammin, M. R., & Gray, S. (2026). Perspective taking through model building: A path to open-mindedness and de-polarization? The Journal of Positive Psychology, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2026.2635423

Jiménez-Díaz, O., Bedrosova, M. J., Machackova, H., Del Rey, R., & Mora-Merchán, J. A. (2026). Longitudinal associations between cyberbullying and cyberhate: The role of online empathy and moral disengagement. Technology in Society, 87, 103385. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2026.103385

Kartiningrum, E. D., Notobroto, H. B., Otok, B. W., Kumarijati, N. E., & Yuswatiningsih, E. (2022). APLIKASI REGRESI DAN KORELASI DALAM ANALIS DATA HASIL PENELITIAN. STIKes Majapahit Mojokerto. https://ejournal.stikesmajapahit.ac.id/index.php/EBook/article/view/807

Kassab, Y. J., Halbeisen, G., & Walther, E. (2025). The unfairness we feel: How positive and aggressive affect could shape relative deprivation and aggression. BMC Psychology, 13(1), 392. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-02732-x

Kim, B., Cooks, E., & Kim, S.-K. (2022). Exploring incivility and moral foundations toward Asians in English-speaking tweets in hate crime-reporting cities during the COVID-19 pandemic. Internet Research, 32(1), 362–378. https://doi.org/10.1108/INTR-11-2020-0678

Kivikangas, J. M., Fernández-Castilla, B., Järvelä, S., Ravaja, N., & Lönnqvist, J.-E. (2021). Moral foundations and political orientation: Systematic review and meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 147(1), 55–94. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000308

Koroh, R. K., Benu, J. M. Y., & Keraf, M. K. P. A. (2025). The Relationship between Self-Control and Cyber Aggressive Behavior in Adolescent Social Media Users. Journal of Health and Behavioral Science, 7(2). https://doi.org/10.35508/jhbs.v7i2.21586

Kusumawardani, V., Chandra Agustin, D. A., & Sheila Silvia Permatasari. (2025). Social Media and Political Preferences Among Generation Z in the 2024 Indonesian General Election. Mediakita, 9(2), 246–269. https://doi.org/10.30762/mediakita.v9i2.2762

Lai, C. C. W., Brooks, K. R., & Boag, S. (2025). Predicting Subjective Well-Being from Personality: The Effects of Suppression, Confounding, and Mediating Variables. Journal of Happiness Studies, 26(3), 42. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-025-00859-7

Laraswati, R., & Moesarofah, M. (2025). Pengaruh Moral Disengagement terhadap Perilaku Cyber Aggression pada Peserta Didik. JKI (Jurnal Konseling Indonesia), 10(1), 22–28. https://doi.org/10.21067/jki.v10i1.11702

Lee, S.-H., Smith, P. K., & Monks, C. P. (2021). Moral Reasoning about Aggressive Behavior in Relation to Type of Aggression, Age and Gender in South Korean Pupils. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18(5), 2288. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18052288

Mane, S. S., Kundu, S., & Sharma, R. (2025). A Survey on Online Aggression: Content Detection and Behavioral Analysis on Social Media. ACM Computing Surveys, 57(7), 1–36. https://doi.org/10.1145/3711125

Marchetti, J. (2023). When Political Ignorance is really harmful for Democracy: Moral Intuitions and Biased Attitudes in Voting Behaviour. Philosophy & Social Criticism, 49(9), 1046–1060. https://doi.org/10.1177/01914537221093742

Maulana, A., & Situngkir, H. (2021). Media Polarization on Twitter During 2019 Indonesian Election. In R. M. Benito, C. Cherifi, H. Cherifi, E. Moro, L. M. Rocha, & M. Sales-Pardo (Eds), Complex Networks & Their Applications IX (Vol. 943, pp. 660–670). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-65347-7_55

Napitupulu, Z. A., & Fatmawiyati, J. (2025). Social Dominance Orientation as a Predictor of Cyber Aggression Behavior During the 2024 Indonesian General Election on Social Media X. Jurnal Sains Psikologi, 14(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.17977/um023v14i12025p1-13

Nasir, M., & Asis, P. H. (2026). Understanding voter behavior in direct local elections: A case study from the Southeast Sulawesi Islands, Indonesia. Frontiers in Political Science, 8, 1754738. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2026.1754738

Nath, L., Pedriana, N., Gifford, C., McAuley, J. W., & Fülöp, M. (2021). Examining Moral Foundations Theory through Immigration Attitudes. ATHENS JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, 9(1), 9–30. https://doi.org/10.30958/ajss.9-1-1

Nilsson, A., Erlandsson, A., & Västfjäll, D. (2020). Moral Foundations Theory and the Psychology of Charitable Giving. European Journal of Personality, 34(3), 431–447. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2256

Nofriandi, R., & Mardianto, M. (2022). PENGARUH KONTROL DIRI TERHADAP AGRESI SIBER PADA REMAJA. Jurnal RAP (Riset Aktual Psikologi Universitas Negeri Padang), 13(2), 184–196. https://doi.org/10.24036/rapun.v13i2.%20122008

Nurhadiyanto, L., Meliala, A., & Sulhin, I. (2023). Social Discourse of Cyber Hate in Indonesia: The Potential Transition from Hate to Crime. Journal of Social and Political Sciences, 6(2). https://doi.org/10.31014/aior.1991.06.02.416

Nurhayati, N., & Suryadi, R. (2017). DEMOCRATIC CHALLENGES OF INDONESIA IN THE SOCIAL MEDIA ERA. Diponegoro Law Review, 2(2), 349. https://doi.org/10.14710/dilrev.2.2.2017.105-114

Olifia, S., Gusma, A. Y. T., & Haqiqi, P. (2025). Remaja dan Anonimitas di Dunia Maya: Mencegah Cyberbullying Melalui Literasi Digital. Jurnal Pustaka Dianmas, 5(1).

Paciello, M., Corbelli, G., Di Pomponio, I., & Cerniglia, L. (2023). Protective Role of Self-Regulatory Efficacy: A Moderated Mediation Model on the Influence of Impulsivity on Cyberbullying through Moral Disengagement. Children, 10(2), 219. https://doi.org/10.3390/children10020219

Popat, A., & Tarrant, C. (2023). Exploring adolescents' perspectives on social media and mental health and well-being – A qualitative literature review. Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 28(1), 323–337. https://doi.org/10.1177/13591045221092884

Prabhu, S., Hahn, L., Tamborini, R., & Grizzard, M. (2020). Do Morals Featured in Media Content Correspond with Moral Intuitions in Media Users?: A Test of the MIME in Two Cultures. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 64(2), 255–276. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2020.1757364

Pradika Rakasiwy, M. R., & Surya Cipta, V. D. (2025). Social Conformity and Political Trust: Relationships with People's Political Participation in Surabaya City. Journal of Politics and Policy, 7(2), 105–122. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jppol.2025.7.2.1

Qolbya, A. G., Siswandi, A. S., & Putri, R. D. (2023). Empati dan Cyberbullying pada Remaja Pengguna Media Sosial: Sebuah Kajian Literatur. Flourishing Journal, 3(9), 352–359. https://doi.org/10.17977/um070v3i92023p352-359

Rahmi, Y. Z., Sukmawati, I., Syukur, Y., & Fikri, M. (2025). Gambaran Perilaku Cyberbullying pada Mahasiswa. Counseling & Humanities Review, 5(1), 91–97. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24036/0001267chr2025

Rianto, P. (2021). Moralitas Kebaikan dan Kesalehan di Seputar Tubuh dan Pakaian dalam Ruang Media Sosial. Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi, 19(2), 221. https://doi.org/10.31315/jik.v19i2.4512

Robiyanti, R. R., Purwaningsih, T., Setyawan, J., & Kholik, A. (2024). Social Media and Political Participation in the 2024 Elections: Survey on Generation Z Voters of Buddhist Society in Indonesia. 5(4). https://ejournal.uit-lirboyo.ac.id/index.php/IJHSS/article/view/6573

Runions, K. C., Bak, M., & Shaw, T. (2017). Disentangling functions of online aggression: The Cyber-Aggression Typology Questionnaire (CATQ). Aggressive Behavior, 43(1), 74–84. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21663

Sahranavard, S., Miri, M., & Salehiniya, H. (2018). The relationship between self-regulation and educational performance in students. Journal of Education and Health Promotion, 7(1), 154. https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_93_18

Septiana, E., Rifameutia, T., & Royanto, L. R. (2020). Effect of Moral Emotions and Moral Identity on College Students' Academic Dishonesty: A Study in Universitas Indonesia. Psychology And Education Journal, 57(6). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17762/pae.v57i6.63

Setiawati, T., Tiara, A., & Mustika, S. (2023). Social Media as a Negative Source of Political News in a Polarized Society? Indonesian and Filipino Students' Perception. Jurnal Komunikasi, 17(2), 243–256. https://doi.org/10.20885/komunikasi.vol17.iss2.art7

Setyoningsih, Y. D., & Srianturi, Y. (2024). Analisis Agresi Verbal Pengguna Media Sosial Ditinjau dari Identitas Peran Gender pada Mahasiswa. Teraputik: Jurnal Bimbingan Dan Konseling, 7(3), 1–10. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26539/teraputik.731762

Simpson, A. (2017). Moral Foundations Theory: Background, Review, and Scaffolding for Future Research. Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences, 1–19.

Sodik, M. A., & Siyoto, S. (2015). Dasar Metodologi Penelitian. Literasi Media Publishing. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/314093441_Dasar_Metodologi_Penelitian

Spears, R. (2017). Social Identity Model of Deindividuation Effects. In P. Rössler, C. A. Hoffner, & L. Zoonen (Eds), The International Encyclopedia of Media Effects (1st edn, pp. 1–9). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118783764.wbieme0091

Statista. (2025). Media sosial di Indonesia—Statistik & fakta | Statista. https://www.statista.com/topics/8306/social-media-in-indonesia/

Stewart, B. D., & Morris, D. S. M. (2021). Moving Morality Beyond the In-Group: Liberals and Conservatives Show Differences on Group-Framed Moral Foundations and These Differences Mediate the Relationships to Perceived Bias and Threat. Frontiers in Psychology, 12, 579908. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.579908

Sugiyono. (2022). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif & RND (Edisi ke-2). Alfabeta. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Syahputri, I. B., & Katimin, K. (2024). Pengaruh Aktivis Mahasiswa Dalam Perubahan Sosial Politik Di Era Digital 5.0. Ganaya : Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora, 7(4), 25–36. https://doi.org/10.37329/ganaya.v7i4.3490

Utomo, C. E. W., Helpiastuti, S. B., Ahmad, H., Prananda, F. A., & Farhana, N. T. (2026). The Power of Media and Changes in Gen Z's Political Behavior in the Era of Digital Democracy: A Comparative Study of Indonesia and Turkey. In M. N. A. H. Akbar, N. L. Ningrum, P. V. Gunawan, & R. M. Prakosa (Eds), Proceedings of the International Conference on Multidisciplinary Issues (INCOMI 2025) (Vol. 996, pp. 225–235). Atlantis Press SARL. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-549-2_18

Van Den Broeck, E., Karolien, P., Heidi, V., & Kathleen, V. R. (2014). Online Perspective-Taking as an Intervention Tool Against Cyberbullying. In Studies in Health Technology and Informatics. IOS Press. https://doi.org/10.3233/978-1-61499-401-5-113

Vecina, M. L., Chacón, J. C., & Piñuela, R. (2021). Child-to-Parent Violence and Dating Violence Through the Moral Foundations Theory: Same or Different Moral Roots? Frontiers in Psychology, 11, 597679. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.597679

Vishkin, A., Bigman, Y. E., & Ginges, J. (2025). Belief in Creation in the Image of God Violates the Individualizing-Binding Dichotomy of Moral Foundations. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 56(4), 380–401. https://doi.org/10.1177/00220221241279222

Wahyuningrum, S. S., Rohmawati, L., Mustaqim, W., Qalban, A. A., & Heriyanto, Y. (2023). Fenomena Cyberbullying pada Kalangan Mahasiswa. Assertive: Islamic Counseling Journal, 2(1), 37–48. https://doi.org/10.24090/j.assertive.v2i01.8296

Wolgast, A., & Barnes-Holmes, Y. (2022). Flexible social perspective taking in higher education and the role of contextual cues. Frontline Learning Research, 10(1), 76–107. https://doi.org/10.14786/flr.v10i1.781

Zakharin, M., & Bates, T. C. (2023). Moral Foundations Theory: Validation and replication of the MFQ-2. Personality and Individual Differences, 214, 112339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2023.112339

Zakharin, M., & Bates, T. C. (2026). Moral foundations in the 2020s: Advancements in measurement, genetics, brain science, and real-world impact. Personality and Individual Differences, 255, 113678. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2026.113678