The Role of Online Disinhibition Towards Cyberbullying on Second-Account Users on Instagram

Emi Zakiah[1], Rosada Dwi Iswari[2]
[1-2] Psychology Department of Medical Faculty, Sriwijaya University
e-mail: *[1]zakiahemi@gmail.com, [2]rd.iswari@fk.unsri.ac.id

Abstract. This study aims to determine the role of online disinhibition towards cyberbullying on second-account users on Instagram. The participants of this study were 150 second-account users on Instagram. The sampling technique used was purposive sampling. Online disinhibition is measured using a scale compiled by researchers based on the aspects proposed by Stuart & Scott (2020). Cyberbullying is measured using the cyberbullying scale, which is also compiled by researchers based on aspects proposed by Langos (2012). Data analysis was performed using simple regression techniques. Data analysis resulted in the value of R square = 0.520 F = 160.136 and p = 0.000 (p <0.005). Data analysis resulted in a value of p = 0.000 (p <0.005), which indicated that there was a role for online disinhibition in cyberbullying with an R square = 0.520, which means that it gave a role of 52%.
Keywords: Online Disinhibition, Cyberbullying, Second Account

Abstrak. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui peran *online disinhibition* terhadap *cyberbullying* pada pengguna *second account* di *Instagram*. Partisipan dari penelitian ini adalah 150 orang pengguna *second account* di *Instagram*.Teknik *sampling* yang digunakan adalah *sampling purposive*. *Online disinhibition* diukur menggunakan skala *online disinhibition* yang disusun oleh peneliti berdasarkan aspek yang dikemukakan oleh Stuart & Scott (2020), *cyberbullying* diukur menggunakan skala *cyberbullying* yang juga disusun oleh peneliti berdasarkan aspek yang dikemukakan oleh Langos (2012). Analisis data dilakukan dengan menggunakan teknik regresi sederhana. Analisis data menghasilkan nilai p = 0,000 (p < 0,005) yang mengindikasikan bahwa ada peran online disinhibition terhadap cyberbullying dengan nilai R square = 0,520 yang artinya memberikan peran sebanyak 52%.
Kata Kunci: Online Disinhibition, Cyberbullying, Second Account

Introduction

Social media plays an essential role as a means of self-expression or self-actualization for its users (Retasari & Janitra, 2018). Based on a survey from GWI

quoted by Beritasatu.com, Instagram is one of the most popular social media and is widely used to express oneself through photos and videos nowadays. In addition, according to the Ditch The Label survey results, Instagram is the social media platform with the most cyberbullying. On Instagram itself, there is a feature that is multiple accounts. This feature allows Instagram users to create and manage more than one account on their smartphone, known as a second account (Retasari & Janitra, 2018).

The second account phenomenon is often found in cyberspace. Retasari & Janitra (2018) found that users create alter accounts to be personal diaries, to comment negatively on some celebrities, to represent others, and for business purposes. The results of other observations made from the comments column of a post that contained a lot of negative comments in various forms, ranging from insults, ridicule, hate speech, or even cyberbullying by using a second account (anonymous username) where they did not show their real identity and use a private account. This is related to forms of cyberbullying, namely online harassment and masquerade (Willard, 2007).

There are many cases of cyberbullying carried out by Indonesian citizens themselves. This is also supported by the low politeness factor of Indonesian netizens, which was quoted based on research data from the Digital Civility Index conducted by Microsoft in February 2021.

Langos (2012) defines cyberbullying as intentional and aggressive online behavior intended to hurt others who cannot easily defend themselves. Langos (2012) also suggests four aspects of cyberbullying behavior: repetition, power differential, intention, and aggression. Watts's (2017) theory said that five factors influence cyberbullying: anonymity, psychological needs, social dissonance, bad child/adult interpersonal relationships, and other social cues.

Furthermore, Watts (2017) explains that the most frequently found factor is anonymity, i.e. someone will do cyberbullying more daringly if their identity is not displayed so that they do not threaten themselves. Meanwhile, Lapidot-Lefler (2012)

argues that anonymity significantly affects toxic online disinhibition behavior, one of which is due to a lack of eye contact.

Several other studies have also tried to explain the role of online disinhibition and cyberbullying. Such research from Stuart and Scott (2020) found that online disinhibition can increase the emergence of cyberbullying behavior. Meanwhile, further research from Zahrotunnisa and Hijrianti (2019) showed a significant positive relationship between online disinhibition and cyberbullying behavior. In other words, cyberbullying can be influenced by online disinhibition.

Online disinhibition is defined by Stuart and Scott (2020) as the perception or lack of behavioral control in an online environment so that individuals can act, think, and feel differently online when compared to face-to-face interactions. Furthermore, Stuart and Scott (2020) suggested five aspects of online disinhibition, including toxic and benign online disinhibition, online false self, social media use, online self-disclosure, and trolling.

Method

The data analysis methods used in this research are normality, linearity, and hypothesis tests. The data analysis technique used is simple linear regression. Considering the unknown number of populations, this research set a sample of 150 people with the number of trial samples (try out) of as many as 50 people. The sampling technique used is the purposive sampling technique, which is a technique of taking samples based on considerations that focus on particular objectives (Arikunto, 2006). The sample criteria determined by the researcher to represent the research objectives are active Instagram users who have a second account with an anonymous username or do not match their real identity and have provided critical comments using a second account.

The data collection method in this study used two psychological scales, namely the cyberbullying scale, which refers to the cyberbullying aspect of Langos (2012), namely repetition, power differentiation, intention, and aggression. This scale is made in the Likert scale type with a total number of items obtained

amounted to 20 items consisting of 12 favorable items and eight unfavorable items. In total, the researchers obtained 20 items used as a cyberbullying psychological scale with validity based on the rix value with the range used for the cyberbullying scale from 0.254 – 0.747. Twenty valid items, the Cronbach's alpha (α) reliability was 0.903.

The online disinhibition scale refers to aspects of online disinhibition that Stuart and Scott (2020) refer to: toxic and benign disinhibition, anonymity, social media use, online self-disclosure, and subjective norms. This scale is made in the Likert scale type with a total number of items obtained amounted to 20 items consisting of 11 favorable items and nine unfavorable items. The researcher obtained 20 items used as the online disinhibition psychological scale with validity based on the rix value with the range used for the online disinhibition scale from 0.256 – 0.707. Twenty valid items, the Cronbach's alpha (α) reliability was 0,834. The data analysis methods used in this research are normality, linearity, and hypothesis tests. The data analysis technique used is simple linear regression.

Result

Description of Research Subject

The subjects in this study amounted to 150 second-account users on Instagram. The description of the research subjects was carried out based on gender, age, regional origin, occupation, duration of use/day, and based on the length of time using the second account. Descriptions of research subjects by gender are as follows:

Table 3.1
Description of Research Subject Gender

Gender	Total	Percentage
Male	38	25,33%
Female	112	74,67%
Total	**183**	**100%**

Based on the description of the gender of the research subject above, the majority of the research subjects were female, as many as 112 people (74.67%). Descriptions of research subjects based on age are as follows:

Table 3.2
Description of the Age of Research Subjects

Age	Total	Percentage
Early Adolescence (12-15 years)	7	4,7%
Middle Ages (16-18 years)	44	29,3%
Late Adolescence (19-21 years)	68	45,3%
Early Adulthood (22-40 years)	31	20,7%
Total	**150 subject**	**100%**

Based on the data above, the results showed that the subjects with the age of late adolescence were the most, namely 68 people (45.3%).

Research Data Analysis Results

Based on the results of the linearity test, the significance value of deviation from linearity of the online disinhibition and cyberbullying variables is 0.303 ($p>0.05$). The data shows that the relationship between online disinhibition and cyberbullying is linear. Based on the results of hypothesis testing that the role of online disinhibition in predicting cyberbullying of second-account users on Instagram is accepted. Based on the data in the table above, the result of the coefficient of determination (R Square) is 0.520 which implies that the influence of the online variable here addiction on the cyberbullying variable is 52%.

Discussion

The analysis results were carried out using a simple linear regression technique based on data obtained from the subject of second-account users on Instagram, the independent variable was online disinhibition, and the dependent variable was cyberbullying. These two variables obtained a significance level of

0.000 (p <0.05). Thus, the hypothesis proposed in this study that there is a role for online disinhibition can be accepted.

Furthermore, based on the results of hypothesis testing, the R square value of online disinhibition is 0.520. This means that online disinhibition has contributed to cyberbullying by 52%. Researchers conducted additional analyzes to calculate the effective contribution of online disinhibition aspects to cyberbullying. From the results of the calculation of the practical contribution, it can be seen that in the toxic & benign aspects, online disinhibition makes an effective contribution of 13.42%. The online false self aspect provides an effective contribution of 0.31%. The social media use aspect is 1.62%, the online self-disclosure aspect contributed 17.76%, and the trolling aspect contributed 14.17%. Based on this elaboration, the aspect of online self-disclosure in online disinhibition provides the most considerable effective contribution compared to other aspects, namely 17.76%. Hollenbaugh and Everett (2013) suggest that individuals who score high on online self-disclosure tend to perceive their anonymity very highly, which supports online disinhibition. Meanwhile, low scorers perceive low self-anonymity and assume that other people might know about their behavior.

Researchers also conducted different tests on the demographic results of the respondents but found no significant differences based on gender, age, occupation, or duration of use. Meanwhile, based on the active period of using the second account, it was found that online disinhibition of second account users on Instagram in subjects with a duration of < 1 year and > 3 years had a significance value of 0.002 (p <0.05) and in subjects with a duration of 1- 2 years and > 3 years have a significance value of 0.026 (p <0.05), which means there is a difference in online disinhibition. Meanwhile, seen from the highest mean online disinhibition in users with a long time of use second account for > 3 years of 51.47. This means that online disinhibition in this study was higher in subjects with >3 years of use.

The categorization of cyberbullying on the subject obtained the highest frequency in the low category, with as many as 103 people (68.7%). Forty-seven

people (31.3%) were in the high category. This is a decrease from the initial survey the researchers did. The online disinhibition categorization of subjects obtained the highest frequency in the high category, with as many as 103 people (71.3%). Forty-three people (28.7%) are in the low category. This categorization is appropriate compared to the initial survey the researcher conducted. According to Suler (2004), this can happen because there are two types of high online disinhibition: benign online disinhibition and toxic online disinhibition. Benign online disinhibition is a different behavior between the real world and the virtual world, which is positive, while toxic online disinhibition itself is harmful and detrimental. From this opinion, the research shows that high online disinhibition that is not followed by high cyberbullying can also occur because of the different types of online disinhibition experienced by users.

Conclusion

Based on the results of the research data analysis and discussion that has been explained, the researcher can conclude that the hypothesis in this study is accepted. This means that there is a role for online disinhibition against cyberbullying on second-account users on Instagram.

Suggestion

1. For Second-Account Users

It is recommended that second-account users reduce their behavior when using a second account while still paying attention to social norms in society so that toxic online disinhibition does not occur. Second-account users must also be careful in using a second account because the longer a user uses a second account, the greater the possibility of online disinhibition to someone

2. For the Community and Victims

It is hoped that they will be more aware of cyberbullying behavior when using a second account as an effort to reduce cyberbullying and prevent cyberbullying behavior in the social world.

3. For Researchers

For further researchers, this research can be used as a reference that can help to conduct research with a similar discussion. Further research is also expected to expand the scope of research further so that the data involved is more varied, both from variables and influencing factors to different subjects.

Reference

Instagram, Media Sosial Pemicu "Cyberbullying" Tertinggi. (2017). Diambil 5 April 2021, dari kompas.com website: https://amp.kompas.com/tekno/read/2021/03/29/07164137/*Instagram*-media-sosial-pemicu-cyberbullying-tertinggi

Langos, C. (2012). Cyberbullying: The challenge to define. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, *15*(6), 285–289. https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2011.0588

Lapidot-Lefler, N., & Barak, A. (2012). Effects of anonymity, invisibility, and

lack of eye-contact on toxic online disinhibition. Computers in Human Behavior, 28(2), 434–443. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2011.10.014

Mason, K. L. (2008). Cyberbullying: A preliminary assessment for school personnel. *Psychology in the Schools*, *45*(4), 323–348. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20301

Retasari, D., & Janitra, P. A. (2018). Dramaturgi Dalam Media Sosial: Second Account di *Instagram* Sebagai Alter Ego. *Mediator: Jurnal Komunikasi*, *8*(3), 340–347. Diambil dari https://jkms.ejournal.unri.ac.id/index.php/JKMS/article/view/5671/5264

Stuart, J., & Scott, R. (2021). The Measure of Online Disinhibition (MOD): Assessing perceptions of reductions in restraint in the online environment. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *114*(March 2020), 106534. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106534

Suler, J. (2004). The online disinhibition effect. *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*, *7*(3), 321–326. https://doi.org/10.1089/1094931041291295

Watts, L. K., Wagner, J., Velasquez, B., & Behrens, P. I. (2017). Cyberbullying in higher education: A literature review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *69*, 268–274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.12.038

Willard, N. E. (2007). *Cyberbullying and Cyberthreats: Responding to the Challenge of Online Social Aggression, Threats, and Distress*. Illnois: Research Press. Diambil

dari
https://books.google.co.id/books?id=VyTdG2BTnl4C&dq=willard+2007&lr=&hl=id&source=gbs_navlinks_s

Zahrotunnisa, A., & Hijrianti, U. R. (2019). *Online Disinhibition Effect Dan Perilaku Cyberbullying*. (April), 93–102.