
CANCEL CULTURE ON SOCIAL MEDIA FROM A DEONTOLOGICAL AND UTILITARIAN PERSPECTIVE

By:

Elizabeth Nurmiyati Tamatjita¹, Marcelina Sanda Lebang Pakan²

^{1,2}Institut Sosial dan Teknologi Widuri

¹Email: tamatjita@gmail.com, ²marcelinalebangpakan@gmail.com



Sections Info

Article History:

Submitted: 10 October 2025

Final Revised: 27 November 2025

Accepted: 2 January 2026

Published: 31 January 2026

Keywords:

Social Media Anomalies, Cancel Culture, Kantian Deontology, Utilitarianism, Digital Ethics.



ABSTRACT

Social media has transformed from an emancipatory space into an arena of digital pathology, giving rise to various anomalies. One such anomaly discussed in this study is 'Cancel Culture'. Given that positive legal regulations are often insufficient to address the root of these ethical issues, this study aims to evaluate social media anomalies through the lens of normative ethics, specifically comparing Immanuel Kant's Deontology with the Utilitarianism of Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill. This qualitative study employs a library research method with an applied moral philosophy approach. Data analysis was conducted through stages of description, interpretation, comparison, and critical reflection on primary and secondary texts. The results of the study reveal a sharp dialectic between the two theories. Kant's deontology absolutely rejects digital space anomalies as they reduce human rational dignity to mere means and violate the categorical imperative. Conversely, Bentham's utilitarianism could potentially justify anomalies (such as high numbers of likes, shares and traffic on the social media platform TikTok) if the hedonistic calculation yields greater collective utility. However, Mill's qualitative utilitarianism offers a middle ground through the Harm Principle, which rejects such anomalies if they infringe upon essential freedoms and individual autonomy. This study concludes that there is a need for integration between absolute respect for the dignity of the subject (Kant) and responsible freedom of expression (Mill) as the foundation for formulating contemporary digital ethics.



I. INTRODUCTION

The development of social media over the past two decades has brought about significant changes in people's lives, particularly in the way they communicate, interact and judge moral conduct. Platforms such as TikTok have become a primary space for individuals to express themselves whilst also judging the actions of others. 'Cogito, ergo sum', a philosophical statement by the French philosopher René Descartes, essentially refers to human self-existence, translated into English as 'I think, therefore I am'. The role

of social media in human interaction, bridging distances through communication via the internet, is undeniable. Modern humans in the digital world are beings controlled by media, functioning as media themselves, and adapting to the digital technological landscape—a phenomenon termed ‘homo digitalis’ (Hardiman, 2021:37). In this context, social media serves not only as a means of communication but also as an arena for the formation and testing of moral values. However, the reality on social media reveals various deviations that can be termed “moral anomalies”. These anomalies are evident in practices such as the spread of hoaxes, hate speech, cyberbullying, and the ‘cancel culture’—which often fails to consider justice and proportionality. This phenomenon highlights a discrepancy between ideal moral principles and actual practices in the digital space.

This issue raises a fundamental philosophical question: How can human behaviour on social media be assessed morally? Are the moral standards that apply in the real world still relevant in the digital world? Does social media create new conditions that demand a reinterpretation of classical moral theories?

This study aims to analyse social media anomalies from a moral philosophy perspective by employing a comparative approach between the major ethical theories of Immanuel Kant’s deontology and the utilitarianism of Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill. It is hoped that this will yield a deeper understanding of the moral crisis in the digital age, as well as potential normative solutions that may be offered.

Moral philosophy is a branch of philosophy that examines the fundamental principles of good and evil, right and wrong, and how humans ought to act. Within the Western philosophical tradition, moral philosophy has developed into several major schools of thought. In this study, the researcher focuses on Deontology and Utilitarianism.

Kant (1993:37–45) emphasises that morality is based on universal duties of a rational nature, whilst Mill (1863:7–15) assesses morality based on the consequences of actions for collective happiness. In the context of social media, these concepts form the basis for assessing whether a digital action can be considered moral or not. Human beings are conscious entities capable of rational thought, possessing moral duties and ideals, as well as free will (Bertocci & Murphy, 1956:442).

Social media can be understood as a digital space for interaction that enables individuals to communicate, share information and construct their identities. Boyd (2014:8–12) refers to social media as ‘networked publics’, that is, network-based public spaces. As a moral space, social media is not merely a place for exchanging information, but also an arena where moral values are negotiated, contested, and even reproduced. Habermas (1989:181–200) views the public sphere as a venue for rational discourse; however, in social media, such discourse often does not proceed ideally due to the influence of emotional factors, group interests, and complex digital technologies.

In understanding these dynamics, it is important to consider the role of algorithms and digital information structures. Eli Pariser (2011), through the concept of the filter bubble, explains that social media algorithms automatically filter information based on user preferences. Consequently, individuals tend to be exposed only to content that aligns with their views, thereby creating a narrow and biased information space.

Furthermore, Cass R. Sunstein (2017) introduced the concepts of the ‘echo chamber’ and ‘cybercascade’. In an echo chamber, individuals interact within a homogeneous environment, thereby reinforcing shared opinions without any critical scrutiny. Meanwhile, through the mechanisms of informational and social cascades, individuals tend to follow the majority opinion without rational evaluation, often because they assume the majority.

A moral anomaly can be understood as a situation in which there is a deviation from the moral norms or principles that ought to apply. In the context of social media, this anomaly arises when actions that are morally considered wrong are instead regarded as morally acceptable or even gain social legitimacy.

The concept of moral anomaly can be enriched by the thinking of Emile Durkheim (1897), who stated that an anomaly is a condition in which social norms experience a weakening or even a loss of their binding power over individuals. In this situation, individuals no longer have clear guidelines regarding what is right or wrong, leading to moral disorientation and deviant behaviour.

In the context of social media, particularly the phenomenon of cancel culture on TikTok, anomalous conditions can be observed in the instability of moral standards, the dominance of collective emotions, and the emergence of a form of 'mass morality' that tends to be impulsive. This phenomenon suggests that the digital space has the potential to create conditions lacking strong normative regulation, leading individuals to act on the basis of fleeting social pressure rather than established moral principles.

Durkheim emphasised that morality is social in nature and is formed through collective consensus. Therefore, when digital social structures – including algorithms and the culture of virality – fail to maintain normative order, moral anomalies emerge as a form of social dysfunction (Durkheim, 1897/2005). In this context, cancel culture can be understood as a symptom of digital anomaly, where individuals attempt to establish moral regulation spontaneously, yet often without rational and proportional mechanisms of justice.

Deontology emphasises moral duties and universal principles (Kant, 1993:37–45). In the context of social media, this concept requires individuals to adhere to moral norms, such as honesty and respect for others. However, digital conditions such as anonymity and social distance often undermine the application of these principles, leading to widespread moral violations.

Utilitarianism judges actions based on the greatest benefit to the greatest number of people (Bentham, 1789:1–5). In social media, this concept is often associated with engagement levels. However, this concept becomes distorted when popularity is taken as the primary measure of value. Viral content does not necessarily bring moral benefits, thereby creating an anomaly in ethical judgement.

Eli Pariser's 'filter bubble' (2011), which explains that social media algorithms filter information based on users' preferences, meaning that individuals tend to be exposed only to uniform viewpoints. In the context of cancel culture, this creates an echo chamber that accelerates collective judgement without a process of rational deliberation.

II. METHOD

Qualitative research from the perspective of Immanuel Kant's deontological moral philosophy and the utilitarianism of Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill. This study takes the form of library research, examining texts, literature and case studies of the 'Cancel Culture' phenomenon on the social media platform TikTok.

Testimony as the earliest source of knowledge and justification. If, as seems a reasonable assumption, acquiring knowledge based on testimony requires only the

absence of reasons to doubt the credibility of the witness, then the view proposed above will encounter no obstacles (Audi, 2003:144).

The data analysis technique employed a descriptive approach, presenting both case studies and theoretical frameworks. This study utilised a comparative method, examining the deontological views of Immanuel Kant, the utilitarianism of Jeremy Bentham, and the utilitarianism of John Stuart Mill.

Immanuel Kant's Deontology: Focuses on intention and moral duty, rather than outcomes. Its main principle is the Categorical Imperative, which comprises two main formulations:

1. **Universalizability:** Act only according to maxims that you would be willing to accept as universal laws.
2. **Humanity as an End:** Treat humanity always as an end in itself, not merely as a means to an end.

The utilitarianism of Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill: Centred on the consequences of actions (consequentialism). An action is considered right if it produces the greatest happiness for the greatest number. Bentham focused on the quantity of pleasure/pain (Hedonic Calculus), whilst Mill added the quality of happiness and the Harm Principle.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The phenomenon of 'cancel culture' on TikTok has unique characteristics due to the 'For You Page' (FYP) algorithm and the 'Stitch' and 'Duet' features. These features allow an issue to spread extremely quickly and trigger a wave of mass criticism within hours. Here are some real-life examples of cancel culture on TikTok, involving both Indonesian and international creators.

3.1. Case Studies in Indonesia

- a. **Zoe Levana (The Busway Lane Incident):** In mid-2024, content creator Zoe Levana uploaded a video showing her car 'stuck' in a TransJakarta (Busway) lane and asked netizens for advice. Instead of receiving sympathy, she was instantly subjected to cancel culture. TikTok netizens flocked to condemn her for allegedly breaking traffic rules, playing the victim, and merely seeking attention (clout chasing).
- b. **Rachel Vennya (Escaping Quarantine):** Although Rachel Vennya is better known as an Instagram influencer, the impact of the 'cancel culture' backlash against her was massive on TikTok. When news broke in 2021 that she had escaped from COVID-19 quarantine, TikTok users flooded the platform with satirical parody videos, boycotted the brands she collaborated with, and attacked anyone in the comments section who tried to defend her.
- c. **Popo Barbie (Controversial Content):** In 2023, TikTok creator Popo Barbie was targeted by cancel culture on several occasions, to the extent that her account was temporarily suspended due to her frequent creation of content deemed indecent, in breach of social norms, or simply seeking attention through extreme means (such as disguising herself to enter a ladies' toilet). TikTok users responded by carrying out mass reporting of her account.

3.2. International Case Studies

- a. **Charli D'Amelio ("The Snail Incident"):** In 2020, Charli (the TikTok creator with the most followers at the time) lost over 1 million followers in just 24 hours. This was triggered by her behaviour in a family dinner video, in which she was deemed rude and disrespectful towards their private chef when served a dish of snails (escargot). TikTok was flooded with stitch videos criticising her behaviour.

b. Colleen Ballinger (“Toxic Gossip Train”): When accused of inappropriate behaviour (grooming) in 2023 towards underage fans, Colleen responded not with an apology, but by singing a song on the ukulele titled “Toxic Gossip Train”. The video immediately went viral on TikTok and was stitched and parodied by tens of thousands of users as an example of cancel culture, as she was seen as lacking empathy and shirking responsibility.

c. Mikhaila Murphy (Dancing Next to a Homeless Person): A TikTok user was heavily criticised (cancelled) in 2023 after filming herself dancing for a TikTok video on the street, right next to a homeless person who was asleep. Netizens deemed her actions to be utterly lacking in empathy, exploitative of poverty, and tone-deaf.

3.3. How Does Cancel Culture Work on TikTok?

Typically, the process by which someone is ‘cancelled’ on TikTok goes through the following stages: “Spill the Tea.” Someone uploads a screenshot, a screen recording, or evidence of another person’s misconduct. Next comes Stitch & Duet: Opinion creators, legal experts, or ordinary netizens create response videos using the Stitch feature, causing the issue to spread to a wider audience. Finally, there is Social Punishment (Boycott): A drastic drop in the number of followers (mass unfollowing), mass reporting of accounts, and even pressuring brands or sponsors to terminate their partnership contracts with the creator.

The phenomenon of cancel culture on social media is a fascinating yet worrying modern paradox. On the one hand, it serves as a tool for public accountability; on the other, it often descends into a form of digital mob justice that tramples on ethical principles. According to Ess (2020: 158), digital ethics should prioritise human dignity. When individuals are ‘cancelled’ en masse, the space for repentance or self-improvement is closed off by a permanent stigma in the digital realm.

“This anomaly gives rise to what is known as ‘digital social death’, where the sanctions imposed are often disproportionate to the offence committed” (Ess, 2020: 160). Just as Russell’s Paradox constitutes an anomaly within mathematical set theory, whilst the phenomenon of Cancel Culture represents a philosophical approach grounded in logic, both share the same anomalous structure: a self-contradiction arising from self-reference. Bertrand Russell discovered this paradox in 1901, which was subsequently named Russell’s Paradox; it shook the foundations of mathematics by demonstrating the existence of an illogical set. Definition: Let R be the set of all sets that do not contain themselves as members. If R does not contain itself, then by definition, it must contain itself. However, if it contains itself, then it is no longer a set that does not contain itself. Thus, the Cancel Culture Anomaly: The ‘Moral Set’ Analogy (Russell, 1903: 101–102).

In the context of social media, the anomaly of cancel culture can be mapped using Russell’s set theory, as a ‘Contradiction of Inclusivity’, namely: Digital communities often form ‘Inclusive Sets’ aimed at cancelling anyone deemed to be non-inclusive or intolerant. The anomaly: If such a community “cancels” (excludes) an exclusive person, then the community is technically engaging in an act of exclusion. The question is: Can a community that champions inclusivity by excluding others still be called inclusive? This is where the “Russell’s Paradox” arises in social ethics.

The ‘Cancel Culture’ anomaly aligns with Karl Popper’s view that, in order to maintain a tolerant society, that society must be intolerant of intolerance. However, this ‘intolerant’ stance logically undermines the very definition of tolerance itself (Popper, 1945: 226).

Ethically speaking, this anomaly creates a moral vicious circle. When the digital masses feel they possess the moral authority to judge, they often employ the very

methods they criticise (such as bullying, hate speech, or ostracism). According to Jean-Pierre Dupuy (2023, 88–90), this phenomenon constitutes a form of ‘mimetic violence’ in which those pursuing justice ultimately come to resemble the very criminals they are hunting.

An ethical analysis of ‘cancel culture’ on TikTok from two perspectives: deontology and utilitarianism. Below is an analysis based on Kant’s deontology, as follows:

1. The Deontological Perspective: Immanuel Kant

In Kant’s view, the morality of an action is not measured by its purpose (e.g. to make TikTok a cleaner place), but by the intention behind it and its adherence to universal moral law. Human dignity versus digital commodities: Kant emphasises that human beings must always be treated as ends in themselves, not as means. In Cancel Culture, individuals are often used as ‘examples’ or tools to boost engagement or demonstrate the moral righteousness of the uploader.

“Act in such a way that you treat your fellow human beings, both in yourself and in others, never merely as a means to an end, but always also as an end in themselves” (Kant, 1998:38). A universal law: If everyone on TikTok were to ‘cancel’ every minor mistake, the space for dialogue would be destroyed. Kant argued that actions which cannot be universalised are immoral (Kant, 1998, 15).

2. The Utilitarian Perspective: Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill

Utilitarianism assesses Cancel Culture based on the ratio between collective happiness and individual suffering. Hedonistic Calculus (Bentham): Bentham measures morality through the intensity and duration of pleasure or pain. If firing a racist TikTok influencer provides a sense of security for millions, it is quantitatively considered good.

“Nature has placed mankind under the rule of two sovereign masters, namely suffering and pleasure. They alone have the right to dictate what we ought to do...” (Bentham, 1907:1).

The Harm Principle (Mill): Mill goes further by warning of the danger of the ‘tyranny of the majority’. If ‘cancel culture’ is used to silence dissenting opinions (rather than actions that are genuinely harmful), then it infringes upon individual freedom.

“The only legitimate purpose for exercising power over a member of a civilised society, against their will, is to prevent harm to others” (Mill, 1999:52). Thus, perhaps the sole moral standard is human well-being (or, to borrow Mill’s term, the well-being of “all sentient beings”). What matters is that people should be as happy and well-off as possible (Rachels, 2004:349).

3.4. The Anatomy of Cancel Culture on TikTok

On TikTok, cancel culture is often triggered by ‘call-out’ videos that highlight a person’s past mistakes or controversial remarks. The algorithm used on TikTok amplifies collective outrage, generating millions of views, abusive comments, and even real-world boycotts (resulting in the loss of jobs, sponsorships, or social connections).

According to Tamatjita (2025: 2), the ‘cancel culture’ currently prevalent in the media, driven by TikTok’s algorithms, is referred to as an ‘intelligent’ machine. People believe that computers are capable of carrying out any command given by humans. Perhaps this is because people often see it on television or read about it in newspapers, and nowadays information via the internet is very easily accessible. That computers are capable of carrying out any command given by humans. Consequently, the scope for

engaging in 'cancel culture' via social media is vast and widespread. The following are the unique characteristics of TikTok:

1. The For You Page (FYP) algorithm: Enables content to go viral very quickly, regardless of demographic boundaries.
2. Visual and Emotional Characteristics: Short videos with music or sound effects often trigger an instant emotional response (anger, sympathy) from netizens, fuelling a mob mentality.
3. Social Sanctions: These range from boycotts and insults to threats that have real-life consequences (job loss, depression) for individuals who are 'cancelled'.

Restoring one's reputation after being targeted by 'cancel culture' on TikTok is a major challenge, as digital footprints on this platform are extremely difficult to erase. However, there are certain strategies that creators typically employ to make a comeback. One notable exception to the above regarding digital footprints is the 2023 case of Mikhaila Murphy (Dancing Beside a Homeless Person), whose digital footprint has since disappeared from social media. Here is an explanation of the psychological impact and common rebranding strategies:

1. The Psychological Impact on Creators

For a creator, being 'cancelled' is not just about losing followers, but also an attack on their identity.

- a. Digital Isolation: Creators often feel as though their world is 'crumbling' due to thousands of hateful comments flooding in every second. This can trigger extreme anxiety and even depression.
- b. Content Paranoia: After being cancelled, creators usually become very afraid to post anything (fearing they might say the wrong thing again), which can actually stifle their creativity.
- c. Loss of Control: TikTok's unpredictable algorithm means they cannot control the narrative. Once a hateful video goes viral, their clarification videos often fail to reach the same number of viewers.

2. Strategies for Reputation Recovery (The Rebranding Roadmap)

If a content creator wishes to make a comeback, they usually follow one of the following paths:

a. The 'Accountability' Path

This is the healthiest yet most difficult approach. A clarification video without excuses: Creating a video without filters, without dramatic background music, and directly admitting mistakes without blaming others. Self-education: Demonstrating evidence that they are learning (e.g. taking an ethics course, making donations, or meeting with those affected privately). Consistency: Continuing to upload useful content whilst accepting that some of the audience may never return.

b. The "Silent Treatment" Path (Disappearing for a While)

Many creators choose to deactivate their accounts for 3–6 months. Aim: To wait until a new, bigger scandal involving another creator emerges so that netizens forget. Outcome: Upon returning, they usually tweak their persona or content style slightly to feel like a "new person".

c. The "Double Down" Approach (Don't Care)

Some creators actually use netizens' hatred to stay relevant (rage baiting). Strategy: They don't apologise; instead, they deliberately create content that provokes further anger. Risk: They will have a toxic community, but in terms of numbers (views and

engagement), they remain high because netizens keep commenting even if the content is abusive.

3. Is Cancel Culture Really Effective?

Interestingly, the phenomenon of 'short-term cancellation' is common on TikTok. Netizens get angry very quickly, but they also move on to other issues just as quickly. Many creators who were once thoroughly cancelled are now still active and have secured new endorsement deals, even though the negative stigma remains attached as a permanent label in the comments section.

Restoring one's reputation after being hit by Cancel Culture on TikTok is a major challenge because digital footprints on this platform are extremely difficult to erase. However, there are certain patterns creators typically follow to make a comeback.

Examining the phenomenon through six examples involving Zoe Levana, Rachel Vennya, Popo Barbie, Charlie D'Amelio, Collen Ballinger and Mikhaela Murphy, it is evident that, ethically speaking, cancel culture serves as a public warning from netizens that, regardless of circumstances, human ethics must and should be upheld. Through moral philosophy, the author conducts an analysis using two distinct perspectives.

3.5. Research Findings

The TikTok anomaly within the phenomenon of cancel culture represents a crisis of digital morality in the context of Immanuel Kant's deontology versus the utilitarianism of Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, as follows:

1. Violations of Human Dignity and Rational Autonomy

Kant did not envisage an infinite gulf between the natural and the learned (Firestone & Palmquist, 2006:150). The anomalies on TikTok directly violate Kant's Formula of Humanity, which requires us to always treat human beings as ends in themselves, and never merely as means. In the case of elderly people exploited for mud baths, human dignity is reduced to a commodity generating revenue and engagement. Furthermore, TikTok's algorithms, designed to trigger dopamine addiction (encouraging doomscrolling behaviour), gradually erode users' autonomy. Kant argued that moral human beings are those who act on the basis of free reason. When users or creators are controlled by manipulative algorithms and irrational desires for the sake of popularity metrics, they operate heteronomously (subjugated by external impulses), thereby losing their moral footing.

2. An Ethical Clash: Deontology versus Systemic Utilitarianism

Why do these anomalies persist and prove so difficult to stop? The answer lies in the very architecture of digital platforms, which operate according to the logic of extreme utilitarianism. Utilitarianism judges goodness by the end result: provided the creator earns enough to survive, the audience is entertained, and the platform makes a profit, then such exploitation is seemingly 'justified'. This is where Kantian deontology acts as an emergency brake. Kantian ethics vehemently rejects the notion that "the end justifies the means". No matter how great the financial gain, if it comes at the cost of degrading human dignity and spreading falsehoods, the action remains morally flawed in every respect.

3. Implications of State Policy Based on Kantian Ethics

The way to address this crisis is through regulation. The state can no longer focus solely on material losses or defamation. Digital laws (such as Article 27(1) of the ITE Law

No. 1/2024, which addresses public decency) must evolve to protect human dignity and public reason. A Kantian approach would promote regulations requiring social media platforms to be algorithmically accountable. Platforms must be prohibited from facilitating the monetisation of content exploiting humanity (cyber-begging) and must be penalised if their algorithms are proven to systematically amplify false news or actions contrary to human morality to millions of people. Furthermore, the state must guarantee users' right to "digital autonomy", for example by requiring platforms to provide feed options free from algorithmic manipulation.

Table 1. Comparison of Deontological Ethics versus Utilitarianism: An Ethical Evaluation of Social Media Anomalies

Anomalous Aspects	Immanuel Kant's Deontology	Jeremy Bentham's Quantitative Utilitarianism	John Stuart Mill's Quantitative Utilitarianism
Basic Principles of Moral Evaluation	Intentions and moral obligations are valid if they conform to the Categorical Imperative (actions can be universalised) and respect human beings as ends in themselves.	The principle of utility. It is morally right if it results in maximum pleasure and minimum suffering for the greatest number of people (Hedonic Calculus).	Kualitas konsekuensi dan kebebasan. Bermoral jika memajukan kebahagiaan intelektual/ kualitas hidup dan tidak melanggar hak/merugikan orang lain (Harm Principle).
The Case of Cancel Culture (Digital Mob Justice)	Utterly rejected. Reducing the individual who has been 'cancelled' merely to a means of satisfying the anger of the masses. Disregarding that individual's rational dignity and autonomy.	Justifiable (Conditional). If punishing one person leads to the satisfaction or sense of security of millions of internet users, then such an action is considered moral because the benefits outweigh the costs.	Rejected (except to prevent harm). Criticising 'cancel culture' as a form of 'tyranny of the majority'. Justified only if the individual is actively endangering the physical safety or rights of others (Harm Principle).

IV. CONCLUSION

Cancel culture on TikTok is a double-edged sword. On the one hand, it serves as a rapid instrument of social accountability for calling out unempathetic behaviour, legal violations or injustices committed by public figures. On the other hand, due to its impulsive and massive nature, this phenomenon often turns into a digital mob that leaves no room for someone to learn from their mistakes or provide a fair clarification. Psychologically, the impact is very real and can cause permanent damage to mental health. However, in terms of careers, TikTok has a tendency to have a short memory; many creators have managed to make a comeback after a 'quiet' period, provided they

are able to manage the narrative of their reputation recovery appropriately. The following advice is for users and content creators in the dynamic TikTok ecosystem:

1. For Users (Netizens)

Verify before reacting: Don't immediately join in the criticism just because you've seen a viral video clip. Find out the full context so you don't get caught up in a wave of slander or misunderstanding. Offer constructive, not destructive, criticism: Express your objections to someone's behaviour without resorting to personal attacks, targeting their family, or making threats of violence. Focus on their mistakes, not on their very existence as a person. Use the Report feature wisely: If the content does indeed violate the community guidelines, use the report button rather than leaving negative comments that might actually boost engagement with that content.

2. For Content Creators

Think twice before posting: Be aware that in today's world, 'spontaneous content' still has long-term consequences. Avoid creating content that exploits other people's suffering or breaches social norms simply for the sake of views. Honest and humble responses: If you make a mistake, admit it immediately without resorting to excessive self-defence. Netizens value honesty far more than clarification videos that feel contrived or use standard scripts. Building a healthy community: Focus on content quality and a loyal audience, rather than simply chasing fleeting virality that carries a high risk of sparking controversy.

3. For Other Researchers

One can examine other cases, such as hoaxes and other inhumane live content, for the sake of material gain without regard for one's own dignity and worth as a human being, using the analytical framework of Virtue Ethics. The general purpose of human life is eudaimonia.

REFERENCES

- Aristoteles. (2009). *Nicomachean Ethics*. Oxford University Press.
- Audi, R. (2003). *Epistemology. A contemporary introduction to the theory of knowledge*. New York: Routledge.
- Bentham, J. (1907). *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (Karya asli diterbitkan 1789).
- Bertocci, P.A. & Murphy, A.E. (1956). *Introduction to The Philosophy of Religion*. Prentice Hall Philosophy Series. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Boyd, D. (2014). *It's Complicated: The Social Lives of Networked Teens*. Yale University Press.
- Dupuy, J-P. (2023). *The Mark of the Sacred*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Durkheim, É. (2005). *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*. London: Routledge. (Karya asli diterbitkan 1897).
- Ess, C. (2020). *Digital Media Ethics (3rd Edition)*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Farisi, B.A. & Farisa, F.C. (2024). *Zoe Levana Mengaku Tak Sengaja Terobos Jalur Transjakarta, Berujung Terjebak 4 Jam*.
<https://megapolitan.kompas.com/read/2024/05/22/16554901/zoe-levana-mengaku-tak-sengaja-terobos-jalur-transjakarta-berujung>.
- Firestone, C.L. & Palmquist, S.R. (2006). *Kant and The New Philosophy of Religion*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.
- Haasch, P. (2020). *Charli D'Amelio lost over 1 million followers after fans called her 'entitled.'* Here's who's defending her. <https://www.businessinsider.com/charli-damelio-losing-followers-influencers-defending-james-charlies-trisha-paytas-2020-11>.
- Habermas, J. (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Mit Press.
- Halidi, R. (2023). *Sembilan Kontroversi Popo Barbie, Terbaru Mengaku Dilecehkan oleh*

- TikToker Rozi. <https://www.suara.com/entertainment/2023/04/19/133828/9-kontroversi-popo-barbie-terbaru-mengaku-dilecehkan-oleh-tiktoker-rozi?page=2>.
- Hardiman, F.B. (2021). *Aku klik maka Aku Ada. Manusia dalam Revolusi Digital*. Yogyakarta: PT Kanisius.
- Kant, I. (1998). *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* (M. Gregor, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Karya asli diterbitkan 1785).
- Kant, I. (1993). *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mill, J.S. (1863). *Utilitarianism*. Parker, Son, and Bourn.
- Pariser, E. (2011). *The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Popper, K. (1945). *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. New York: Routledge.
- Rachels, J. (2004). *Filsafat Moral*. Yogyakarta: PT Kanisius.
- Russell, B. (1903). *The Principles of Mathematics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sutrisna, T. & Erdianto, K. (2021). *Pelanggaran Karantina Rachel Vennya, Kabur Setelah Bayar 40 Juta*.
<https://megapolitan.kompas.com/read/2021/12/11/12111301/pelanggaran-karantina-rachel-vennya-kabur-setelah-bayar-rp-40-juta>.
- Sunstein, C. R. (2017). *#Republic: Divided Democracy in the Age of Social Media*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- TikTok. (2023). *Deleted news: TikTok creator Mikaila Murphy (often referred to as Mikhaila) faced intense backlash for a video where she danced in front of a sleeping homeless person*.
- Tamatjita, E.N. (2025). *The Influence of Examination, Online Registration and Price on Health Services in Hospitals from the Perspective of Don Ihde's Postphenomenology*. *International Conference on Nusantara Philosophy: Philosophy of Well-Being: Revisiting the Idea of Sustainable Living and Development*. Yogyakarta: UGM Digital Press Social Sciences and Humanities. <https://doi.org/10.29037/digitalpress.412480>.
- Undang-undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2024 tentang Perubahan Kedua atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik.
- Youngs, I. (2023). *Colleen Ballinger: YouTube star writes song to respond to accusing fans*.
<https://www.bbc.com/news/entertainment-arts-66051531>.



*** Elizabeth Nurmiyati Tamatjita (Corresponding Author)**

Department of Informatics, Institut Sosial dan Teknologi Widuri
Jl. Palmerah Barat No. 353, Grogol Utara, Kebayoran Lama, Kota Jakarta
Selatan, Jakarta, 12210
Email: tamatjita@gmail.com



Marcelina Sanda Lebang Pakan

Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology, Institut Sosial dan
Teknologi Widuri
Jl. Palmerah Barat No. 353, Grogol Utara, Kebayoran Lama, Kota Jakarta
Selatan, Jakarta, 12210
Email: marcelinalebangpakan@gmail.com
