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ABSTRACT

Introduction: Cyberbullying has become a new case in young millennials that can lead to being a serious problem if it is not faced properly. Many cases cannot be resolved because the victims did not tell the truth clearly to their parents and teachers. It may cause a lack of self-esteem among the students and also make the perpetrator become morally disengaged. The purpose of this study was to identify the correlation between parental communication patterns, moral disengagement, and self-esteem with cyberbullying behavior in junior high school.

Methods: A cross-sectional study was performed with 362 junior high school students in Indonesia using purposive sampling. Variables in this study were moral disengagement, self-esteem and parental communication patterns with cyberbullying behavior. The data were collected with the Rosenberg self-esteem scale, the cyberbullying behavior scale, the moral disengagement scale and the family communication pattern scale. Bivariate analysis with Chi-square was used to analyze the data.

Results: This study found out that there were 223 students, 61.6% were female, and 43.6% were aged 14 years. There were 187 students (51.7%) who had mild cyberbullying behavior. The study revealed that there were significant correlations among cyberbullying behavior with moral disengagement (p = 0.005, self-esteem (p = 0.008), and parental communication pattern (p = 0.019).

Conclusions: Parental communication, moral disengagement and self-esteem have a correlation with cyberbullying behavior. It was expected that the schools need to implement a training to improve social skills in junior high school students.
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Introduction

The development of communication and information technology also has great impact on the development of today’s generation, which we know as millennials society (society 5.0 era). Convenience in almost all daily activities can now be accessed very easily everywhere and any time. But, besides those great impacts, we cannot be blind to one of the negative impacts which be experienced by our young generation, that is cyberbullying.

Cyberbullying is a type of bullying which uses digital technologies and take place on social media, messaging platforms, gaming platforms or websites (Febriana and Fajrianthi, 2019). Practically, it has many negative impacts on victims such as depression low self-esteem, difficulty concentrating in class, anxiety and suicide (Talaei and Ardani, 2009; Patchin and Hinduja, 2012; Rahayu, 2012). Other studies have found that bullying causes stress, emotional, social anxiety, and risk of drug use (Sartana and Afriyeni, 2017). Another study revealed that students who experienced bullying in cyberspace were twice as likely to experience adverse health effects, such as headaches and stomachache, than those who did...
not experience bullying (Nursalam et al., 2019). In addition, another study stated that only one out of three adolescents who had been victims of cyberbullying shared their experiences with their parents, teachers and friends (Mendez-Baldwin et al., 2015). It shown that many cases are still undercovered and victims did not receive proper intervention to recover from the situation.

The Indonesian Child Protection Commission (KPAI) stated child victims of cybercrime in Indonesia reached 679 cases and are growing very rapidly (KPAI, 2019). The prevalence among junior high school students was around 48.2% (Safaria, 2016). One factor that makes a child becomes of cyberbullying perpetrator is a grudge against the victim (Pandie and Weismann, 2016). There are several factors influencing the motives of cyberbullying behavior, namely family factors, failure to control oneself, and environmental factors. The poor quality of communication between parents and adolescents can cause adolescent behavior deviations (Nursalam et al., 2019). Other research also stated that through positive communication and interaction within the family, parents and adolescents can strengthen interpersonal relationships, so that adolescents would not be easily influenced by negative invitations, including becoming bullies, by their friends (Firdanianty, Lubis, et al., 2016).

Based on the preliminary survey in four junior high schools in four different districts of Jambi City, Indonesia, it was found that junior high school students tend not to open up with their parents if they become victims of bullying in social media. Students are also reluctant to report the incident to their teachers and tell their close friends about problems instead. When it comes to asking about committing cyberbullying, they seemed to be reluctant to tell the truth. They said that they tend to be victims of bullying in social media. Considering the lack of research related to cyberbullying in Indonesia, this study aimed to identify the correlation among parental communication patterns, moral disengagement, and self-esteem with cyberbullying behavior in junior high schools in Jambi City.

Materials and Methods

Study Design

This was a quantitative study with a cross sectional design which aimed at determining the tendency of the early adolescents with cyberbullying behavior in junior high schools. The study sample was selected by purposive sampling technique. The study location was chosen by multistage random sampling. The study was carried out in two months between October and November, 2020. The independent variables were parental communication patterns, moral disengagement, and self-esteem, while the dependent variable was cyberbullying behavior.

Respondents

The population of this study was all students from four selected junior high schools in Jambi City, with 6,541 students in total. The sample size was 362 students selected by purposive sampling methods and calculated using Lemeshow formula (Sopiyyudi Dahlan, 2016). The samples were divided into four junior high schools using proportional sampling technique. The inclusion criteria were students registered as first, second and third year in selected public junior high schools in four districts (Kota Baru District, represented by Public Junior High School 14; Telanaipura District, Public Junior High School 17; East Jambi District, Public Junior High School 9, and Paal Merah District, Public Junior High School 4). The students must be able to communicate and willing to participate. The students will be excluded if they did not attend school during the data collection process.

Instrument

Cyberbullying Behavior Questionnaire

The data were collected using Cyberbullying Behavior Questionnaire (CBQ), which consists of 20 items covering a wide range of work-related cyberbullying behaviors (Jonsson, Muhonen and Backstrom, 2017). The participants scored the items on a four-point scale, 1 = never, 2 = monthly, 3 = weekly, 4 = daily. The scale has an internal consistency with a coefficient alpha of 0.638 to 0.879 (Husna, Tentama and Purwadi, 2020).

| Variables                          | n  | %   |
|-----------------------------------|----|-----|
| **Genders**                       |    |     |
| Male                              | 139| 38.4|
| Female                            | 223| 61.6|
| **Age (years)**                   |    |     |
| 11                                | 8  | 2.2 |
| 12                                | 77 | 21.3|
| 13                                | 101| 27.9|
| 14                                | 158| 43.6|
| 15                                | 17 | 4.7 |
| 16                                | 1  | 0.3 |
| **Cyberbullying information**     |    |     |
| Social media                      | 252| 69.6|
| Friends                           | 60 | 16.57|
| Teacher                           | 15 | 4.1 |
| Parents                           | 10 | 2.76|
| Not know                          | 25 | 6.9 |
| **Parents’ education levels**     |    |     |
| Primary school                    | 29 | 8.0 |
| Junior high school                | 86 | 23.75|
| Senior high School                | 197| 54.1|
| Bachelor high school              | 50 | 13.8|
| **Family Income**                 |    |     |
| ≥ Rp 1,750,000.-                  | 150| 41.4|
| ≤ Rp 1,750,000.-                  | 212| 58.5|

Table 1 Demographic characteristics of the respondents (N = 362)
Table 2 Relationship between parental communication pattern, self-esteem, and moral disengagement with cyberbullying behavior (N = 362)

| Variable                  | Cyberbullying behavior |                |                |                |                |                |
|---------------------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                           | Mild (n, %)             | Strong (n, %)  | Total (n, %)   | p-value        |                |                |
| Parental Communication    |                        |                |                |                |                |                |
| Bad                       | 86 (46)                | 103 (58.9)     | 189 (52.2)     | 0.019          |                |                |
| Good                      | 101 (54)               | 72 (41.1)      | 173 (47.8)     |                |                |                |
| Self-Esteem               |                        |                |                |                |                |                |
| Low                       | 86 (46)                | 101 (57.7)     | 187 (51.7)     | 0.008          |                |                |
| High                      | 101 (54)               | 74 (42.3)      | 175 (48.3)     |                |                |                |
| Moral Disengagement       |                        |                |                |                |                |                |
| Mild                      | 110 (58.8)             | 76 (43.4)      | 186 (51.4)     | 0.005          |                |                |
| Strong                    | 77 (41.2)              | 59 (56.6)      | 136 (48.6)     |                |                |                |
| TOTAL                     | 187 (100)              | 175 (100)      | 362 (100)      |                |                |                |

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES) was developed by Rosenberg in 1965. It consists of 10 items that refer to self-respect and self-acceptance rated on a four-point Likert-scale, from 1 (totally disagree) to 4 (totally agree). Five items were worded positively (i.e., 1, 3, 4, 7, and 10) and five items negatively (i.e., 2, 5, 6, 8, and 9) (Martin-Albo, Nunez and Navarro, 2007). The scale has an internal consistency with a coefficient alpha of 0.40 to 0.97 (Tinakon and Nahathai, 2012).

Moral Disengagement Scale

Moral disengagement constructs include vilifying victims through attribution of blame, reinterpreting conduct or moral justification, hiding personal causal responsibility, and misrepresenting the consequences of individual action (Bussey, Fitzpatrick and Raman, 2015). The participants in this study were asked how much they agreed, starting from 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree. The scale of internal consistency found a coefficient alpha of 0.80 to 0.87 (Whang and Yang, 2010).

Family communication pattern

The family communication pattern consisted of 28-item Likert scale (Gupta, 2019). This study used the four-point scale, namely 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = agree; 4 = strongly agree. The scale of internal consistency had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.869. The validity and reliability of the test were carried out at a public junior high school in Jambi City on August 8, 2020, with the total of 67 question items. The validity value with the RSES was 0.87. The CBQ was on a scale of 0.98, the moral disengagement scale was at 0.87, and the parental communication pattern scale was at 0.85. The reliability test of the overall instruments, cyberbullying behavior, self-esteem, moral disengagements and family communication pattern, were 0.88, 0.86, 0.83, and 0.81, respectively.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using univariate analysis to describe the demographic characteristics, cyberbullying behavior and all independent variables (i.e., self-esteem, moral disengagement and parental communication pattern). The normality data was tested by Kolmogorov Smirnov test for large sample. It was found that the p-value were under 0.05 for all variables, which means the data were not normal (Sopiyudi Dahlan, 2016). The data used median to categorize all variables. The bivariate correlation used Chi-square test to analyze independent and dependent variables. The correlation coefficients varied from -1 to +1. This study indicates a perfectly positive linear relationship. For a positive coefficient, as one variable increases, the other also increases. The analysis found strong relationship between independent and dependent variables in which α = 0.05 was used for analysis. The data analysis was processed in Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS file version 1.0.0-51). The data analysis included data screening and assumption of primary data analysis.

Table 3 The types of cyberbullying behaviors in early adolescence (N = 362)

| Type of cyberbullying          | n   | %   |
|-------------------------------|-----|-----|
| flaming                       |     |     |
| Low (6-9)                     | 194 | 53.6|
| High (10-24)                  | 168 | 46.4|
| Harassment                    |     |     |
| Low (2)                       | 215 | 59.4|
| High (3-8)                    | 147 | 40.6|
| Denigration (put downs)       |     |     |
| Low (3-4)                     | 245 | 67.7|
| High (5-12)                   | 117 | 32.3|
| Cyber-stalking                |     |     |
| Low (2)                       | 302 | 82.4|
| High (3-8)                    | 60  | 16.6|
| Impersonation                 |     |     |
| Low (1)                       | 312 | 86.2|
| High (2-5)                    | 50  | 13.8|
| Outing                        |     |     |
| Low (2)                       | 198 | 54.7|
| High (3-10)                   | 164 | 45.3|
| Exclusion                     |     |     |
| Low (1)                       | 239 | 66.0|
| High (2-5)                    | 123 | 34.0|
| Cyber-threat                  |     |     |
| Low (3)                       | 291 | 80.6|
| High (4-15)                   | 71  | 19.4|
| Anonymity                     |     |     |
| Low (3)                       | 290 | 80.1|
| High (4-15)                   | 72  | 19.9|
Ethical Consideration
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Results

The total of 362 early adolescents registered in four junior high schools in Jambi City based on several sub-districts were recruited. The characteristics of early adolescents showed that the majority 223 (61.60%) were female, and almost a half, 158, were aged 14 years old (43.60%; see Table 1).

Table 2 shows that parental communication pattern, self-esteem, and moral disengagement have significant correlation with cyberbullying behavior of students at the four public junior high schools. All p-value were below 0.05; parental communication (p = 0.019); self-esteem (p = 0.008); and moral disengagement (p = 0.005).

Table 3 shows that all cyberbullying types were in low categories, but high categories in few variables nearly reached a half, namely flaming (n = 168; 46.4%), outing (n = 164; 45.3%), and harassment (n = 147; 40.6%).

Discussions

The majority of respondents were female and almost a half of 158 were at the age of 14 years old. Boys and girls both participate in cyberbullying, although for different reasons. They also use different methods. Girls tend to use a more passive approach, such as spreading rumors and reputation and relationship damage. Boys tend to use direct and cyber-threats intended to revenge. In addition, another view says that, in carrying out their actions, women are more often the target of cyberbullying, while men tend to be the main perpetrators of violence in cyberspace (Pandie and Weismann, 2016).

This study found there were associations between self-esteem, parental communication pattern, and moral disengagement with cyberbullying behavior. Several factors that could influence the variables were friends, parents and school environment, parents’ educational levels, and parents’ salary (Aini, 2018).

Self-esteem was a component of self-concept factors that can influence self-concept such as pressure from outside from good peers (Yuliyana and Wichaikkul, 2014). A peer group was a group of friends who had strong emotional ties and students who could be accepted, socialized, exchanged ideas, and experiences in providing the change and the development of social life. The experience of being a victim can lower person’s self-esteem, or people with low self-esteem are more likely to be targeted as victims.

The quality of communication between parents and adolescents should be improved so the adolescents could get guidance and education to avoid cyberbullying. The poor quality of communications between parents and adolescents can cause adolescent behavior deviations (Gunawan, 2013). Other research stated communication between parents and adolescents that is less than optimal will cause adolescents to be easily influenced by deviant behavior (Luk et al. 2010). Positive communication and interaction within family, parents and adolescents can strengthen interpersonal relationships, so adolescents will not be easily influenced by invitations to do negative activities from their friends (Firdanianty, Djuara et al., 2016).

Reframing behavior is accomplished through moral justifications, euphemistic labelling, and advantageous comparisons, which enable the individual to view their immoral behavior as ultimately moral or benign. Individuals could also morally disengage by changing their perceptions of their own personal responsibility for the behavior by displacing or diffusing responsibilities to others. Moral disengagement mechanisms blame the target for their suffering, or dehumanize the target, act to reframe the individual’s perceptions about the target’s role for the behavior. Finally, the harmful outcomes of the immoral behavior can be minimized or viewed as providing benefits for the victim (Bandura, 2002). Cyber-communication may promote hostile attributions of intent, and triggering attributions of blame (Runions, 2013). Ambiguous communications, that are common on social media, may provoke self-justifications of cyber-aggression as retaliatory responses, with responsibility for the perceived provocation attributed to the other person; one’s own behavior is perceived as merely a reaction. These processes may be particularly pertinent to aggressive-victims (i.e., bully-victims), whose responses to perceived provocation fuel cycles of bullying (Salminvall and Nieminen, 2001).

This study also found most adolescents have mild moral disengagement, self-esteem and cyberbullying behavior. This study was in line with Jiang et al. (2021), that stated adolescents whose information was on the topic of self-acceptance and competence, or having good self-esteem, could judge themselves better than most people. According to other research, the sources related to bullying and self-esteem have consistently found that victims of bullying tend to have lower self-esteem than non-victims (Patchin and Hinduja, 2012). Among people with different levels of self-esteem, victims of bullying tend to have lower self-esteem than non-victims.

This study has several limitations. It only identified the correlation between independent and dependent variables with cross-sectional approach that cannot show causality. This study also did not examine any intervention to increase self-esteem, improve family
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communication, address moral disengagement, or prevent cyberbullying behavior. Therefore, further study is needed to address these aspects.

Conclusions

There is a correlation between self-esteem, moral disengagement, parental communication pattern and cyberbullying behavior in early adolescence in junior high school. Further research need to address factors related to moral disengagement between genders, improvement by social group about self-esteem, and disengagement in cyberbullying behavior.

References

Aini, D. F. N. (2018) ‘Self in elementary school age children for prevention of bullying cases’, Elementary School of Thought and Development, 6(1), pp. 36–46. doi: https://doi.org/10.22219/jp2sd.v6i1.5901.

Bandura, A. (2002) ‘Selective Moral Disengagement in The Exercise of Moral Agency’, Journal of Moral Education, 31, pp. 101–119.

Bussey, K., Fitzpatrick, S. and Raman, A. (2015) ‘The role of moral disengagement and self-efficacy in cyberbullying’, Journal of School Violence, 14(1), pp. 30–46. doi: 10.15388/jsv.2015.49.40.45.

Fahrizna, S. K. T. and Fajrianti (2019) ‘Cyber Incivility Perpetrator: The Influenced of Dissociative Anonymity, Invisibility, Asychronicity, and Dissociative Imagination’, in 1st International Conference on Advance and Scientific Innovation, ICASI 2018. Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Banjarmasin, Indonesia: Institute of Physics Publishing, doi:10.1088/1742-6596/1175/10/102238.

Firdaniaty, Djura, L. P., et al. (2016) ‘Adolescent Communication Patterns and Influence on Emotional Intelligence of High School Students in Bogor City’, Comunication Journal of Indonesian Association of Communication of Scholars, 01, pp. 37–47.

Gunawan, H. (2013) ‘Jenis pola komunikasi orang tua dengan anak perokok aktif di Desa Jembayan Kecamatan Loa Kulu Kabupaten Kutai Kartanegara’, journal Ilmu Komunikasi, 1(3), pp. 1–5.

Husna, M., Tentama, F. and Purwadi (2020) ‘Validity and Reliability Analysis of the Cyberbullying Scale’, American Scientific Research Journal for Engineering, Technology, and Sciences (ASRJETS), 7(1), pp. 20–33.

Jiang, S. et al. (2023) ‘Cyber victimization and psychological well-being among Chinese adolescents: Mediating role of basic psychological needs satisfaction and moderating role of positive parenting’, Children and Youth Services Review. Elsevier, 130, p. 106248.

Jonsson, S., Muhonen, T. and Backstrom, R. C. F. M. (2017) ‘Assessing Exposure to Bullying through Digital Devices in Working Life: Two Versions of a Cyberbullying Questionnaire (CBQ)’, Psychology, 8(3), pp. 477–494. doi: 10.4243/psyh.2017.83030.

Jose Martin-Albo, Juan L. Nunez, Jose G. Navarro, and F. G. (2007) ‘The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale: Translation and Validation in University Students’, The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 10(2), pp. 458–467. doi:10.5381/SI1387416000046727.

KPAI (2019) ‘Catatan KPAI di Hardiknas, Kasus Anak Bully Guru Meningkat Drastis , Komisi Perlindungan Anak Indonesia (KPAI)’, 24 July. Available at: https://www.kpai.go.id/publikasi/kpai-sebut-anak-korban-kejahatan-dunia-maya-capai-679-kasus.

Luk, J.W., Farhat, T., Iannotti, R.J., & Morton, B. G. (2010) ‘Parent-child communication and substance use among adolescents: do father and mother communication play a different role for sons and daughters?’, Addictive Behaviors, 35:426–431., 35, pp. 426–431.

Mendez-Baldwin, M. et al. (2015) ‘Cyberbullying Among Teens’, Journal of Bullying and Social Aggression, 1(1).

Nursalam, N. et al. (2019) ‘Association between insomnia and social network site use in Indonesian adolescents’, Nursing Forum. Department of Mental Health, Gerontology and Community Nursing, Faculty of Nursing, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 54(2), pp. 149–156. doi: 10.1111/nuf.12308.

Pandie, M. M. and Weismann, I. T. J. (2016) ‘The Effect of Cyberbullying on Social Media on Reactive Behavior as Perpetrators and Victims of Cyberbullying in Christian Middle School Students in Makassar’, Jurnal Jaffry, 14(1), pp. 42–62.

Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2012) ‘Cyberbullying Prevention and Response’, in Cyberbullying Prevention and Response. New York: Routledge.

Rahayu, R (2020) ‘Cyberbullying as a Negative Impact of Information Technology Users. Journal of Information Systems, Journal of informations Systems, 8(1). doi: https://doi.org/10.22219/ji.v8i1.321.

Rumions, K. C. (2013) ‘Toward a Conceptual Model of Motive and Self-Control in Cyber-Aggression: Rage, Revenge, Reward, and Recreation’, Journal of & Youth Adolescence, 42, 751–771, 42(5), pp. 751–771. doi:10.1007/s10964-013-9952-2.

Safaria, T. (2016) ‘Prevalence and impact of cyberbullying in a sample of indonesian junior high school students.’, Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET. ERIC, 15(1), pp. 82–91.

Salmivalli, C. and Nieminen, E. (2001) ‘Proactive and reactive aggression among school bullies, victims, and bully-victims’, Aggressive Behavior, 28(1), pp. 30–44. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.90004.

Sartana and Afriyeni, N. (2017) ‘Cyber Bullying in Early Adolescence. Journal of Psychology Insight, Journal Psikologi Insight, 1(1), pp. 25–39.

Savita Gupta, G. (2019) ‘Family Communication Patterns Questionnaire: Development and Validation’, International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering (IJRTE), 8(1C2), pp. 542–550.

Sopiyudi Dahlan, M. (2016) Sample size in medical and health research, series 2 edition 2.2nd edn. Jakarta: Epidemiologi Indonesia.

Sopiyudi Dahlan, M. (2021) Statistics for Medicine and Health. Indonesia: Salemba Medika.

Talaei, A., B. M. R. F. and Ardani, A. R. (2009) ‘Gender, Self-Esteem, Social Support and Depression Among Seventh Grade Students in Junior High Schools’, Iranian Journal of Psychiatry, 4, pp. 17–22.

Tinakon, W. and Nalathai, W. (2012) ‘A Comparison of Reliability and Construct Validity between the Original and Revised Versions of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale’, Psychiatric Symptomatology, 771, pp. 54–58. doi: https://doi.org/10.4306/pis.2012.771.54.

Whang, xhing-maya and Yang, J. (2010) ‘Reliability and validity of Moral Disengagement Scale in Chinese students’, Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology, 18(2), pp. 177–179.

Yuliyana, R. and Wichaikull, S. (2014) ‘Gender, Self-Esteem, Social Support and Depression Among Seventh Grade Students in Junior High Schools’, International Proceedings of Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2(1), pp. 142–148.

How to cite this article: Octavia, D., Sari R. M., Merdekawati D., Maridaysana R., Yuliyana R. (2022) ‘The correlation between parental communication pattern, self-esteem, moral disengagement with cyberbullying behavior in early adolescents’, Jurnal Ners, 17(1), pp. 42-46. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.20473/jvn.171.24539