

Digital Citizenship Competence: Initiating Ethical Guidelines and Responsibilities for Digital Citizens

Budi Mulyono¹, Idrus Affandi², Karim Suryadi³, Cecep Darmawan⁴
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia^{1,2,3}

Abstract: The Covid-19 pandemic, which has lasted more than a year, has drastically changed the way people interact. Before the pandemic, daily activities such as communicating, shopping, studying, and even civic engagement were mostly done through direct interaction. However, during a pandemic, when physical activity decreases, digital interactions become more dominant. Unfortunately not everyone is ready for all the openness and infinity in the digital space. Many people stumble into digital problems that ignore digital ethics and responsibility. Several literatures describe digital citizenship as a behavioral norm related to the use of technology. This interpretation was chosen because this definition is the most salient standard in education. To strengthen the conception of digital citizenship, digital citizenship competence is needed as a guideline for ethics and the responsibility of citizens in interacting in the digital world. This literature study describes broadly the digital citizenship competencies developed by several reputable international institutions. We recommend the five competencies of digital citizenship as a guide for digital ethics and responsibility which consists of; Digital citizenship identity, Privacy and security management, Right and responsibility, Digital Empathy, and Active and engaged. The ability to master digital citizenship competencies is an early indicator that a person is considered capable and ready to become a responsible, orderly, and effective digital citizen.

Keyword: *Digital citizenship, Competence, Ethics, Responsibilities, Digital citizen*

Introduction

Since it was declared a global pandemic on March 23, 2020, the Corona Virus Disease 2019 pandemic or known as Covid-19, has infected more than 131 million people in the world with 2.8 million deaths. In Indonesia, since the first case was detected on March 3, 2020 to April 3, 2021 on the *covid19.go.id* page, the government has reported that 1.53 million people have been infected with a virus that resembles the SARS virus. The policies made to control this pandemic are by means of social restrictions on a small scale as well as on a large scale. With this social restriction policy, this health crisis ultimately affected various sectors, from economy, politics, and even education.

¹ E-Mail: budi.mulyono@uny.ac.id

No exception to the social interactions carried out by the community. With the social distancing policy, it is as if people are "forced" to divert all their activities in the digital world. The process of education, seminars, and shopping for daily necessities is now more familiar to the digital world. The number of Indonesians connected to the internet cannot be underestimated. In the annual report from the We Are Social institution entitled Digital 2021: Global Overview Reports released in January 2021, it is stated that active internet users in Indonesia are 202.6 million or 73.7 percent of the population of 274.9 million. Of these, 170 million of them access social media with an average of 3 hours 14 minutes to access it. This data indicates that the Indonesian people are already attached to activities in the digital world, from social media, playing games, to online shopping.

The problem is that not everyone is ready for all the openness and infinity in the digital world. Many people are trapped in problems related to internet use, both through social media and other digital platforms. Social behavior that is usually raised in social interactions in the real world is not necessarily carried out in interactions in cyberspace. There is a change in behavior which John Suler (2004) in the journal *Cyberpsychology & Behavior* calls the online disinhibition effect. That is the psychological condition of a person who feels more comfortable showing certain behaviors, feelings, or thoughts online compared to the real environment. The factors include: dissociative anonymity, invisibility, asynchronicity, solipsistic introjection, dissociative imagination, and minimization of authority (Suler, 2004).

So it is not surprising if the condition of Indonesian digital citizens' civility is rated the lowest in Southeast Asia according to the results of a study entitled "Civility, Safety, and Interactions Online" (2021) together with findings from the Digital Civility Index (DCI) 2020. In the survey, Indonesia ranks 29 of 32 countries surveyed about the level of civility in behaving in the digital space. The survey results certainly contradict the label of Indonesia as having an Eastern culture that upholds the norm of decency. For this reason, an online behavior guide is needed that can guide what is allowed and what is not done in the digital space.

Literature Review

From citizenship to digital citizenship

Digital citizenship consists of the words "citizenship" and "digital". Between "citizenship" and "digital" are actually two completely different concepts. Traditionally the word "citizenship" or some call it "civics" comes from the Latin "civitas" which means "state". Can be translated the word citizenship is "membership of the state" (Banks, 2008, p. 136; Ohler, 2010, p. 28). In legislative language, the meaning of citizenship is a person who lives in a country that has certain civil, social, political and economic rights.

Citizens who are good at the concept of traditional citizenship obey laws and regulations, vote, and pay taxes. The emphasis lies on the rights and obligations of citizens (Choi, 2016, p. 3). For a long time, the word citizenship in the language of law was the membership of a country, but also the language to describe the three components of citizenship: civil, political and social rights, as conceptualized by TH Marshall (1950) more than half a century ago.

In many literatures, citizenship is conceptualized in two views; civic republican and liberal framework. In the civic republican view, participation in political community at the local or national level is essential. Participation can take the form of being involved in; voting,

volunteering, and petitioning, all of which are individual civic duties. Whereas in the view of liberal citizenship, the emphasis is on individual civil, social, political and economic rights as an important element of citizenship. From these two views, the civic republican perspective is most highlighted in civic education as it promotes active citizenship (Choi, 2016, p. 4).

Citizenship as a membership status of a country has geographic, legal, cultural and political boundaries which in turn determine the privileges and obligations of being a citizen. This means that the word "citizenship" has clear geographical boundaries. This traditional concept of citizenship has been criticized because it does not include the multiculturalism and globalization phenomena that are widespread today. Because true citizenship is actually more related to identity and community (Banks, 2008; Choi, 2016, p. 4).

Traditionally Marshall (1950) has described citizenship as the status given to those who are full members of the community "Citizenship is a status that is bestowed on those who are full members of a community" (Marshall, 1950, p. 28). The word community is key in the discussion of citizenship, which is the result of the innate desire of humans to group and come together by serving everyone individually or collectively.

On the other hand, the internet provides the potential to provide benefits to society as a whole and facilitate membership and participation of individuals and society or in sociological terms it is referred to as a social inclusion process (Mossberger, Tolbert, & McNeal, 2008, p. 1). Once groups are formed in the online world, with sufficient focus and cohesion, citizenship issues naturally arise (Ohler, 2010, p. 35). In more precise language Mossberger et al. Call it a digital community (Mossberger et al., 2008, p. 41). It is in this process that between "citizenship" and "digital" find a connection. The virtual world is a place where we think, feel, behave and experience on a daily basis due to the mix of offline and online participation.

Therefore, the discussion of digital citizenship cannot be completely separated from the concept of citizenship in general. Moonsoon Choi (2016) formulates that digital citizenship is built from three elements of citizenship: social responsibility, being well-informed on issues, and active engagement (Choi, 2016, p. 21). The concept of digital citizenship is a multidisciplinary and multidimensional topic. Some literature describes digital citizenship as a digital literacy foundation that focuses on (1) respecting online behavior, and (2) online citizen engagement (Jones & Mitchell, 2016). Therefore, the concept of digital citizenship that is the most common reference, especially regarding education, is the norm and responsible behavior in the use of technology (Ribble & Bailey, 2007, 2011).

Digital citizen in concept

Mossberger, Tolbert, and McNeal briefly refer to digital citizens as: "*digital citizens*" as those who use the Internet regularly and effectively —... who use technology for political information to fulfill their civic duty, and who use technology at work for economic gain (Mossberger et al., 2008, pp. 1–2). This definition highlights that the development of practical digital skills is a prerequisite for political participation. If you use the definition made by Mossberger et al., Anyone who uses the internet on a regular basis can be categorized as a digital citizen.

A different definition is conveyed by Richardson and Milovidov who refer to digital citizens as: "... someone who, through the development of a broad range of competences, is able to actively,

positively and responsibly engage in both on-and offline communities, whether local, national or global”(Richardson & Milovidov, 2019, p. 11).

The definition of a digital citizen in the Richardson and Milovidov concept is someone who, through competency development, is able to actively participate, positively and responsibly in both online and offline communities on a local, national, and global scale. This definition is broader in scope which imposes limits not only on behavior in online communities, but also offline on a large scale.

If we refer to these two opinions, it can be concluded that what is meant by digital citizens is someone who is involved online in their daily lives both to access information and to fulfill their obligations as citizens who participate actively and positively in online and offline communities on a local, national, and national scale. regionally, as well as globally.

Digital Ethic and responsibilities

Ethics, which refers to the study of philosophy, is closely related to both the good and the bad of human action. Ethics is also closely related to values and beliefs that are very important for individuals and society. In a more general definition, Bertens defines ethics as: (1) moral values and norms adopted by a person or group of people in regulating their behavior; (2) a set of moral principles or values adhered to by a group of people in accordance with their field of work which is also called a code of ethics; (3) knowledge of good and bad things(Bertens, 2007, p. 6). Ethics presupposes knowledge of these basic principles and the responsibility to make appropriate choices when necessary.

Ethics is often associated with morals, but even though they are both related to human behavior, both have different meanings. The notion of morality refers to the good and bad values of every human act itself, while ethics means the study of good and bad. Ethics presupposes the capacity to think in abstract terms about the implications of certain actions for oneself, groups, professions, communities, nations, and the world. In philosophy it is categorized as moral philosophy. The essence of ethics is responsibility to others who interacts with a person through various roles (James et al., 2009, p. 14).

Ethics are categorized according to three types of investigation or study: 1) normative ethics, is an attempt to decide or determine values, behavior, and ways of life that are right or wrong, good or bad, praiseworthy or despicable. 2) meta-ethics, which deals with understanding the language of morality through the analysis of the meaning of ethically related concepts and theories, such as the meaning of goodness, happiness, and virtuous character. 3) descriptive ethics, namely ethics describing moral behavior in a broad sense, for example: customs, assumptions about good and bad, actions that are allowed or not allowed (Bertens, 2007, pp. 15–21; Rich, 2020, p. 6).

In relation to human behavior in the internet world, ethics is needed, especially in communicating, including on social media. Because in the use of social media is governed by personal and communal norms, and in most cases the two are connected to the network. The combination of these factors poses a unique ethical challenge (Johns, Chen, & Hall, 2004). The importance of implementing ethics in using social media is based on five reasons; First, internet users come from various cultural and political backgrounds. Second, communication through social media is basically text-based, allowing different interpretations based on the backgrounds of each party. Third, content disseminated through social media is not only directed at the desired user, but

can occur indirectly. Fourth, social media cannot be separated from real world life. Fifth, internet ethics is needed so that every user when in cyberspace understands his rights and obligations as part of cyberspace (Nasrulloh, 2014, pp. 122–124).

Research Methods

This article has been written using the literature review method, which is a research method that critically examines or reviews the knowledge, ideas, or findings contained in the academic-oriented literature, and formulates its theoretical and methodological contributions to certain topics.

Findings & Discussion

Three Categories of Digital Citizenship

The concept of digital citizenship is a “conceptual flexible platform” (Noula, 2019, p. 4) so it requires multiple approaches to fully understand what digital citizenship is. From several literatures, academics who discuss digital citizenship use different approaches. This happens because the concept of digital citizenship is a multidisciplinary and multidimensional concept. From the various existing literature, the authors classify the definition of citizenship into three categories: *as media and information literacy* (Hobbs & Jensen, 2009; Simsek & Simsek, 2013); *online civic engagement and participation* (Jones & Mitchell, 2016; Mossberger et al., 2008; Richardson & Milovidov, 2019). And *ethics and online responsibility* (Papacharissi, 2010; Ribble & Bailey, 2011).

Firstly, digital citizenship as media and information literacy. This concept refers to a person's ability to access, use, create, and evaluate information and to communicate with others online (Choi, 2016, p. 13). Some academics who use this concept include Hobs and Jensen (2009) who explain that: "digital citizenship 'and' new media literacies' emphasize the skills and knowledge needed to be effective in the increasingly social media" (Hobbs & Jensen, 2009, p. 5). This means that digital citizenship and new media literacy are the skills and knowledge needed to be effective in an increasingly social media environment, creating new ethical challenges and opportunities. The opinion of Hobs and Jensen is supported by Simsek and Simsek (2013).

Secondly, digital citizenship as online civic engagement and participation. Namely civic engagement and civic participation both politically and non-politically to achieve the public good. Digital citizenship as civic engagement was proposed by Jones & Mitchell (2016) and Richardson & Milovidov (2019). Jones & Mitchell recommends that digital citizenship focuses on (1) respecting behavior and being tolerant of others, and (2) increasing online civic engagement (Jones & Mitchell, 2016, p. 3). For Jones & Mitchell this definition is more in line with civic education to promote positive online behavior of young citizens. This opinion is in line with the definition presented by Richardson & Milovidov. In his view, digital citizenship and citizen engagement involve activities, from creating, consuming, sharing, playing and socializing, to investigating, communicating, learning and working. This means that all of these activities are included in the domain of digital citizenship.

Meanwhile, digital citizenship as online citizen participation was put forward by Mossberger, Tolbert, and McNeal who described: 'Digital citizenship' is the ability to participate in society online (Mossberger et al., 2008, p. 1). Research conducted by Mossberger et al. Examining the factors that support online participation found that those who participated online coupled with

media and information literacy skills had greater social benefits. In the concept of Mossberger, et al., (2008) digital citizenship is seen as a precursor to political participation. The more young people do online politics, they will increase political knowledge, engagement with politics, and political participation. In other words, Mosberger et al, designed digital citizenship as a political concept. In their definition, link the traditional debate on the topic of inclusion and participation in citizenship with 'digital' as a fundamental social problem that extends before activities in the physical world to cyberspace (Noula, 2019, p. 8).

Thirdly, digital citizenship as an online ethic and responsibility. This concept links digital citizenship with the use of safe, ethical and responsible internet technology (Choi, 2016, p. 9). The most prominent academic in relation to digital citizenship as digital ethics is Mike Ribble who calls digital citizenship “the norms of appropriate, responsible behavior with regard to technology use” (Ribble & Bailey, 2007, p. 10, 2011, p. 10; Ribble, Bailey, & Ross, 2004, p. 7). The definition developed by Ribble is inseparable from the application of the concept of citizenship in the sphere of education, therefore the normative perspective developed is how students understand the rights and responsibilities of being digital citizens, including about how to be safe, legal and ethical, in behaving in the digital world. The concept of digital citizenship then reinforces the positive aspects of technology so that everyone can work and play in this digital world (Ohler, 2012; Ribble & Bailey, 2011).

Another academic who explains digital citizenship as an online responsibility is Papacharissi in her book *A Private Sphere: Democracy in a Digital Age* (2010) which describes digital citizenship as "civic responsibility enabled by digital technologies" (Papacharissi, 2010, p. 103). In her analysis, Papacharissi recognizes the important role of context, describing citizenship as deeply embedded in the factors that shape the historical context of a given time including sociopolitical relationships, economical state of affairs as well as developments in the technology sector (Noula, 2019, p. 6).

Digital citizenship competencies from various global institutions

Citizens in the 21st Century are expected to become learning citizens by developing learning intelligence. Globalization and technological advances cannot be avoided by citizens. So it is necessary to develop technological intelligence as a guide and understanding for citizens of how to live in the digital era. Digital citizenship is defined as the appropriate norms, as well as responsible behavior in the use of information technology. It refers to citizens who can use the internet regularly and effectively (Ribble & Bailey, 2011, p. 10). To make it happen, digital citizenship competence is needed which is an indicator that someone is considered capable and ready to become a responsible, orderly, and effective digital citizen.

From the literature reviewed, there are not many academics who clearly demonstrate what and how digital citizenship competencies are needed in the digital era. There are only a few international institutions that make clear references to the competence of digital citizenship. From the search results, there are at least four international institutions that make digital citizenship competencies. Each of the four institutions has its own point of view and digital citizenship competencies that are different from one another.

Firstly, organizations around the world dedicated to transforming learning with technology The International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) create digital citizenship

competencies in the face of the information technology era using the concept of digital citizenship from Ribble and Bailey (2011). In his idea, there are at least five digital citizenship competencies that must be owned, namely: *Inclusive, Informed, Engaged, Balance, and Alert*.

Secondly, the Council of Europe created a digital citizenship competency which is Europe's perspective in entering the digital era. Digital citizenship competencies in Europe are divided into 10 competencies which are grouped into 3 categories: **being online** which consists of: Access and inclusion, Learning and creativity, Media and information literacy; **well-being online** consisting of; Ethics and empathy, Health and well-being, e-Presence and communications; and **right online** which consists of Active participation, Rights and responsibilities, Privacy and security, Consumer awareness (Richardson & Milovidov, 2019).

Thirdly, The DQ Institute (DQI), an international think tank dedicated to setting global standards for digital intelligence education, outreach, and policy, sets out eight standards for digital citizenship competencies that must be mastered, namely: digital citizen identity, screen time management, cyberbullying management, cyber security management, privacy management, critical thinking, digital footprints, and the last is digital empathy (DQI, 2017).

The last one is Common sense media, a non-profit organization that "provides education and advocacy to families to promote safe technology and media for children" making six competencies of digital citizenship which include: Media Balance and Well-Being, Privacy and Security, Digital Footprint and Identity, Relationships and Communication, Cyberbullying, Digital Drama, and Hate Speech, and News and Media Literacy (James, Weinstein, & Mendoza, 2019).

The comparison of each competency can be seen in the following table.

Table 1
Various Digital Citizenship Competencies

ISTE	Council of Europe	DQ Institute	COMMON SENSE
<i>Inclusive</i>	Being Online: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access and inclusion • Learning and creativity • Media and information literacy) 	<i>digital citizen identity</i>	<i>Media Balance and Well-Being</i>
<i>Informed</i>		<i>screen time management</i>	<i>Privacy and Security</i>
<i>Engaged</i>		<i>cyberbullying management</i>	<i>Digital Footprint and Identity</i>
<i>Balance</i>	Well-being online <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethics and empathy • Health and well-being • e-Presence and communications 	<i>cyber security management</i>	<i>Relationships and Communication</i>
<i>Alert</i>		<i>privacy management</i>	<i>Cyberbullying, Digital Drama, and Hate Speech</i>
	Right online <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active participation • Rights and responsibilities • Privacy and security • Consumer awareness 	<i>critical thinking</i>	<i>News and Media Literacy</i>
		<i>digital footprints</i>	
		<i>digital empathy</i>	

Sources:(DQI, 2017; Fingal, 2019; James et al., 2019; Richardson & Milovidov, 2019)

Of the four institutions that make digital citizenship competency, all refer to the concept of digital citizenship conceptualized by Ribble and Bailey (2011), which emphasizes on norms and responsible behavior in the use of technology. This singular reference occurs because Ribble and Bailey were able to define the earliest and most famous digital citizenship that addresses the educational implications of the concept. adopted by many other advocacy organizations such as

Ethics guidelines and digital citizen responsibility

Internet technology and social media platforms have become new means of communication, expression and collaboration. In it there are private and communal norms, and in most cases both are connected to the network. The combination of these factors poses a unique ethical challenge. (Johns et al., 2004). In the digital space, there are new or at least different ethical stakes (James et al., 2009, p. 16). Therefore, the norms, legal rules and ethical guidelines in offline life do not necessarily apply in online life. This difference is a challenge that is not easy for academics in formulating and establishing ethics in surfing the internet.

Differences in the implementation of ethics and responsibilities in behaving online and offline are due to differentiating factors that contribute to shaping online ethics and responsibilities, such as; 1) technical literacy and technology availability; 2) cognitive and moral person-centered factors; 3) online and offline peer cultures; and 4) presence or absence of ethical supports (James et al., 2009, p. 16). These four factors will reinforce each other in shaping digital ethics and responsibility. Therefore, in understanding ethics and responsibility in the digital space, we should not only focus on ethical violations and responsibility, but also must understand why, how and where such behavior is carried out. In this context Porter (Porter, 1998, p. 68) calls it "rhetorical ethics", namely an approach that emphasizes the implicit understanding between the author and the audience about their relationship, not on a moral code or a set of laws.

In the context of implementing digital citizenship competence, especially in education, digital citizenship competence can be a guide for ethics and responsibility for students in carrying out activities in the digital world. However, the wide reach of the digital world requires that there are clear boundaries, what problems can become the domain of ethics and digital responsibility. In the study of James et al., (2009, p. 20) there are five issues at stake in the use of new media related to ethics and digital responsibility; identity, privacy, ownership and authorship, credibility, and participation. These five issues are also our political entries in discussing the competence of digital citizenship in.

On the basis of this study, we identified five digital citizenship competencies that can guide ethics and responsibility for digital citizens when surfing in the digital world, which include; Digital citizenship identity, Privacy and security management, Right and responsibility, Digital Empathy, and Active and engaged.

Digital citizenship identity, is the ability to build and manage self-identities both online and offline in a healthy and integrity manner. Being a digital citizen is the same as being a citizen, having rights and obligations that must be fulfilled as part of society. For that, integrity must be maintained by managing one's identity responsibly.

Privacy and security management, is the ability to manage all personal information shared online and create strong passwords as an effort to protect yourself from various attacks in cyberspace. Personal data is a new source of economic strength in the midst of big data

management. Often times due to negligence of social media users or weaknesses of media platforms, personal data can be stolen and used for unexpected purposes such as fraud or other cyber crimes.

Right and responsibility, is the ability to respect and use rights and responsibilities as digital citizens proportionally. As part of society, digital citizens have special rights such as the right to privacy, access and inclusion, freedom of expression, and other rights. However, these rights also give rise to certain responsibilities such as ethics and empathy as well as other responsibilities to ensure a safe and responsible digital environment for all.

Digital Empathy, namely the ability of digital citizens to show empathy for others. This ability is demonstrated by skills in communicating in a nonjudgmental way and empathizing with other digital citizens.

Active and engaged, is the ability to use technology and digital channels to actively participate and engage with civilians in a democratic culture both politically and non-politically to solve common problems. Active participation and civic engagement are a form of awareness as citizens in interacting in a digital environment to make responsible decisions and try to solve common problems in both physical and virtual communities.

The five digital citizenship competencies can be a guide for teachers, especially citizenship education teachers, in teaching digital citizenship. Because, civic education teachers are not only required to teach knowledge about the rights and obligations of citizens, but also character and ethics are the inevitable duty of civic educators.

Conclusion and Summary

Digital citizenship became an inevitable necessity when the 4.0 industrial revolution began to roll with the emergence of social media and various applications that shifted citizens' activities to the digital world. But the Covid-19 pandemic has accelerated the migration process. We may quickly be able to adapt to new technology, but not with conventional and traditional attitudes, behaviors, perspectives. An open, balanced, vigilant attitude is still a foreign attitude for some people because they are accustomed to conventional activities.

Digital citizenship competencies guide the ethics and responsibilities of digital citizens when devoting citizenship activities to the digital world such as on social media. The focus is on how to equip citizens for the behaviors that may arise as a result of “infinity” and “anonymity” in the digital world. The ability to master digital citizenship competencies is an initial indicator that a person is considered capable and ready to become a responsible, regular, and effective digital citizen. Because the digital world is like a vast wilderness and has not been fully protected by law. When the activities of citizens in the digital world are allowed to be free, what happens next is the law of the jungle that applies. For this reason, guidance is needed as citizen capital in carrying out activities in the digital world. With this competency, every citizen will be taught to be responsible for every behavior in the digital world and limit himself according to his needs.

Bibliography

- Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher*, 37(3), 129–139. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X08317501>
- Bertens, K. (2007). *Etika*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Choi, M. (2016). A concept analysis of digital citizenship for democratic citizenship education in the internet age. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 44(4), 1–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2016.1210549>
- DQI. (2017). *Digital intelligence: A conceptual framework & methodology for teaching and measuring digital citizenship*. Nanyang. Retrieved from <https://www.dqinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/DQ-Framework-White-Paper-Ver1-31Aug17.pdf>
- Fingal, J. (2019). The 5 competencies of digital citizenship. Retrieved from <https://www.iste.org/explore/digital-citizenship/5-competencies-digital-citizenship>
- Hobbs, R., & Jensen, A. (2009). The Past, Present, and Future of Media Literacy Education. *Journal of Media Literacy Education*, 1, 1–11.
- James, C., Davis, K., Flores, A., Francis, J. M., Pettingill, L., Rundle, M., & Gardner, H. (2009). *Young people, ethics, and the new digital media*. London: The MIT Press.
- James, C., Weinstein, E., & Mendoza, K. (2019). *Teaching digital citizens in today's world: Research and insights behind the common sense K–12 digital citizenship curriculum*. (J. Pritchett, Ed.). San Francisco: Common Sense Media.
- Johns, M. D., Chen, S.-L., & Hall, J. G. (2004). *Online Social Research: Methods, Issues and Ethics*. New York: P. Lang.
- Jones, L. M., & Mitchell, K. J. (2016). Defining and measuring youth digital citizenship. *New Media & Society*, 18(9), 2063–2079. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444815577797>
- Marshall, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and social class and other essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Microsoft. (2021). *Civility, safety & interaction online*.
- Mossberger, K., Tolbert, C. J., & McNeal, R. S. (2008). *Digital citizenship: The internet, society, and participation*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Nasrulloh, R. (2014). *Teori dan riset media siber (Cybermedia)*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenadamedia Group.
- Noula, I. (2019). *Citizenship with a twist?: Discussing citizenship at the digital education turn*. London: Media@LSE.
- Ohler, J. B. (2010). *Digital community: Digital citizen*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin.
- Ohler, J. B. (2012). Digital Citizenship Means Character Education for the Digital Age. *The Education Digest*, 77(8), 14–17.
- Papacharissi, Z. A. (2010). *A private sphere: Democracy in a digital age*. Cambridge: Polity press.
- Porter, J. E. (1998). *Rhetorical ethics and internetworked writing*. Greenwich: Ablex.
- Ribble, M., & Bailey, E. (2007). *Digital citizenship in schools*. Washington D.C: International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE).
- Ribble, M., & Bailey, E. (2011). *Digital Citizenship in Schools*. Washington D.C: International Society for Technology in Education.
- Ribble, M., Bailey, G., & Ross, T. (2004). Digital citizenship: Addressing appropriate technology

- behavior. *Learning and Leading with Technology*, 32, 6–11.
- Rich, K. L. (2020). Introduction to ethics. In J. B. Butts & K. L. Rich (Eds.), *Nursing ethics: Across the curriculum and into practice* (Fifth, pp. 3–30). New York: Jones & Bartlett Learning.
- Richardson, J., & Milovidov, E. (2019). *Digital citizenship education handbook: Being online, well-being online, rights online*. Strasbourg Cedex: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Simsek, E., & Simsek, A. (2013). New literacies for digital citizenship. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 4(2), 126–137.
- Suler, J. (2004). The online disinhibition effect. *Cyber Psychology & Behavior*, 7(3), 321–326.

About the Author:

Chief Researcher
Budi Mulyono <i>Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia</i>
Researcher Member
Idrus Affandi <i>Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia</i>
Karim Suryadi <i>Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia</i>
Cecep Darmawan <i>Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia</i>