

ISSN 2964-3902 (Online)
SUJANA: Journal of Education and Learning Review
https://journal.jfpublisher.com/index.php/sujana
Vol. 5, Issue. 4, (2026)
doi.org/10.56943/sujana.v5i4.1088

Translating Christian Values into Digital Responsibility among Senior High School Students

Alicia Sharon Josephine[1]*, Yunusman Hulu[2], Chellia Delfatiova Pardede[3], Joyce Emilitan Ginting[4]
[1]alicia@ekumene.sch.id, [2]yunusmanhulu114@gmail.com, [3]chellia@ekumene.sch.id, [4]joyce@ekumene.sch.id
[134]Ekumene Christian School, [2]Universitas Mitra Bangsa

*Corresponding Author: Joyce Emilitan Ginting
Email: joyce@ekumene.sch.id

ABSTRACT

Digital technology, including social media and generative artificial intelligence, expands learning opportunities for senior high school students but also raises ethical problems such as misinformation, cyberbullying, privacy violations, and academic dishonesty. This study aimed to analyse Christian values as a foundation for digital ethics and to formulate the responsibilities of senior high school students in Indonesia. A qualitative descriptive design with library research was used. The Bible served as the normative source, and journal articles on Christian ethics, Christian education, digital citizenship, and digital ethics, published mainly between 2020 and 2025, served as scholarly sources. Data were analysed through thematic content analysis in four stages: identification of ideas, grouping into themes, comparison across sources, and synthesis. The findings show that love, honesty, responsibility, respect for human dignity, self-control, and wisdom function as a related set, with love as the orienting aim. These values translate into six domains of responsibility: communicating respectfully, verifying information before sharing, protecting privacy and managing digital footprints, using artificial intelligence honestly and with disclosure, regulating time and emotions, and being a positive influence. Formation is strengthened through case-based learning, biblical reflection, teacher example, school and family collaboration, and restorative responses to violations. The study offers a framework that treats students as moral agents and connects Christian values to Indonesian character education. Its conceptual nature requires empirical testing.

Keywords: *Christian Education, Christian Values, Digital Citizenship, Digital Ethics, Senior High School Students*

INTRODUCTION

Information and communication technology has changed how senior high school students learn, obtain information, form friendships, express identity, and take part in social life (Hursen et al., 2023; Mensah et al., 2023). Social media platforms, search engines, learning platforms, and generative artificial intelligence (AI) give young people considerable convenience, yet convenience does not guarantee moral maturity in the way these tools are used (Ugli, 2025). The same digital space that supports learning and creativity also carries hoaxes, hate speech, cyberbullying, humiliation, privacy violations, and impulsive behaviour (Shakeeva et al., 2025). Technical competence alone therefore cannot protect students or the people they interact with. Harrison and Polizzi (2022) made a similar argument when they proposed that digital citizenship education should draw on moral theory to explain how adolescents reach decisions about civil and uncivil conduct online. Digital ethics, in this sense, concerns the capacity to deliberate about right and wrong, rights and obligations, and the consequences of one's actions, and it must develop alongside digital skill. Indonesian evidence shows that this judgement is exercised in context. Sukma et al. (2025) analysed 150 public comments on X and Instagram and concluded that Indonesian online politeness had not simply declined but had become a hybrid, context-dependent repertoire in which users adjusted, softened, or broke politeness norms according to audience and topic.

The structure of digital platforms and the arrival of generative AI add further difficulty. Smith (2025) examined 20 political clipper accounts and 100 high-performing TikTok videos in Indonesia and found that visibility depended more on decentralised curation and algorithmic amplification than on the size of an account's following. The finding suggests that a single post, comment, or edited clip from an ordinary student account can travel far beyond the circle of friends for whom it was intended, so a decision made in seconds may carry consequences that the student can neither predict nor withdraw. Generative AI raises a parallel concern in the academic sphere. Eke (2023) asked whether ChatGPT and other generative AI tools threaten academic integrity in education. Such tools can help students to understand material, draft ideas, and practise skills, but they can equally invite copying, the outsourcing of assignments, and the displacement of independent thinking. Digital responsibility consequently extends beyond courtesy on social media to include academic honesty and the disciplined use of technology as an aid to learning and not as a substitute for it.

For Christian education, the formation of digital ethics cannot stop at rules about device use or lists of prohibitions. Christian ethics treats Scripture and the character of Christ as the standard for evaluating human conduct, so the question asked of any digital action extends beyond "Is this permitted?" to "Is this right, constructive, and an expression of love toward others?" Love (Matthew 22:39), truthfulness (Ephesians 4:25), responsibility (Galatians 6:5), respect for human

dignity (Genesis 1:27), self-control (Galatians 5:22–23), and wisdom (Colossians 4:5–6) bear directly on how students write comments, share information, protect privacy, handle conflict, and use technology for study. Research in Indonesian faith-based schools suggests that such formation proceeds through practice and example. Al Jailani et al. (2025) reported, on the basis of interviews and classroom observation at an Islamic junior secondary school in South Tangerang, that character formation combined theory with practice, that teachers acted as moral exemplars, and that school leaders, homeroom teachers, and parents shared responsibility for the outcome. The religious tradition differs from the one examined here, but the pattern of formation through example, practice, and cooperation between school and home is relevant to Christian schools.

Several Indonesian studies have already linked Christian education to digital ethics. Waruwu et al. (2020) discussed the role of Christian ethics education in the use of social media in an era of disruption, and Giawa and Dwikristanto (2025) examined how Christian teachers can guide students through the decline of ethical standards in digital life. These studies establish the importance of education, mentoring, and Christian values. They say less about how such values translate into concrete responsibilities across the activities in which senior high school students are actually engaged, namely communication, information sharing, privacy and digital footprints, AI use, and academic integrity. In the sources reviewed for this study, online communication ethics and AI-related academic integrity were also treated largely apart from one another, so that no single framework connected them to the same set of values.

A library research approach suits this gap because the problem is conceptual before it is empirical. What is missing is a coherent account that links normative sources, namely Scripture and Christian ethical thought, with findings from the education and digital citizenship literature, and then states that account in terms that schools can apply. A survey or interview study at one school would describe a single setting but would not supply such a framework, whereas a qualitative literature synthesis allows normative and empirical sources to be read together and compared. The study makes three contributions. It examines six Christian values as a related set and not as a checklist, it derives six domains of digital responsibility from those values and shows which values ground each domain, and it connects the domains to formation strategies and curriculum opportunities in Indonesian senior high schools, with AI use treated alongside online communication within the same framework.

Students are treated in this study as moral agents, that is, as persons who can deliberate about what ought to be done, choose among alternatives, and answer for the consequences of that choice. This view differs from a compliance model, in which schools monitor devices, block content, and sanction breaches, and students appear mainly as objects of control. Surveillance can limit exposure to risk, but it cannot supply the judgement a student needs when no adult is watching. The

perspective has a theological basis in the conviction that persons are created in the image of God (Genesis 1:27) and are therefore capable of, and accountable for, responsible choice, and it corresponds to the concern of Harrison and Polizzi (2022) with how adolescents actually reach moral decisions online. In the present study it serves as an analytical lens at three points. Each of the six values is read as a disposition that guides judgement and not as a rule to be obeyed, each domain of responsibility is framed as an area in which students face real decisions, and each formation strategy is assessed by whether it builds the capacity to reason and choose and not only by whether it reduces violations.

On this basis, the present study analyses the Christian values relevant to the formation of digital ethics and formulates the responsibilities of senior high school students in their use of technology. Three research questions guide the analysis. The first asks which Christian values provide a normative foundation for the digital ethics of senior high school students and how these values relate to one another. The second asks how those values can be translated into concrete domains of digital responsibility for students. The third asks which strategies Christian schools can use to internalise these values and responsibilities in students' digital practice.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed a qualitative descriptive design using the method of library research (Creswell & Poth, 2024). The method was chosen because the objective was to construct a conceptual understanding of the relationship between Christian values, digital ethics, and the responsibilities of senior high school students from relevant scholarly sources, and not to collect data from participants. The analysis therefore rests entirely on published material. Its findings are intended to offer a conceptual and practical framework for reflection and for the development of digital ethics education, and they do not describe the empirical condition of students at Ekumene Christian School or at any other particular school.

Two kinds of sources were used. The normative source was the Bible, which served to identify the principles of Christian ethics from which the six values were drawn. The scholarly sources were journal articles on Christian ethics, Christian education, social media, digital citizenship, digital ethics, adolescent behaviour, the role of teachers, and academic integrity in the use of technology. These were searched through Google Scholar, GARUDA, and journal publisher websites with keywords such as "digital ethics," "Christian values," "Christian Religious Education," "social media," "digital citizenship," "students," and "academic integrity." Priority was given to literature published between 2020 and 2025, so that the discussion would correspond with recent digital developments.

Sources were selected on the basis of direct relevance to the topic, clarity of publication identity, availability of bibliographic information, and pertinence to the context of students or the younger generation. Sources that treated technology in

purely technical terms without an ethical dimension, duplicate sources, and writings with no substantive connection to the focus of the study were not used as primary references.

Data analysis employed thematic content analysis in four stages. The first stage identified the principal ideas of each source. The second stage grouped these ideas into four themes: challenges of digital ethics, Christian values as a moral foundation, forms of students' digital responsibility, and strategies for the internalisation of values. These four themes were set in advance by the research questions, whereas the specific values, responsibilities, and strategies within each theme were drawn from the sources themselves. The third stage compared similarities and differences among sources, and the final stage constructed a synthesis connecting biblical principles with digital actions that senior high school students can undertake. Because the quality of a thematic analysis depends on transparent and reflexive decisions about how themes are produced, each of these stages was kept explicit (Braun & Clarke, 2021).

Trustworthiness was approached through the four criteria proposed by Lincoln and Guba (1985). Credibility was supported by reading normative and scholarly sources together and by comparing similarities and differences across sources before synthesis. Transferability was supported by stating the context of the framework, namely Christian education in Indonesian senior high schools, so that readers can judge its applicability to other settings. Dependability was supported by reporting the databases, keywords, and selection criteria used, and confirmability by tying each claim to a cited biblical text or published source. Several limitations follow from the design. The study contains no primary data, it depends on secondary sources whose own methods vary, the choice of databases and selection criteria may have introduced selection bias, and the proposed framework remains conceptual until it is tested empirically.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Digital Ethics Challenges for Senior High School Students

The literature indicates that digital ethics problems among students cannot be reduced to the frequency of device use. The more basic difficulty lies in the moral decisions made during use. Students may have to decide whether to forward an unverified message, answer a provocative comment in anger, upload a friend's photograph without permission, join in mocking a classmate, copy another person's work, or let an AI tool complete an assignment. Each situation carries consequences for the student and for others, which makes the digital space a moral space and not a neutral one. Adolescence sharpens these decisions because peer acceptance, identity formation, and the desire for recognition are particularly strong, and likes, comments, followers, and the speed at which content spreads can intensify the pressure.

Empirical work on Indonesian students shows what such decisions look like in practice. Kollo et al. (2024) surveyed 290 high school students in three schools in Kupang City and found that a more positive school climate and stronger social self-efficacy were associated with less cyberbullying, whereas social support had no direct effect on cyberbullying behaviour. The result suggests that whether a student bullies online depends partly on the climate of the school and on the student's confidence in handling social situations, and not only on the presence of rules. Afdal et al. (2023) studied 633 Indonesian university students and found a medium overall tendency toward hoax behaviour, with analytical thinking the weakest area, since nearly a third of respondents scored low on it. Because that sample was older than senior high school students, the finding is indicative only, but it points to critical evaluation of information as a skill that needs deliberate formation. Studies of hoax sharing and plagiarism specifically among Indonesian senior high school students were scarce in the sources retrieved, and this is acknowledged as a limitation of the present synthesis.

Generative AI introduces a further problem that rules about copying do not settle. Eke (2023) asked whether ChatGPT and other generative AI tools threaten academic integrity, but integrity alone does not tell a student what to do in a particular assignment. Nguyen et al. (2023) proposed seven ethical principles for AI in education: governance and stewardship, transparency and accountability, sustainability and proportionality, privacy, security and safety, inclusiveness, and human-centred AI. For students, the most directly applicable are transparency and accountability, privacy, and a human-centred use that preserves the learner's autonomy and agency. Christian values give these principles moral content. Honesty explains why AI assistance should be disclosed, responsibility explains why the student remains answerable for submitted work whatever tool contributed, and wisdom and self-control explain why a student may sometimes choose not to use a tool that would shorten a struggle through which learning occurs. The difference between using AI as a tool and surrendering moral agency can then be stated plainly. A tool serves a judgement that the student still makes, whereas surrender occurs when the student stops judging and accepts the output as the answer. In Christian education, undertaking the effort of learning is also a form of stewardship over one's own mind, so the question is one of integrity and not only of compliance.

Taken together, these challenges show that digital ethics must be understood as the capacity to direct digital freedom with moral consideration. The freedom to upload, comment, search, or use AI does not remove responsibility for the consequences, and the greater a person's technological capability, the greater the need for wisdom, self-control, and awareness of others. Communication, information, privacy, and AI use all require a standard of judgement that technical rules cannot supply, and the next section therefore asks what moral foundation Christian ethics can provide.

Christian Values as the Foundation of Digital Ethics

Christian ethics supplies a normative foundation that helps students evaluate digital actions not only by asking whether an action is permitted but also whether it is right, constructive, and an expression of love toward others. Six values emerge from the biblical and scholarly sources: love, honesty and truth, responsibility, respect for human dignity, self-control, and wisdom. In the digital context, faith has to appear as observable habits in communication, use of information, management of time, and academic conduct.

The first value is love. In Matthew 22:34–40, Jesus answers a lawyer who asked which commandment was greatest by joining love of God (Deuteronomy 6:5) with love of neighbour (Leviticus 19:18) and stating that the whole Law and the Prophets depend on these two. The question was posed as a test by opponents, which makes the answer notable, because love is presented as the principle that organises the other commandments and not as one rule among many. In a digital setting the neighbour is any person reached by a post, comment, or message, including classmates seen only through a screen and strangers whom the student will never meet. Love therefore excludes treating others as material for entertainment or ridicule. Ephesians 4:29 belongs to a passage (4:17–5:2) in which Paul contrasts the former way of life with the new life formed in Christ. Within it, readers are told to put away falsehood because they are members of one another (4:25) and to let no corrupting speech leave their mouths, only what builds up according to need and gives grace to those who hear (4:29). The reasoning is communal, so speech is judged by its effect on the shared body and not by the speaker's right to express an opinion. For comments, private messages, and group chats, this yields a threefold test of whether a word builds up, whether it fits the need of the moment, and whether it gives grace to the person who receives it.

The remaining values extend this orientation to specific areas of digital life. Honesty and truth (Ephesians 4:15, 4:25) rule out false identities, manipulated information, news known to be untrue, and the claiming of another person's work as one's own, and they also apply to the use of AI. Responsibility (Galatians 6:5) holds each person accountable for a own load, yet it appears beside the instruction in 6:2 to bear one another's burdens, so accountability for one's posts and assignments is held together with care for others. Respect for human dignity rests on the conviction that every person is created in the image of God (Genesis 1:27), which gives a theological reason to protect privacy, to refuse doxing and harassment, and to reject the habit of measuring a person's worth by digital popularity. Self-control, named as part of the fruit of the Spirit in Galatians 5:22–23, appears when a student delays a reply made in anger, limits unhealthy content, regulates screen time, and resists sharing something merely because it is trending. Wisdom, which Colossians 4:5–6 connects with graceful speech toward outsiders, means weighing time, context, purpose, truth, and impact before acting.

The six values are not a list of equal and separate items. Love functions as the orienting aim, because each of the other values describes how love is practised truthfully and responsibly. Honesty and respect for dignity set limits on how love may be expressed, responsibility supplies accountability, and self-control and wisdom are the capacities through which the other four are exercised in a given moment. The relation becomes visible when values appear to conflict. Truth without love can become public humiliation, as when a student corrects a classmate's false post in front of the whole class group, while love without truth can become silence about a harmful falsehood. Ephesians 4:15 resolves the tension by describing the believer as speaking the truth in love. In practice, the student might message the classmate privately, correct the information and not the person, and invite the classmate to remove the post. Seen this way, the values reinforce one another without forming a rigid hierarchy.

Positioning these values in dialogue with secular digital ethics clarifies what they add. Moor (1985) argued that computing creates policy vacuums and conceptual muddles, and that ethical analysis must clarify the concepts at stake before formulating policies to fill the vacuums. The six values can be read as a response to such a vacuum in the school setting, where new technologies such as generative AI outpace existing rules. Floridi (2013) developed an information ethics in which actions are evaluated by their effect on the flourishing of the infosphere, the whole environment of informational entities, and in which even informational objects have some minimal moral worth. The Christian emphasis on human dignity and on harm to persons overlaps with this concern for the wellbeing of the shared informational environment, although it grounds that concern in persons created in the image of God and not in informational status. Contemporary work on digital citizenship also moves in a similar direction, since Harrison and Polizzi (2022) argued that adolescents' moral decision making should be engaged through moral theory and not only through behavioural guidance. The distinctive contribution of the Christian framework lies in three features: a source of motivation beyond the avoidance of sanction, an account of character as the goal of formation, and accountability that extends beyond the audience present online. Table 1 translates the six values into practices that reflect the digital environments in which Indonesian senior high school students actually operate.

Table 1 Translation of Christian Values into Students' Digital Ethics

Christian value	Biblical foundation	Examples of application in Indonesian senior high school digital contexts
Love	Matthew 22:34–40; Ephesians 4:29	Answering a classmate's mistake in a WhatsApp class group with a correction or encouragement and not with sarcasm or a mocking sticker; leaving supportive Instagram comments and refusing to join a pile-on against a stranger's TikTok video.

Christian value	Biblical foundation	Examples of application in Indonesian senior high school digital contexts
Honesty and truth	Ephesians 4:15, 4:25	Checking a forwarded WhatsApp broadcast against a reputable news outlet or an official source before passing it on; not using a fake account to comment on a rival's post; stating in an assignment which parts were produced with an AI tool.
Responsibility	Galatians 6:2, 6:5	Deleting a post found to be false or hurtful and publishing a correction in the same group; apologising to the person affected; accepting the school's sanction for a rule violation.
Respect for human dignity	Genesis 1:27	Asking a friend's permission before posting their photograph on Instagram Stories or TikTok; refusing to circulate screenshots of private chats or a classmate's embarrassing video; not publicly rating peers' appearance.
Self-control	Galatians 5:22–23	Waiting before answering a provocative message; silencing notifications during lessons, study, and worship; leaving a trending challenge that is harmful or humiliating.
Wisdom	Colossians 4:5–6	Deciding whether a message belongs in a group chat, a private message, or a face-to-face conversation; considering how a post would read to teachers, parents, and future employers; choosing when AI supports learning and when it replaces it.

Source: Developed by the researchers (2026)

The Responsibility of Senior High School Students in the Digital Space

The six domains of responsibility described below grow out of the six values, and each domain draws on more than one value. Communicative responsibility corresponds mainly to love and respect for human dignity. Responsibility toward information corresponds to honesty and wisdom, and responsibility for privacy and digital footprints corresponds to respect for dignity and to responsibility itself. Academic responsibility rests on honesty and responsibility, responsibility toward oneself on self-control and wisdom, and the responsibility to be a good influence on love, responsibility, and wisdom taken together. The domains are interconnected, since a single action such as sharing a classmate's photograph can engage communicative, privacy, and influence responsibilities at once.

The evidence base for these domains is partly empirical and partly conceptual. Kollo et al. (2024) support the communicative domain by showing that cyberbullying among Indonesian high school students is linked to the school climate and to students' social self-efficacy. Afdal et al. (2023) support the informational domain by showing a weakness in analytical thinking among Indonesian university students, and Smith (2025) supports the privacy and footprint domain by showing that content on TikTok can reach audiences far beyond an account's followers. For the academic domain, the support is mainly the principle-

based work of Nguyen et al., (2023). Direct evidence on prevalence among Indonesian senior high school students is thinner than the framework would ideally require, so the domains are presented as a conceptual framework to be tested and not as an empirically confirmed model.

The first domain is communicative responsibility. Students must use language that respects others, avoid insults, threats, slander, and demeaning sarcasm, and be able to express disagreement without attacking the person. This does not eliminate freedom of expression but places it within the bounds of love and respect. The second domain is responsibility toward information. Before sharing, students must verify the source, date, context, and consistency of the content with other sources, and where the content concerns a particular person, they must also consider whether sharing it breaches privacy or causes harm. The spread of false information is then understood as a matter of honesty and moral responsibility and not merely as a technical error. The third domain is the protection of privacy and digital footprints. Students must protect passwords, limit the sharing of personal data, understand privacy settings, and refrain from disseminating the data or photographs of others without permission. Because every post may be stored, copied, or redistributed beyond the poster's control, a reflective question such as whether the student would be willing to account for the post if teachers, parents, or future employers saw it can guide action before posting.

The fourth domain is academic responsibility, which needs the most concrete guidance because the boundary between assistance and plagiarism is often unclear to students. A workable line distinguishes three kinds of use. Acceptable uses include asking an AI tool to explain a concept, generate practice questions, or comment on a draft that the student wrote. Uses that require disclosure include using AI to suggest an outline, to improve the language of the student's own text, or to translate material, and here the student should state the tool used, the purpose, and the extent of its contribution. Prohibited uses include submitting AI output as personal work, inventing sources or data, and using AI in an assessment where the school has forbidden it. In every case, the student must understand the content submitted, check its accuracy, and follow the school's rules on citation and disclosure. These guidelines follow from the principles of transparency, accountability, and human-centred use proposed by Nguyen et al. (2023), together with the Christian values of honesty and responsibility, and they treat academic integrity as part of digital ethics and not as a separate issue.

The fifth domain is responsibility toward oneself. Students must manage their time, attention, emotions, and the content they consume. Self-control keeps technology a tool and not the centre of life, and it takes concrete form in time limits for social media, disabled notifications during study or worship, and a pause before replying to messages that provoke strong emotion. The sixth domain is the responsibility to be a good influence, which reflects the image of salt and light in Matthew 5:13–16. In that passage, within the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus tells his

disciples that they are the salt of the earth and the light of the world, that a city on a hill cannot be hidden, and that others should see their good works and glorify the Father. For students, salt and light take the form of sharing content that is true and useful, supporting friends, reporting bullying, and refusing to spread demeaning material. The passage also fixes the purpose of such influence as service and not self-promotion, so a student's influence is not measured by follower counts. This is consistent with Smith's (2025) observation that reach online is only loosely related to follower numbers, since even a modest account can affect many people.

Strategies for the Formation of Digital Ethics Based on Christian Values

Moral values do not become habits merely because they have been taught. Their internalisation requires a process that connects knowledge, reflection, example, and practice. Giawa and Dwikristanto (2025) emphasised the role of Christian teachers as guides in the face of declining digital ethical standards, observing that teachers do more than convey rules, since they help students understand the moral reasons behind rules and weigh real situations. The strategies below follow this approach. The evidence for individual strategies in digital ethics is uneven, and the studies cited are not conclusive, so each strategy is presented as a design principle that supporting studies make plausible and that future evaluation should test.

The first strategy is case-based learning. Teachers can use examples close to students' lives, such as screenshots of a conversation containing bullying, a viral message of unclear origin, a friend's request for private photographs, or the use of AI in an essay. Students then identify the problem, the parties affected, the relevant Christian values, the available courses of action, and the consequences of each. This approach treats ethics as a decision-making skill and not as a body of concepts to memorise, and it matches the argument of Harrison and Polizzi (2022) that digital citizenship education should engage adolescents' moral decision making directly. The second strategy is contextual biblical reflection, in which passages on speech, love, truth, self-control, and wisdom are connected to specific digital activities. Ephesians 4:29 can serve as a test for a comment that is about to be posted, and Galatians 5:22–23 can anchor reflection on emotional control and media habits.

The third strategy is example and consistency of rules. Students observe how teachers and other adults communicate, handle conflict, use information, and manage their own devices, so adult example carries weight. Al Jailani et al. (2025) found that teachers acted as moral exemplars and that character formation combined theory with practice in an Indonesian faith-based school, and the same logic applies to Christian schools. School rules concerning privacy, bullying, device use during lessons, plagiarism, and generative AI should be consistent, clear, and accompanied by reasons. The fourth strategy is collaboration among school, family, and faith community, since students' digital lives do not end at the school gate. Chen et al. (2023) surveyed 642 secondary school students in China together with one parent

each and found that active parental mediation, meaning discussion and explanation, was associated with lower cyberbullying victimisation and perpetration, whereas restrictive mediation showed no significant association. The study was cross-sectional and was conducted in a different country, so it cannot be applied directly to Indonesia. Even so, it suggests that agreements about screen time, content, online conflict, and AI use will be stronger when they rest on conversation between home, school, and church and not on prohibition alone.

The fifth strategy is a culture of accountability and restoration. Ethical violations must be addressed firmly, but the purpose of education is not punishment alone. Alonso-Rodríguez et al. (2025) reviewed 13 studies and found that most reported reduced school violence and improved emotional wellbeing after restorative practices were introduced, although one randomised trial found no significant difference, so results depend on context, staff commitment, and design. A restorative response to cyberbullying in a Christian school can begin with separate conversations with the affected student and with the student who posted, so that each is heard. A facilitated conversation then follows, in which the student who caused harm describes what happened and who was affected, and the affected student explains the impact. The group agrees on steps to repair the harm, such as removing the content, apologising in the same space where the harm occurred, and agreeing on future conduct, and a teacher follows up afterwards. Accountability remains, because consequences such as a temporary restriction on posting in school groups may still apply. Grace is expressed in the manner and purpose of the process, in line with Galatians 6:1, which describes restoring a person who has gone astray in a spirit of gentleness, and with the stepwise approach to conflict in Matthew 18:15.

These strategies also fit the Indonesian educational setting. The Pancasila Student Profile in the Merdeka Curriculum sets six dimensions, which are faith and devotion to God Almighty together with noble character, global diversity, mutual cooperation, independence, critical reasoning, and creativity (BSKAP, 2022). The first dimension corresponds closely to the six values and to the aim of character formation. Critical reasoning matches responsibility toward information, independence matches responsibility toward oneself, and mutual cooperation matches collaboration among school, family, and faith community. Christian schools can therefore present digital ethics education as part of the character education that national policy already expects, and not as an addition to the curriculum.

Implications for Christian Education in Secondary Schools

Digital ethics should be treated as an integral part of Christian character education and need not become a separate subject. In Christian Religious Education, students can study Matthew 22:34–40 and Ephesians 4:25–32 and then audit their own comments in a class group against the threefold test described

above, writing a short reflection on one comment they would change. In Civic Education, discussion of the Pancasila Student Profile can be linked to hoaxes and to the shared duty of citizens to protect a healthy public space, with an assessment in which students trace a viral claim to its source. In Indonesian Language, students can analyse the register and politeness of messages in WhatsApp groups and on Instagram, drawing on Sukma et al. (2025), who found that Indonesian online politeness is context-dependent and negotiated, and then rewrite an impolite exchange so that it keeps its meaning while preserving the dignity of the other person. In Informatics, students can examine privacy settings, trace their own digital footprint, and test the limits of AI tools, and a portfolio of assignments accompanied by short AI-use disclosure statements can serve as an assessment of honesty. Homeroom and character formation activities can then connect these experiences through reflective journals and role-play of difficult decisions, assessed with a rubric that rewards the quality of moral reasoning and not only the absence of violations.

Such integration allows schools to prevent problems and not only respond to violations. Preventive digital ethics education helps students build a moral compass before they face difficult situations, which means success should be judged by students' capacity to explain moral reasons, consider consequences, and choose responsible actions independently, and not by the scarcity of violations alone. The concept of faithful presence offers a theological frame for this aim. Hunter (2010) used the term to describe a Christian way of engaging the world that neither withdraws from it nor seeks to dominate it, but exercises fidelity to God and to the people and institutions with whom believers share life. Applied to the digital space, faithful presence means that students are expected to remain consistent in faith and action across online and offline settings. They are expected not only to be safe from digital risks but also to use technology to produce work, to learn honestly, to communicate with love, to spread truth, and to exert a positive influence. Technology is then understood neither as an enemy nor as something entirely neutral, but as a tool whose moral value depends on the purpose, the manner, and the character of the person using it.

The findings support earlier Indonesian work on Christian education and digital ethics. Few researchers stressed the importance of Christian ethics education, mentoring, and the teacher's role, and the present synthesis agrees that digital ethics formation depends on more than rules (Giawa & Dwikristanto, 2025; Waruwu et al., 2020). The finding that example, practice, and cooperation among school and home matter also corresponds to Al Jailani et al. (2025), whose study of character formation in an Islamic junior secondary school reached a similar conclusion in a different religious tradition. This convergence suggests that the formative pattern identified here is not peculiar to Christian schools but is shared by faith-based schooling more broadly, while the content of the values remains specific to each tradition.

The findings extend earlier studies in three ways. First, the earlier Christian education studies established the value of education and mentoring but did not specify what responsibility looks like in particular activities. The six domains and the examples in Table 1 move from the general affirmation of values to concrete decisions in communication, information sharing, privacy, AI use, and academic work. Second, Smith (2025) showed that visibility on TikTok depends on curation and algorithmic amplification more than on follower numbers, and the present analysis draws the moral implication that even an ordinary student's post can have a wide and uncontrollable reach, which gives the domain of privacy and digital footprints a stronger rationale than a general warning about caution. Third, Eke (2023) framed generative AI mainly as a threat to academic integrity. The present study places the same issue within moral agency and offers graded guidance, comprising acceptable use, use with disclosure, and prohibited use, that connects integrity to honesty, responsibility, and human-centred principles such as those set out by Nguyen et al. (2023).

The findings qualify one assumption found in some earlier work. Studies of Christian education often describe the digital era in terms of ethical decline, as in the reference to decadence in the title of Giawa and Dwikristanto (2025). Sukma et al. (2025), however, found that Indonesian online politeness had not simply eroded but had become a hybrid, context-dependent repertoire. Their sample consisted of general users of X and Instagram and not specifically of students, so it does not refute the concern about decline. It does indicate that a framing based only on decline risks overlooking the skills young people already use to negotiate online conduct, and it supports the moral agency perspective adopted here, in which formation builds on students' existing judgement and does not merely suppress behaviour.

CONCLUSION

This study analysed Christian values as a foundation for the digital ethics of senior high school students and formulated the responsibilities that follow from them. The synthesis indicates that love, honesty and truth, responsibility, respect for human dignity, self-control, and wisdom form a related set, with love as the orienting aim and the other values describing how love is practised truthfully, responsibly, and wisely. These values translate into six domains of responsibility, namely communicative, informational, privacy and digital footprints, academic, responsibility toward oneself, and being a good influence. The study contributes to knowledge in three ways. It shows how the values relate to one another and not only what they are, it derives the domains from the values and treats the use of AI within the same framework as online communication, and it links the framework to formation strategies and to the Pancasila Student Profile that guides Indonesian schools. Treating students as moral agents who can deliberate, choose, and answer

for their actions, and not as objects of surveillance, shapes each of these contributions. Digital responsibility is therefore not mere compliance with technological rules but an expression of Christian character in digital spaces.

For practice, the findings suggest that Christian schools can integrate digital ethics into Christian Religious Education, Civic Education, Indonesian Language, Informatics, and homeroom activities through case-based learning, contextual biblical reflection, teacher example, consistent rules, agreements with families and churches, and restorative responses to violations. Graded guidance on AI, distinguishing acceptable use, use with disclosure, and prohibited use, gives students a concrete basis for honest practice. Several limitations qualify these conclusions. The study contains no primary data, so it does not describe the digital behaviour of students in any particular school. It relies on secondary sources whose methods vary, and the choice of databases and selection criteria may have introduced selection bias and publication bias, since studies reporting positive or significant findings are more likely to be published and retrieved. The sources were mainly in Indonesian and English, which excludes work in other languages. Evidence on hoax sharing and plagiarism specifically among Indonesian senior high school students was limited, some supporting studies came from other countries or from older students, and the proposed framework remains conceptual until it is tested.

Future research can address these limitations through three questions. The first asks how Christian senior high school students in Indonesia navigate ethical dilemmas in digital spaces, which interviews, focus groups, and scenario-based tasks would explore. The second asks what relationship exists between the internalisation of Christian values and digital behaviour, which a survey using validated scales could examine, for example by testing the hypothesis that stronger internalisation is associated with less cyberbullying and that school climate and social self-efficacy mediate the relationship. The third asks how effective specific strategies such as case-based learning, biblical reflection, and restorative practice are in promoting digital ethics, which quasi-experimental or cluster-randomised designs with pre-test, post-test, and follow-up measurement, supported by classroom observation, would be suited to evaluate. Comparative studies across school types and longitudinal studies that follow students through senior high school would further test whether the framework holds beyond a single context.

REFERENCES

Afdal, A., Fikri, M., Neviyarni, N., Iswari, M., Sukmawati, I., Firman, F., Karneli, Y., Mardianto, M., & Hariko, R. (2023). Hoax behavior tendencies among Indonesian students: An analysis during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, *12*(1), 59. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v12i1.23632

Al Jailani, Y., Rizki, R. A., Ulfah, N., Rudini, & Syairoh, A. N. (2025). AQIDAH

AKHLAK TEACHER STRATEGIES FOR CULTIVATING NOBLE CHARACTER IN GRADE IX STUDENTS AT MTS AR RAHMANIYAH. *SUJANA (Education and Learning Review)*, *4*(2), 41–57. https://doi.org/10.56943/sujana.v4i2.893

Alonso-Rodríguez, I., Pérez-Jorge, D., Pérez-Pérez, I., & Olmos-Raya, E. (2025). Restorative practices in reducing school violence: a systematic review of positive impacts on emotional wellbeing. *Frontiers in Education*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1520137

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *18*(3), 328–352. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238

BSKAP. (2022). *Dimensi, Elemen, dan Subelemen Profil Pelajar Pancasila pada Kurikulum Merdeka*.

Chen, L., Liu, X., & Tang, H. (2023). The Interactive Effects of Parental Mediation Strategies in Preventing Cyberbullying on Social Media. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, *Volume 16*, 1009–1022. https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S386968

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2024). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. SAGE Publications Ltd. https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/qualitative-inquiry-and-research-design/book266033#main-content

Eke, D. O. (2023). ChatGPT and the rise of generative AI: Threat to academic integrity? *Journal of Responsible Technology*, *13*, 100060. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrt.2023.100060

Floridi, L. (2013). *The Ethics of Information*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199641321.001.0001

Giawa, G. J. S., & Dwikristanto, Y. P. (2025). Peran Guru Kristen Sebagai Pembimbing Siswa terhadap Dekadensi Etika Digital. *Diligentia: Journal of Theology and Christian Education*, *7*(2), 86–101. https://doi.org/10.19166/dil.v7i2.9628

Harrison, T., & Polizzi, G. (2022). (In)civility and adolescents' moral decision making online: drawing on moral theory to advance digital citizenship education. *Education and Information Technologies*, *27*(3), 3277–3297. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10710-0

Hunter, J. D. (2010). *To change the world: The irony, tragedy, and possibility of Christianity in the late modern world*. Oxford University Press.

Hursen, C., Paşa, D., & Keser, H. (2023). High School Students' Use of Information, Media, and Technology Skills and Multidimensional 21st-Century Skills: An Investigation within the Context of Students, Teachers, and Curricula. *Sustainability*, *15*(16), 12214. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151612214

Kollo, F. L., Zulkarnain, Z., Mahfud, T., & Matang, M. (2024). Beware of cyberbullying! Evidence from high school students in Indonesia. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, *13*(3), 1465. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v13i3.26686

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic Inquiry. In *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE.

Mensah, R. O., Quansah, C., Oteng, B., & Nii Akai Nettey, J. (2023). Assessing the

effect of information and communication technology usage on high school student's academic performance in a developing country. *Cogent Education*, *10*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2188809

Moor, J. H. (1985). What is computer ethics? *Metaphilosophy*, *16*(4), 266–275. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9973.1985.tb00173.x

Nguyen, A., Ngo, H. N., Hong, Y., Dang, B., & Nguyen, B.-P. T. (2023). Ethical principles for artificial intelligence in education. *Education and Information Technologies*, *28*(4), 4221–4241. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11316-w

Shakeeva, N., Andashova, R., & Jumalieva, G. (2025). Intercultural communication in digital space: Challenges and adaptation strategies. *Bulletin of the Jusup Balasagyn Kyrgyz National University*, 59–67. https://doi.org/10.58649/1694-8033-2025-3(123)-59-67

Smith, M. F. (2025). Political Clippers on TikTok: Double Gatekeeping, Curatorial Power, and Algorithmic Amplification Beyond Follower Count. *SUJANA (Education and Learning Review)*, *4*(3), 76–90. https://doi.org/10.56943/sujana.v4i3.1058

Sukma, R., Manaf, N. A., & Tressyalina. (2025). Leech's Politeness Maxims in Indonesian Digital Communication: Enactment, Violation, and Negotiation on X and Instagram. *SUJANA (Education and Learning Review)*, *4*(3), 55–75. https://doi.org/10.56943/sujana.v4i3.1041

Ugli, M. A. U. (2025). Scientific-theoretical foundations of the negative impact of social networks on the moral and ethical upbringing of youth. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies*, *3*(3), 689–698. https://doi.org/10.35912/jomaps.v3i3.3259

Waruwu, M., Arifianto, Y. A., & Suseno, A. (2020). Peran Pendidikan Etika Kristen dalam Media Sosial di Era Disrupsi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Kristen (JUPAK)*, *1*(1), 38–46. https://doi.org/10.52489/jupak.v1i1.5