



AGAINST CYBERBULLYING IN ADOLESCENTS IN YOGYAKARTA INDONESIA

by Anonymous

From Tugas (Academic Writing 2019 B)

Similarity Index

13%

Internet Sources: 9%

Publications: 4%

Student Papers: 4%

Processed on 12-Sep-2020 8:49 AM

+08

ID: 1385004236

Word Count: 6377

sources:

1

4% match (Internet from 14-Aug-2020)

<https://sersec.org/journals/index.php/IJAST/article/view/17316>

2

1% match (Internet from 03-Aug-2014)

<http://ml.scribd.com/doc/126554252/HUBUNGAN-ANTARA-KONFORMITAS-DAN-PERILAKU-KONSUMTIF-PADA-REMAJA-STUDI-PADA-SISWA-KELAS-XI-SMA-TRIMURTI-SURABAYA>

3

1% match (student papers from 13-Apr-2020)

[Submitted to Bethune Cookman University on 2020-04-13](#)

4

< 1% match (Internet from 14-Feb-2017)

<http://calhoun.nps.edu/bitstream/handle/10945/9927/04Jun%255FDrakopoulos%255FMBA.pdf?isAllowed=y&sequence=1>

5

< 1% match (student papers from 09-Jul-2020)

[Submitted to Florida Community College at Jacksonville on 2020-07-09](#)

6

< 1% match (Internet from 29-Sep-2014)

<http://www.gjfre.org/admin/papers/gjcmp/74-78-MANAGEMENT-vol-3-4-gjcmp.pdf>

7

< 1% match (student papers from 08-Apr-2020)

[Submitted to Sabanci Universitesi on 2020-04-08](#)

8

< 1% match (student papers from 07-Jan-2018)

[Submitted to Universiti Teknologi MARA on 2018-01-07](#)

9

< 1% match (student papers from 01-Nov-2010)

[Submitted to EDMC on 2010-11-01](#)

10

< 1% match (student papers from 13-Apr-2020)

[Submitted to Universiti Teknologi Petronas on 2020-04-13](#)

11

< 1% match (publications)

Mahrous A Ibrahim, Rehab I Abdel-Karim, Mostafa S Ibrahim, Umar F Dar. "Comparative study of the reliability of frontal and maxillary sinuses in sex identification using multidetector computed tomography among Egyptians", Forensic Imaging, 2020

12 < 1% match (student papers from 06-Jan-2020)
Submitted to School of Business and Management ITB on 2020-01-06

13 < 1% match (student papers from 18-Sep-2018)
Submitted to Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology on 2018-09-18

14 < 1% match (Internet from 25-Aug-2020)
<https://che.uad.ac.id/2018/01/page/4/>

15 < 1% match (student papers from 11-Jul-2017)
Submitted to Asia e University on 2017-07-11

16 < 1% match (Internet from 05-Sep-2019)
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0829573514556853>

17 < 1% match (publications)
Osnat Erel, Yael Oberman, Nurit Yirmiya. "Maternal versus nonmaternal care and seven domains of children's development.", *Psychological Bulletin*, 2000

18 < 1% match (Internet from 14-Jul-2018)
<http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12618900/index.pdf>

19 < 1% match (Internet from 13-Apr-2020)
https://journals.lww.com/joem/Fulltext/2020/04000/Employer_or_Employee_Who_is_More_Likely_to_Suffer.13.a

20 < 1% match (publications)
"Handbook of Child Well-Being", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2014

21 < 1% match (publications)
Petra Gradinger, Takuya Yanagida, Dagmar Strohmeier, Christiane Spiel. "Prevention of Cyberbullying and Cyber Victimization: Evaluation of the ViSC Social Competence Program", *Journal of School Violence*, 2014

22 < 1% match (Internet from 06-Sep-2017)
http://scholar.sun.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10019.1/1352/nel_factors_2007.pdf?isAllowed=y&sequence=3

23 < 1% match (Internet from 27-Feb-2019)
<https://archiv.ub.uni-marburg.de/diss/z2017/0211/pdf/drk.pdf>

- 24 < 1% match (Internet from 09-Aug-2012)
<http://www.eurojournals.com/IRJFE4%2012%20ologunde.pdf>
-
- 25 < 1% match (Internet from 01-Feb-2008)
<http://publications.naspa.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1361&context=naspajournal>
-
- 26 < 1% match (Internet from 03-Jun-2020)
<https://epdf.pub/psychology-around-us.html>
-
- 27 < 1% match (Internet from 24-Mar-2020)
https://doc.anet.be/docman/docman.phtml?file=.irua.9042ae.135933_2018_10_20.pdf
-
- 28 < 1% match (Internet from 14-Jan-2014)
<http://scholarworks.uno.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2307&context=td>
-
- 29 < 1% match (Internet from 15-Jun-2020)
https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10964-020-01215-z?code=bd1868f8-9348-4c99-875b-1b3ceb59aeca&error=cookies_not_supported
-
- 30 < 1% match (Internet from 30-Dec-2019)
<https://epdf.pub/fathering-and-child-outcomes.html>
-
- 31 < 1% match (publications)
["The Palgrave Handbook of International Cybercrime and Cyberdeviance", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2020](#)
-
- 32 < 1% match (publications)
[Tony R. Smith, Vaughn J. Crichlow. "A cross-cultural validation of self-control theory", International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice, 2013](#)
-
- 33 < 1% match (publications)
[Siti Bariroh. "The Influence of Parents' Involvement on Children with Special Needs' Motivation and Learning Achievement", International Education Studies, 2018](#)
-
- 34 < 1% match (publications)
[Kevin M. Beaver, Matt DeLisi, Daniel P. Mears, Eric Stewart. "Low Self-Control and Contact with the Criminal Justice System in a Nationally Representative Sample of Males", Justice Quarterly, 2009](#)

paper text:

THE

1 ROLE OF FATHER AND SELF CONTROL AGAINST CYBERBULLYING IN ADOLESCENTS IN YOGYAKARTA INDONESIA Alif Muarifah¹, Nina Zulida

Situmorang2, **Sri**

Saktiar3 alif_muarifah@yahoo.co.id1, nina.situmorang@psy.uad.ac.id2, .arisaktiar@gmail.com3 1Faculty of Teacher Training and Education Ahmad Dahlan University, Indonesia 2, Faculty of Psychology Ahmad Dahlan University Yogyakarta, Indonesia Author Note This work supported by the research fund of Ahmad Dahlan University.

17 **Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to** Alif Muarifah, Faculty **of** Teacher Training and **Education**,

14 **Ahmad Dahlan** University, **Jl. Ringroad Selatan, Kragilan, Tamanan, Kec. Banguntapan, Bantul, Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta,**

INDONESIA 55191. Email: alif_muarifah@yahoo.co.id

1 **ABSTRACT This research study aims to examine the role of fathers and self-control on cyberbullying. This research involved 238 students in Yogyakarta City (139 female, 99 male, the age range of 12 to 16 years old). The respondents filled out the scale of fathers' role, self-control scale, and cyberbullying scale. This research used a quantitative correlational approach with path analysis technique. Analysis of the main hypotheses shows that the role of father correlates very significantly with cyberbullying, both directly and mediated by self-control. The role of fathers is directly correlated with cyberbullying with a correlation (-0.175). This correlation value is smaller than the correlation value of the role of the father against cyberbullying mediated by self-control (-0.334). Besides, this study shows the role of fathers has a positive and very significant correlation with self-control 0.678. Self-control is negatively related and very significant with cyberbullying (-0.664).**

Keywords: cyberbullying, role of father, self-control. 1. Introduction People

31 **in the digital era** have **the** ease **of** accessing information through **the internet.**

Indonesian Internet Service Providers Association or APJII (2017) reported that internet users in Indonesia amount to 54.68%. That is 143.26 of Indonesia's 262 million internet users. Java Island occupies the top position of internet users, as much as 58%, then Sumatra 19.05% and Kalimantan 7.97% (APJII, 2017). Internet users mostly use smartphone devices. Various services used in internet chat 89.35% following social media 87.13%. The most accessed social media are Facebook, Instagram and YouTube. Educational

content ranks fourth after social media, entertainment and news (APJII, 2016), whereas internet users aged 13-18 years amounted to 16.68% or 23.89 million, where internet use should focus more on accessing education content, but the reality is not how it looks. The ease of accessing internet technology has positive and negative effects for its users (Turkle, 2005). Positive impacts, such as increased academic achievement (Torres-Diaz, Duarte, Alvarado, Gutiérrez, & Faggioni, 2016), facilitate psychosocial adjustments, for individuals who have social anxiety (Valkenburg & Peter, 2007). One of the negative impacts of the internet is cyberbullying (Cassidy, Faucher, & Jackson, 2013; Netzley, 2014; Smith & Slonje, 2010). Li, Cross, and Smith (2012) explained cyberbullying is aggression using information and communication technology such as cell phones, video conferences, e-mails, and web pages to upload or send messages with the aim of harassing or humiliating others; or

18 **the use of information and communication technology to support** hostility both individuals **and**

groups, with the intent of hurting others intentionally, repeatedly (Belsey, 2005). For victims, cyberbullying causes psychological distress (Safaria, 2016), mental health disorders (Bannik, Broeren, Waart, & Raat, 2014), subjective health disorders (Fridh, Lindström, & Rosvall, 2015),

16 **depression (Bonanno & Hymel, 2013)**, low academic achievement (**Schneider, O'Donnell, Stueve, & Coulter, 2012**),

emergence of suicidal ideation and behavior especially for women (Roberts, Axas, Nesdole, & Repetti, 2016), and risk of psychiatric disorders at a later age (Sourander, Jensen, Davies, Niemela, & Elonheimo, 2007). Researchers have reported that cyber abuse in adolescents occurs in various countries. Heirman

3 **and Walrave (2012) reported that Belgian adolescents aged 12- 18 years were involved in** cyber negotiations, **33.2% of whom were perpetrators. Lovegrove and Cornell (2014) found 12% of American students** engage in **cyberbullying.**

Holfeld and Grabe (2012) reported that adolescents in the Midwestern region, America are engaging in Cyberbullying and targeting teachers.

7 **Ditch The Label (2017) reported that around 12% of people in the United Kingdom** harass **and 54%** experience bullying **through digital media.**

Holfeld and Grabe (2012) reported that Midwestern students, Americans aged 14.5 years experienced 64% cyber abuse and 60% witnessed cyberbullying. Seventeen percent of ninth grade students in Australia and America were victims of cyber abuse, 33% were victims of traditional abuse, and 12% experienced both (Hemphill, Tollit, Kotevski, & Heerde, 2015). In 2016, UNICEF recorded 41% to 50% of Indonesian adolescents aged 13 to 15 years old do cyberbullying (Razak, 2014). Eighty percent of junior high school students in Yogyakarta experience cyberbullying (Safaria, 2016). Similar to traditional bullying in terms of aggressiveness, the difference is seen in terms of face to face, repetition and strength. Cyberbullying is done because the perpetrators do not meet directly with the victims (Kowalski, Giumetti, Schoroeder, &

Lattanner, 2014, Sticca & Perren, 2012). Repetitions in cyberbullying repeatedly, or uploaded actions are forwarded or downloaded by other internet users so they can be accessed at any time. The power imbalance in cyberbullying can be seen from the number of internet users who witnessed cyberbullying in one victim. Cyberbullying is easier to do anywhere, not limited by time not having to deal with victims (Kowalski et al., 2014). The perpetrators can do cyberbullying without being seen directly and given the freedom to launch the action, even more so the effects of anonymity (Patchin & Hinduja, 2006). Anonymity causes the perpetrator not to face the suffering of the victim therefore it is easy to keep a moral distance from the victim (Navarro, Yubero, & Larrañaga, 2015). This indicates the offender does not feel guilty when injuring others. Cyberbullying is carried out for a variety of reasons, such as replying to bullying (Frey, Pearson, & Cohen, 2015; Betts, Spenser & Baguley, 2016), humor (Wilton & Campbell 2011; Sari, 2016), eliminated the negative feelings due to abuse and prevent further bullying. Cyberbullying is a serious problem and is getting worse, experiencing an explosion involving a long time span and age range (Parks, 2013). Because the perpetrators do have moral considerations, even take action that is not done in the real world or known as the online dis-inhibition effect (Suler, 2004). Parents are of an important figure in educating and giving moral example, especially in adolescents who are in the search for identity. Therefore the disruption in communication, the breakdown of harmony in the family can stimulate the emergence of bullying as an escape or impingement of adolescents. The

23lack of parenting is a potential for aggression in adolescents

(Batool, 2013). Qualitatively, fathers have different roles in socialization with mothers (Batool, 2013; Lamb, 1975). The role of father is an important asset in growing a child's personality into adulthood thus he has a good relationship with others (Palkovitz, Copes, Woolfolk, 2001). 1.1 Literature Review The role of fathers in care makes it easier for children to maximize gender roles thus, androgyny attitudes can develop properly. Therefore relationships with the opposite sex become healthy, able to improve achievement, minimize depression, emotional stress, and negative emotional expression, minimize conflict, aggressiveness thus prosocial behavior (Allen & Daly, 2007; Lamb, 2010). The role of father for his children, involved in maintaining and providing care, guiding morals and ethics, providing moral, practical, and psychosocial support for mothers of their children, meeting economic needs (Marsiglio, Day & Lamb, 2000). Involved in childcare and moral education (Palkovitz, 2002). Able to influence children's emotions and social (Rosenberg & Wilcox (2006). Fathers who have a positive character and are involved in educating children, make children grow up to be tolerant, solve conflicts independently, adapt easily, forgive the mistakes of others, have good achievements, and succeed in life in the future. Emotional reactions are not excessive, calmer in interacting with others (Allen & Daly (2007). So the involvement of fathers in educating is an important factor in predicting adolescent behavior (Carlson, 2006). Fathers who raise children with physical and psychological violence influence depression, low self-esteem, love to commit violence or aggression, anti-social behavior and criminality as adults. Besides the role of father, there are other factors that influence cyberbullying, namely personality. One of them

29is self-control. Self-control is an attempt to rule out or

inhibit reactions that arise automatically, habits, or behaviors, urges, emotions, or desires that interfere with the achievement of goals (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000). Controlling yourself means trying to work and direct the behavior in the desired direction consciously (Bauer & Baumeister, 2011). Self-control according to Averill (1973) is divided into three aspects: 1) behavioral control, responding to a stimulus by modifying unpleasant circumstances 2) cognitive control, the ability to manage negative information by interpreting and

linking events in a cognitive sequence to minimize pressure 3) decision control, choosing actions that are believed and appropriate from various choices. Low self-control becomes the forerunner to all forms of deviation or crime (Baumiester & Tierney, 2011; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). Low self-control makes individuals impulsive, like to fight, selfish and insensitive to the suffering of people, prefers physical activity, easily frustrated, and lack of ability to respond that it can be a cause of the emergence of cyberbullying among European adolescents

27(Vazsonyi, Machackova, Sevcikova, Smahel, dan Cerna (2012). The rise of

bullying among Indonesian adolescents can illustrate how important the role of fathers in parenting, where at present the role of fathers in parenting has not been maximized because there is still a visible distance of communication between them (Andayani & Kuncoro, 2007). Adolescents with good self-control abilities are wiser in using digital gadgets, including acting aggressively in cyberspace, such as cyberbullying, conversely, if teens have low self-control then tend to refuse to delay desires, reactive, and act aggressively. Therefore self-control issue becomes the cause of cyberbullying among teens (Vazsonyi et al., 2012) 1.2 Hypothesis 1. The hypotheses in this study are: 2. There is a relationship between the role of fathers directly or indirectly (through self-control) to cyberbullying in Yogyakarta City. 3. There is a positive relationship between the role of fathers and adolescent self-control in Yogyakarta. 4.

28There is a negative relationship between self-control and

cyberbullying in Yogyakarta. 2. Methode The study involved 238 adolescents aged 13-16 years, consisting of 139 female and 99 male. Data were collected using three scales that revealed three variables: role of father, self-control and cyberbullying. The role of father scale consisted of 28 items with a scale reliability of 0.896, the correlation coefficient moving from 0.326 to 0.591. The self-control scale consisted of 29 items with a reliability scale of 0.906, the correlation coefficient moves from 0.276 to 0.588. The cyberbullying scale consists of 26 items with a reliability value of 0.907, with a correlation coefficient between 0.091 to 0.766. Data collected in this study were analyzed by using an SPSS 20.0 program, along with descriptive analysis, correlation analysis, and regression analysis. 3. Result 3.1 Descriptive Analysis Descriptive analysis results show the minimum score, maximum, average, average and standard deviation of each variable to find a general overview of empirical data. Empirical scores are values obtained based on field data, while hypothetical scores are scores based on the scale weighting rules according to the number of items. Table 1 presented categorization norm. Table 1. Categorization norm Norm Category $(\mu+1\sigma) \leq X$ High

$8(\mu-1\sigma) \leq X < (\mu+1\sigma)$ Intermediate $X < (\mu-1\sigma)$ Low Note: X = subject score μ = Hypothetical mean σ = Hypothetical standard deviation (SD)

Descriptive statistics the role of father presented in Table 2. In empirical data, the minimum score was 59, the maximum score was 111, the average was 89.85, and the standard deviation was 9.555. Hypothetical data show a minimum score of 28, a maximum score of 112,

4a mean of 70 and a standard deviation of

23,333. Table 2. Descriptive statistics of role of father variable Var Total Item Min Empirical Data Max Mean SD Hypothetical Data Min Max Mean SD Role of Father 28 59 111 89.85 9.555 28 112 70 23,333
Descriptive statistics self-control presented in Table 3. In empirical data, the minimum score was 69, the maximum score was 116, the average was 92.63, and the standard deviation was 9.567. Hypothetical data show a minimum score of 29, a maximum score of 116,

4a mean of 72.5 and a standard deviation of

24,166. Table 3. Descriptive statistics of self-control variable Var Total Empirical Data Item

11Min Max Mean SD Hypothetical Data Min Max Mean SD

Self-control 29 69 116 92,63 9,57 29 116 72,5 24,166 Self-control score categorization in empirical data in Table 4. showed as much as 15.97% (15 men and 23 women), 70.59% medium category (69 men and 99 women), and low categories with a frequency of 13.44% (15 men and 27 women. Hypothetical data showed high category with a frequency of 31.5% (24 men and 51 women), and moderate category as much as 68.5% (75 men and 88 women) Data show that most of the respondents have moderate self-control. Descriptive statistics cyberbullying presented in Table 5. In the empiric data, the minimum score was 25, the maximum score was 69, the average was 43,12, and the standard deviation was 9,073. Hypothetic data show a minimum score of 26, a maximum score of 104, an average of 65 and a standard deviation of 21,67. Table 4. Categorization of self-control score Category Empirical Data Hypothetical Data Interval M F Total % Interval M F Total % High Intermediate Low $X \geq 102,199$ 15 23 83,063 $\leq X < 102,199$ 69 99 $X \leq 83,063$ 15 17 38 15,97 168 70,59 32 13,44 $96.666 \leq X$ 24 51 75 31.50 $48.334 \leq X < 96.666$ 75 88 163 68.50 $X < 48.334$ 0 0 Table 5. Descriptive statistics of cyberbullying variable Var Total Empirical Data Item

11Min Max Mean SD Hypothetical Data Min Max Mean SD

Cyberbullying 26 25 69 43,12 9,073 26 104 65 21,67 Empirical data showed in Table 6, the number of respondents in the high category of 21.01% (50 respondents). Male in a total of 20 respondents and female 30 respondents. The medium category was 58.40% (139 respondents). Men consisted of 63 respondents and women as many as 76 respondents. Respondents in the low category was 20.59% (49 respondents). Men consisted of 16 respondents and women consisted of 33 respondents. Table 6. Empirical data on cyberbullying variables Interval Category Frequency % M Gender F $52,193 \leq X$ High 34,047 $7 \leq X < 52,193$ Intermediate $X < 34,047$ Low 50 139 49 21.01 58,40 20,59 20 63 16 30 76 33 Total 238 100 99 139 Note: M = Male, F = Female Hypothetical data showed in Table 7, the respondents in the medium category as much as 47.1% (112 respondents). Male consisted of 55 respondents and female in the medium category were 57 respondents. Respondents in the low category was 52.9% (126 respondents). Male consisted of 44 respondents, and female consisted of 82 respondents. Table 7. Hypothetical data on cyberbullying variable Interval Category Frequency % M Gender F $86,67 \leq X$ 43,33 $\leq X < 86,67$ $X < 43,33$ High Intermediate Low 0 112 126 0 47,1 52,9 0 55 44 0 57 82 Total 238 100 99 139 Note: M = Male, F = Female 3.2 Assumption Test

12Normality test aims to test the residual value of the regression model, whether it is normally distributed or not.

This study uses a probability plot normality test.

10 **Data is normally distributed if the distribution of points** or data **is around a line and follows a diagonal line.**

Conversely, if a point spreads away from a line and does not follow a diagonal line, then the data is not normally distributed. Normality test presented in Figure 1, shows points or data located around the

33 **line and follows the diagonal line,**

hereby the data are distributed normally thus regression test can be performed.

19 **Figure 1. Normal probability plot of regression standardized residual**

Linearity test knows the research variables contain a linear relationship or not and it presented in Table 8. If the significance value of linearity ($p < 0.05$) signifies significant, and the

13 **significance value of deviation from linearity is greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$)** signifies not significant, **then the**

two variables are related linearly. Linearity test between cyberbullying variables with the role of the father produces a linearity

2 **significance value of 0.00 ($p < 0.05$), which means** significant, and **a**

significance value of deviation from linearity of 0.965 ($p > 0.05$) which means it is not significant, so the relationship of the two variables is linear. Linearity test between cyberbullying variable and self-control produced a linearity significance of 0.00 ($p < 0.05$), which means significant, and a significance value of deviation from linearity of 0.646 ($p > 0.05$) which means it is not significant, so the relationship between the two variables is linear. Linearity test of paternal role and self-control variables showed the significance value of linearity was 0.00 ($p < 0.05$) which means significant, and the significance value of deviation from linearity was 0.341 ($p > 0.05$) which means it is not significant, so the relationship between the two variables is linear.

Table 8. Linearity test results

Variable	Linearity F	Sig (p)	Deviation from Linearity F	Sig (p)	Note
CB*RF	85.758	0.000	0,622	0,965	Linier
CB*SC	161,712	0.000	0,903	0,646	Liner
RF*SC	204.253	0.000	1.089	0,236	Linier

Note: CB = Cyberbullying, RF = Role of Father, SC = Self Control

3.3 Hypothesis Test 3.3.1 Major Hypothesis (The role of fathers and self-control as moderators of cyberbullying) Hypothesis testing is done by using intervening variable regression tests or path analysis. The analysis is carried out in two-stage, first path coefficient model and second two-level regression test. Table 9 presented path coefficient model 1. Significance value of the role of fathers to self-control of 0.00 ($p < 0.01$) indicates very significant. The path value of the role of father variable to self-control was seen from the standardized beta coefficients of 0.678 ($P1 = 0.678$). The value of self-control variance that is not explained by the role of the father or $e1 = \sqrt{1 -$

0,460) = 0,735. The regression model formed is: $Y = 31,618 + (-0,679) \text{ fathers' role} + 0,735$. Y = variable of self-control. Table 9. Path Coefficient model 1

4 Unstandardized Standardized Coefficients Coefficients Sig. R2 B Beta (Constant)

31,618 RF*SC 0,679 0,678 0 0,46 Note: RF = Role of Father, CB = Cyberbullying Path analysis is done to test the major hypothesis through two levels. The first step is to do a regression test of the role of fathers to self-control. The results of the level one regression test (table-10) show the role of fathers to moderator variable is very significant. R square value in the table "model summary" was equal to 0.460, which shows that the contribution of paternal role variables to self-control by 46%. The remaining 54% is contributed by other variables outside this study. Two-level regression test presented in Table-10. The significance of the role of fathers towards cyberbullying directly or through self-control moderators. The value of the role of father pathway to the Cyberbullying variable is -0,175 (P2 = -0,175). The significance value of self-control towards cyberbullying of 0.00

24 means that it is very significant. the path value of

the self-control variable to the cyberbullying variable is -0,522 (P3 = -0,522). The variant values of cyberbullying are not explained by the role of the father and self-control or $e^2 = \sqrt{(1 - 0,428)} = 0,756$. The regression model formed is: $Y = -103.955 + (-0,166) \text{ fathers' role} + (-0,495) \text{ self-control} + 0,756$; Y = Cyberbullying variable. Table 10. one path tier analysis

15 Unstandardized Coefficients B Std. Error Standardized Coefficients Beta t Sig. (Constant) 31.618 4.

327 7.306 .000 RF .679 .048 .678 14.179 .000 Note: RF = Role of Father Table 11 presented two-path tier analysis. The significance value of the role of father in cyberbullying is 0.01 (very significant). The value of the role of father in cyberbullying -0,175 (P2 = -0,175). The significance value of self-control for cyberbullying is 0.00 (very significant). The value of self-control variable to the cyberbullying variable is 0.522 (P3 = -0.522). Values of cyberbullying that are not explained by the role of the father and self-control or $e^2 = \sqrt{(1-0,428)} = 0,756$. The regression model formed is: $Y = -103.955 + (-0,166) \text{ fathers' role} + (-0,495) \text{ self-control} + 0,756$ (Y = Cyberbullying variable). The value of R square in the model summary table is 0.428 indicating the contribution of the role of father variable through self-control to the cyber abuse variable at 42.8%, while the remaining 57.2% is the contribution of other variables outside this study. Table 11. two path tier

6 analysis Unstandardized Standardized Coefficients Coefficients t Sig. B Std. Error Beta (Constant)

103.955 4.689 22.170 .000 RF*CB -.166 .064 -.175 -2.610 .010 SC*CB -.495 .064 -.522 -7.775 .000 Note: CB = Cyberbullying, RF = Role of Father, SC = Self Control 3.3.2 Minor Hypothesis Minor hypothesis testing is performed to see separately the relationship of each variable the role of the father to self-control and self-control to cyberbullying. Table 12 presented Pearson correlation analysis. A correlation value of the role of

father in self-control was 0.678 with a significance of 0.00, $p < 0.01$. Effective contributions are obtained through the following calculations: $EC = Bx1 \times r1y \times 100\%$; $EC = 0,460 \times 0,678 \times 100\%$; $EC = 31,188 \%$. The Pearson correlation value of self-control to cyberbullying was -0,641 with a significance of 0.00, $p < 0.01$. Effective contributions are obtained through the following calculations: $EC = Bx2 \times r2y \times 100\%$; $EC = 0,522 \times 0,641 \times 100\%$; $EC = 33,46\%$. Role of father is positively related and very significant to self-control with a Pearson correlation value of 0.678 and

2a significance value of 0.00 ($p < 0.01$). That means,

the higher the role of fathers, the

6higher the level of self-control. Conversely, **the lower the** role of fathers, **the**

lower the

34level of self-control. Effective contribution of **the** role of

fathers contributing to cyberbullying is 31,188%.

1Self-control is negatively related and highly **significant** to **cyberbullying**

with a Pearson correlation value of -0,641, and

2a significance value of 0.00 ($p < 0.01$). That means,

the higher the self-control, the lower the level of cyberbullying is done. Conversely, the lower the self-control, the higher the Cyberbullying is carried out. The effective contribution of self-control to cyberbullying is 33.46%. Table 12. Pearson correlation analysis Pearson Sig Correlation RF*SC 0.678 0.000 SC*CB -0,641 0.000 Note: CB = Cyberbullying, RF = Role of Father, SC = Self Control 4 Discussion The analysis

1shows that the role of fathers is **very significantly** related to **cyberbullying** **directly**

or through self-control mediators; therefore the first hypothesis is accepted. The value of the direct path is smaller than the value of the path mediated by self-control therefore the indirect relationship is more dominant. The relationship formed is a negative relationship, meaning that cyberbullying is lower if the role of fathers through self-control is higher and vice versa, the lower the role of fathers through self-control the cyber abuse in adolescents is higher. According to cognitive social learning human life is built by social systems, behavior is formed through social interaction by imitating through direct and indirect experience (Bandura, 1986). Father can portray himself as a person of character then directly or indirectly become a model for his child. The basic principles of social and moral learning occur through observation and the

presentation of examples of behavior (Bandura, 1977). In interacting they learn reciprocally with full familiarity about a variety of things, including, norms, moral ethics, sexual roles, cooperation and ways of establishing relationships (Thomas, 2000). The involvement of children in interactions can help develop the potential for cognition, morals, increasing achievement and the formation of positive mental health (Johnson & Johnson, 1997). Interaction with fathers in parenting will form cognitive schemes that affect behavior (McMunn, Martin, Kelly, & Sacker, 2017, Rollè et al., 2019). The role of father in positive parenting will develop positively thus the child's ability to control and control oneself develops optimally (Caspi & Roberts, 2001). Cyberbullying is associated with traditional bullying, with acts of externalization carried out in cyberspace because it contains negative behavior, hostility, emotions, envy, anger (Vazsonyi et al., 2012). Externalization is associated with parental supervision, strict

30 **discipline, parental disharmony, rejection of children, and low involvement**

(Flouri, 2005). Longitudinal studies conducted by Cohen, Brook, Cohen, Velez and Garcia (1991) showed that acts of externalization of adolescents such as cyberbullying are caused by conditions that develop over the previous eight years.

20 **In this case, the father plays an important role in shaping the personality of**

the child, because a positive father's involvement in the child is a capital for the child in entering his social world and is carried over into adolescence and adulthood. The effective role of fathers not only contributes negatively to bullying but also that children are protected from bullying from others (Flouri, 2005). Adolescents who are safe from cyberbullying actions are closely related to the role of fathers. Fathers

26 **play a role in shaping children's self-control primarily in**

social life because self-control is a process formed since childhood (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000). Beside, self-control is the mother of all forms of deviation, including cyberbullying (Baumeister & Tierney, 2011). The results of the analysis show the significance value formed between the role of the father against cyberbullying is 0.00, $p < 0.01$ and the correlation value is 0.678 thus the role of father is positively related and very significant to self-control. Thus the hypothesis is accepted. The relationship formed between the two variables is a positive relationship, the higher the role of fathers, the higher the self-control of adolescents, conversely the lower the role of fathers the lower the self-control. The role of fathers contributed 31.188% to self-control, while 68.812% is contributed by other variables outside the study. This study is in line with the findings of five senior high schools in Yogyakarta that the role of parent mediation

22 **is significantly related to self-control with a value of**

$F = 69.267$, $p < 0.01$ (Hidayati, 2017). The results of this study are strengthened by Muranven and Baumeister (2000) that self-control arises automatically because of habit or behavior since childhood. The main cause of individual failure in self-control is parental care that is not effective (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990). The ineffective components of parenting are

9 failure to monitor children's behavior, failure to recognize when deviant behavior occurs, and erratic and excessive punishment for deviant behavior

(Meece & Mize, 2011). The role of fathers partially plays an important role in child development, influencing until adolescence (Hidayati, Kaloeti, & Karyono, 2011). The frequency of contact with children does not guarantee ideal child development including self-control (Palkovitz, 2002). Fathers who educates with non-ideal parenting, such as rude behavior, the omission of violation, it will have an impact on

3 the formation of negative self-control which is the forerunner of

all forms of actions outside moral standards (Zhou, Eisenberg, Wang, & Reiser, 2004). The data shows that

1 self-control is negatively related and very significant towards cyberbullying.

The two variables are

5 negatively related, the higher the self-control, the lower the level of cyberbullying, conversely the lower the self-control, the higher the cyberbullying. The effective contribution of

self-control to cyberbullying is 33.46%, while the remaining 66.54% is contributed by other variables not examined. This study supports research conducted by Vazsonyi et al. (2012) in 1000 European adolescents aged nine to 16 years that cyberbullying and traditional bullying are interconnected and indirectly influenced by low self-control of adolescents. Self-control is responsible for exercising mind control, decision control and behavioral control in choosing responses (Fujita, Trope, Liberman, & Levin-Sagi, 2006). Individuals with good self-control will choose a positive response or direct the behavior according to the desired consciously despite overriding the desired behavior to follow the rules or norms (Bauer & Baumeister, 2011). Conversely,

2 individuals with low self-control tend to respond to a

stimulus quickly without thinking long even though it is not in accordance with moral standards (Grasmick, Tittle, Bursik, & Arneklev, 1993). All forms of deviation that are not in accordance with moral standards begin with weak self-control (Baumeister & Tierney, 2011). Cyberbullying is a form of behavior that is not in accordance with moral standards associated with weak self-control. Weak self-control in Cyberbullying is increasingly manifested by online disinhibition effects in cyberspace which lack social rules and easy internet access. 5 Conclusion The role of fathers proved to be highly significant correlated

1 with cyberbullying both directly and through mediation of self-control. The role of fathers

towards Cyberbullying mediated by self-control has a greater correlation value than the value of the correlation of the role of fathers to cyberbullying directly. The role of fathers is positively related

1 and very significant with adolescent self control. Self-control is negatively related and is very significant with cyberbullying.

Male adolescent are more involved in cyberbullying than female. Acknowledgments We thank Ahmad Dahlan University that provided research funds. We thank Rector, Dean, and Research and Development Institut Ahmad Dahlan University. We appreciate the

21 schools and the students who participated in our study. We thank to

research assistant who helps in process research. Lastly, we thank all parties involved in this research that cannot be mentioned all. REFERENCES Allen, S. M., & Daly, K. J. (2007). The effects of father involvement: An updated research summary of the evidence. Centre for Families, Work & Well-Being, University of Guelph. Andayani, B., & Koentjoro. (2007). Psikologi keluarga: Peran ayah menuju parenting. Sidoarjo: Laros. Asosiasi Penyelenggara Jasa Internet Indonesia. (2016). Infografis penetrasi & perilaku pengguna internet indonesia. Jakarta Pusat: Poling Indoensia. Asosiasi Penyelenggara Jasa Internet Indonesia. (2017). Infografis penetrasi & perilaku pengguna internet indonesia. Teknopreneur. Averill, J. R. (1973). Personal control over aversive stimuli and its relationship to stress. *Psychological bulletin*, 80(4), 286. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0034845> Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1977). *Social learning theory* (Vol. 1). Prentice-hall. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood cliffs. Bannink, R., Broeren, S., van de Looij-Jansen, P. M., de Waart, F. G., & Raat, H. (2014). Cyber and traditional bullying victimization as a risk factor for mental health problems and suicidal ideation in adolescents. *PLoS one*, 9(4). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0094026>. Batool, S. S. (2013). Lack of adequate parenting: A potential risk factor for aggression among adolescents. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 28(2). Bauer, I. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2011). Self-regulatory strength. *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and applications*, 2, 64-82. Baumeister, R. F., & Tierney, J. (2011). *Willpower: Rediscovering the greatest human strength*. Penguin. Belsey, B. (2005). Cyberbullying: An emerging threat to the "always on" generation. http://www.cyberbullying.ca/pdf/feature_dec2005.pdf Betts, L. R., Gkimitzoudis, A., Spenser, K. A., & Baguley, T. (2016). Examining the roles young people fulfill in five types of cyber bullying. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 34(7), 1080– 1098. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407516668585> . Bonanno, R. A., & Hymel, S. (2013). Cyber bullying and internalizing difficulties: Above and beyond the impact of traditional forms of bullying. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 42(5), 685-697. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-9937-1>. Carlson, M. J. (2006). Family structure, father involvement, and adolescent behavioral outcomes. *Journal of marriage and family*, 68(1), 137-154. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00239>. Caspi, A., & Roberts, B. W. (2001). Personality development across the life course: The argument for change and continuity. *Psychological Inquiry*, 12, 49–66. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1202_01 Cassidy, W., Faucher, C., & Jackson, M. (2013). Cyberbullying among youth: A comprehensive review of current international research and its implications and application to policy and practice. *School psychology international*, 34(6), 575-612.. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034313479697> Cohen, P., Brook, J.S., Cohen, J., Velez, C. & Garcia, C. (1991). Common and uncommon pathways to adolescent. In L. Robins & M. Rutter (Eds.), *Straight and devious pathways from childhood to adulthood*. Cambridge University Press. Ditch The Label. (2017). *The annual cyber survey 2017*. Ditch The Label Your World Prejudice Free. Flouri, E. (2005). *Fathering and child outcomes*. John Wiley & Sons. Frey, K. S., Pearson, C. R., & Cohen, D. (2015). Revenge is seductive, if not sweet: Why friends matter for prevention

efforts. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 37, 25-35.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2014.08.002>. Fridh, M., Lindström, M., & Rosvall, M. (2015). Subjective health complaints in adolescent victims of cyber harassment: moderation through support from parents/friends-a Swedish population-based study. *BMC public health*, 15(1), 949.

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-2239-7>. Fujita, K., Trope, Y., Liberman, N., & Levin-Sagi, M. (2006). Construal levels and self-control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(3), 351– 367.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.3.351> Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford University Press.

Grasmick, H. G., Tittle, C. R., Bursik Jr, R. J., & Arneklev, B. J. (1993). Testing the core empirical implications of Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, 30(1), 5-29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427893030001002>

Heirman, W., & Walrave, M. (2012). Predicting adolescent perpetration in cyberbullying: An application of the theory of planned behavior. *Psicothema*, 24(4), 614-620.

Hemphill, S. A., Kotevski, A., Tollit, M., Smith, R., Herrenkohl, T. I., Toumbourou, J. W., & Catalano, R. F. (2012). Longitudinal predictors of cyber and traditional bullying perpetration in Australian secondary school students. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 51(1), 59-65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2011.11.019>

Hidayati, F., Kaloeti, D. V. S., & Karyono, K. (2011). Peran ayah dalam pengasuhan anak. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.14710/jpu.9.1>

Hidayati, I. (2017). Peran mediasi orangtua dan kontrol diri terhadap kecenderungan perilaku penggunaan internet secara berlebihan pada remaja (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Gadjah Mada).

Holfeld, B., & Grabe, M. (2012). Middle school students' perceptions of and responses to cyber bullying. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 46(4), 395-413. <https://doi.org/10.2190/EC.46.4.e>

Johnson & Johnson. (1997). *Emotional intelligence*. Prentice Hall Inc.

Kowalski, R. M., Giumetti, G. W., Schroeder, A. N., & Lattanner, M. R. (2014). Bullying in the digital age: A critical review and meta-analysis of cyberbullying research among youth. *Psychological bulletin*, 140(4), 1073. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035618>

Lamb, M. E. (1975). Fathers: Forgotten contributors to child development. *Human development*, 18(4), 245-266. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000271493>

Lamb, M. E. (2010). How do fathers influence children's development? Let me count the ways. The role of the father in child development, 1-26

Li, Q., Cross, D., & Smith, P. K. (Eds.). (2011). *Cyberbullying in the global playground: Research from international perspectives*. John Wiley & Sons.

Lovegrove, P. J., & Cornell, D. G. (2014). Patterns of bullying and victimization associated with other problem behaviors among high school students: A conditional latent class approach. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 37(1), 5-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2013.832475>

Marsiglio, W., Day, R. D., & Lamb, M. E. (2000). Exploring fatherhood diversity: Implications for conceptualizing father involvement. *Marriage & Family Review*, 29(4), 269-293. https://doi.org/10.1300/J002v29n04_03

McMunn, A., Martin, P., Kelly, Y., & Sacker, A. (2017). Fathers' involvement: Correlates and consequences for child socioemotional behavior in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Family Issues*, 38(8), 1109-1131.

Meece, D., & Mize, J. (2011). Preschoolers' cognitive representations of peer relationships: Family origins and behavioral correlates. *Early Child Development and Care*, 181, 63–72.

Muraven, M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources: Does self-control resemble a muscle?. *Psychological bulletin*, 126(2), 247. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.2.247>

Navarro, R., Yubero, S., & Larrañaga, E. (Eds.). (2015). *Cyberbullying across the globe: Gender, family, and mental health*. Springer.

Netzley, P. D. (2014). *How Serious a Problem is Cyberbullying?*. ReferencePoint Press.

Palkovitz, R. (2002). *Provisional balances: The dynamics of involved fathering and men's adult development*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Palkovitz, R., Copes, M. A., & Woolfolk, T. N. (2001). "It's Like... You Discover a New Sense of Being" Involved Fathering as an Evoker of Adult Development. *Men and masculinities*, 4(1), 49-69. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X01004001003>

Parks, P. J. (2013). *Cyberbullying*. United States: Reference Point Press.

Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2006). Bullies move beyond the schoolyard: A preliminary look at cyberbullying. *Youth violence and juvenile justice*, 4(2), 148-169. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204006286288>

Razak, N. (2014). Study: Most children in Indonesia are online now, but many are not aware of potential risks [Online]. Geneva: United Nations Children's Fund UNICEF.

Roberts, N., Axas, N., Nesdole, R., & Repetti, L. (2016). Pediatric emergency department visits for mental

health crisis: prevalence of cyber-bullying in suicidal youth. *Child and adolescent social work journal*, 33(5), 469-472. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PEC.0000000000000537>. Rollè, L., Gullotta, G., Trombetta, T., Curti, L., Gerino, E., Brustia, P., & Caldarera, A. M. (2019). Father Involvement and Cognitive Development in Early and Middle Childhood: A Systematic Review. *Frontiers in psychology*, 10, 2405. Rosenberg, J., & Wilcox, W. B. (2006). The importance of fathers in the healthy development of children. US Department Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau, Office of Child Abuse and Neglect. Safaria, T. (2016). Prevalence and Impact of Cyberbullying in a Sample of Indonesian Junior High School Students. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 15(1), 82-91. Schneider, S. K., O'donnell, L., Stueve, A., & Coulter, R. W. (2012). Cyberbullying, school bullying, and psychological distress: A regional census of high school students. *American journal of public health*, 102(1), 171-177. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2011.300308>. Smith, P. K., & Slonje, R. (2010). Cyberbullying: The nature and extent of a new kind of bullying in and out of school. In Jimerson, S. R., Swearer, S. M., & Espelage, D. L. (Eds), *Handbook of Bullying in schools: An international perspective*. New York: Routledge. Sourander, A., Jensen, P., Davies, M., Niemelä, S., Elonheimo, H., Ristkari, T., ... & Tamminen, T. (2007). Who is at greatest risk of adverse long-term outcomes? The Finnish From a Boy to a Man study. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 46(9), 1148-1161. <https://doi.org/10.1097/chi.0b013e31809861e9>. Sticca, F., & Perren, S. (2013). Is cyberbullying worse than traditional bullying? Examining the differential roles of medium, publicity, and anonymity for the perceived severity of bullying. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 42(5), 739- 750. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-012-9867-3>. Suler, J. (2004). The online disinhibition effect. *Cyberpsychology & behavior*, 7(3), 321-326. <https://doi.org/10.1089/1094931041291295>. Thomas, R. M. (2000). Comparing theories of child development. Wadsworth/Thomson Learning. Torres-Díaz, J. C., Duart, J. M., Gómez-Alvarado, H. F., Marín-Gutiérrez, I., & Segarra-Faggioni, V. (2016). Internet use and academic success in university students. *Comunicar. Media Education Research Journal*, 24(2). Turkle, S. (2005). *The second self: Computers and the human spirit*. MIT Press. Valkenburg, P. M., & Peter, J. (2007). Preadolescents' and adolescents' online communication and their closeness to friends. *Developmental psychology*, 43(2), 267. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.43.2.267>. Vazsonyi, A. T., Machackova, H., Sevcikova, A., Smahel, D., & Cerna, A. (2012). Cyberbullying in context: Direct and indirect effects by low self-control across 25 European countries. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 9(2), 210-227. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2011.644919>. Wilton, C., & Campbell, M. A. (2011). An exploration of the reasons why adolescents engage in traditional and cyber bullying. *Journal of Educational Sciences & Psychology*, 1(2), 101-109. Zhou, Q., Eisenberg, N., Wang, Y., & Reiser, M. (2004). Chinese children's effortful control and dispositional anger/frustration: Relations to parenting styles and children's social functioning. *Developmental Psychology*, 40, 352-366. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15