
INTEGRATING CYBER ETHICS AND DIGITAL MORALITY IN CHINESE HIGHER EDUCATION

Received: 13-02-2026, Revised: 09-03-2026, Accepted: 15-04-2026, Published: 15-05-2026

Abstract:

The rapid digitalization of higher education has made it increasingly urgent to incorporate cyber ethics and digital morality into the university education system. In China, although educational policies and traditions advocate for the education of cyber ethics and digital morality, there are some problems in implementation that need to be addressed urgently. This study adopts methods such as conceptual analysis and literature research to investigate the current situation and propose a comprehensive framework. Some major problems were identified, but opportunities and advantages were also pointed out, and an integrated model in the Chinese context was proposed. The study shows that China has favorable conditions and is expected to establish a digital morality education model based on national values and in line with global norms, thereby cultivating university students to engage in responsible moral interactions in the digital world. It provides a favorable position for educating university students to engage in moral interactions in the digital world.

Keywords: Cyber Ethics, Digital Morality, Higher Education, Moral Competence, China.

Authors:

Liu Yan (Faculty of Liberal Arts, Perdana University, Malaysia)

Low Suet Fin (Faculty of Liberal Arts, Perdana University, Malaysia)

Correspondence: 24220009@perdanauniversity.edu.my

1. Introduction

In the digital age, higher education is undergoing a comprehensive transformation as the acquisition and creation of knowledge cannot be separated from digital technology (Cserkó et al., 2024). Although these technological advancements have provided convenience for higher education, they have also brought about new ethical issues such as data privacy, cyberbullying, false information, and plagiarism by artificial intelligence (Valeeva, 2024). China has developed rapidly in the popularization of digital technology, and the national policies have also formulated guidelines for the digital ethics and moral behavior of university students (Ma & Kim, 2024). However, the contradiction between the rapid development of digital technology and the relatively lagging moral awareness of university students is becoming increasingly prominent. Therefore, strengthening the construction of cyber ethics and digital ethics has become an urgent and pressing problem to be solved (Lapteva et al., 2024).

Cyber ethics advocate for the implementation of moral principles such as respecting privacy, protecting intellectual property rights and maintaining network security in the digital space (Sari et al., 2024). Digital morality, on the other hand, goes further by focusing on cultivating ethical practice values and behavioral habits that go beyond basic compliance requirements (Miller & Bossomaier, 2024). These two aspects are both the external norms that higher education needs to cultivate, and also the internal requirements that need to be transformed. Many countries have implemented curriculum reforms and moral awareness training programs. Currently, the construction of cyber ethics and digital ethics in China is also underway, but it faces some challenges. These challenges indicate that there is a certain gap between national policies and specific implementations (Kostka, 2023). How to bridge this gap depends on how universities implement and solve it - integrating cyber ethics and digital ethics into comprehensive education (Aliasari et al., 2024).

This study aims to explore the integration of cyber ethics and digital morality in higher education in China. It is a conceptual study based on literature review, policy analysis and comparative understanding. Taking China as an example, this study provides valuable lessons that can be learned by other regions facing similar problems.

The organization of the study is as follows: Section 2 offers an overview of global and Chinese perspectives on cyber ethics and digital morality; Section 3 outlines the methodological approach; Section 4 offers findings and discussion on state, challenge, and opportunity for integration; and Section 5 concludes with implications for policy, practice, and research.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Global Perspectives on Cyber Ethics and Digital Morality

In recent years, cyber ethics and digital morality have been central concerns in higher education with the digitalization of teaching, research, and communication (Aliasari et al., 2024). Globally, world institutions promote digital literacy as both a technical skill and as a civic skill. The European environment places particular stress on ethical awareness, data security, and accountability of AI (Puran, 2024), whereas North American universities incline to incorporate digital morality into computer science and media studies programs (Pierson & Hildt, 2023). Such measures indicate that higher education must cultivate the comprehensive qualities of university students, enabling them to become professional talents while also becoming ethical citizens in the digital age.

However, there are some problems. For instance, the integration of ethical resources within universities is rather scattered. It is either presented in the form of individual courses or emerges as a form of character education (Gurgu, 2022). Moreover, the diversity of cultures makes this task even more complicated: Western culture emphasizes autonomy and rights, while Asian societies emphasize collectivity and responsibility (Kokuryo, 2022). Therefore, effective digital ethical education requires the combination of global principles with local cultural backgrounds.

2.2 The Chinese Context

China is exceptional, since moral education has never taken a second place to higher education policy. Universities have a responsibility to develop ideological and civic virtues as well as academic knowledge (Ye, 2022). Contemporary policies also highlight cyber ethics and digital morality, coupling technological advancement with social responsibility.

The practical activities of cyber ethics education in China's higher education include cybersecurity training, information security lectures, and media publicity campaigns, etc (Yao et al., 2023). However, these activities are not well-organized and rarely incorporated into the curriculum. University students generally know that there are threats in the digital world, but they lack systematic channels for ethical reflection (Nascimento et al., 2020).

The development of digital media technology - such as digital open courses (MOOCs), artificial intelligence software, and the acceleration of digital learning - has raised numerous ethical issues (Shi, 2024). Chinese university students, while being exposed to the influence of international digital culture, must also abide by the local digital moral rules. Therefore, higher education must balance the relationship between diverse cultures and the local culture in order to address these problems (Wang, 2024).

2.3 Theoretical Foundations

Kohlberg's theory focuses on levels of moral reasoning, from obedience to rules to moral justice (Gómez Mejía, 2025). In computer-based environments, this moves students away from not breaking a rule because it's a rule and toward comprehending fairness and integrity as internalized principles (Kumar & Choudhury, 2023).

Rest's Four-Component Model—moral sensitivity, judgment, motivation, and character—can be applied to actual digital dilemmas (Hafidurrahman et al., 2023). Students are expected to recognize ethical issues digital, weigh conflicting values, prioritize ethical responses, and practice consistent behavior digital (Stenmark, 2025).

The Integrative Ethical Education (IEE) model extends this with the promotion of the practice of moral skill, regulation, and supportive environments (Leftwich, 2022). When it comes to the application of cyber ethics, universities are not only required to instruct abstract norms but also to provide experiential learning activities, like simulations or case-based learning, that allow students to internalize ethical commitments (Hervouet, 2022).

2.4 Research Gap

At the international level, most activity is limited to technical aspects of digital literacy without much integration of moral thinking. Research has a tendency to describe fragmented practice rather than overarching, adaptable models (Oktria et al., 2024). In China, while moral education is strongly emphasized, cyber ethics and digital morality are not systematically incorporated into higher education. Policy ambitions call for the development of "ethical digital citizens," yet implementation is gradual (Liu, 2022). Empirical studies that assess effectiveness are limited, and the connection between classic moral theories and digital dilemmas is understudied (Belchior-Rocha et al., 2024).

Current research on cyber ethics and digital morality has isolated the exploration of factors such as policies, teaching methods, technology, and culture, resulting in a lack of coherence in practice (Aliasari et al., 2024). Therefore, these aspects need to be integrated to enable universities to cultivate moral capabilities suitable for the digital age.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative conceptual research design with the intention of synthesizing, rather than generating, empirical data by consolidating existing scholarship, policy, and theoretical advances. The goal is to map the terrain, identify gaps, and construct an integrative framework for the incorporation of cyber ethics and digital morality at Chinese universities.

3.2 Sources of Evidence

The analysis is supported by three sets of evidence. Research literature from 2022 to 2025 provides the fundamental foundation, reflecting contemporary argumentation and advances. International and national policy documents—at UNESCO, EU levels, and China's Ministry of Education guidelines—expose institutional priorities and governance directions. Case studies and secondary accounts of higher education practice indicate how ethical values are realized in digital settings. Together, these sources render the framework both theoretically informed and pragmatically helpful.

3.3 Research Methods

Four methodological techniques were employed across the study. A systematic literature review was employed to identify key themes and issues from keyword searches and thematic coding. Discourse analysis-based policy analysis cross-compared Chinese and international documents to identify convergences (e.g., digital literacy) and divergences (e.g., moral foundations). Comparing Chinese practices to the global context, comparative analysis enabled identifying transferable approaches and new local issues. Finally, conceptual synthesis integrated the findings with theories of moral development to create a formulated practice framework.

3.4 Ensuring Rigor

Although no empirical data were collected, rigor was maintained by transparency in the selection of literature and policies, triangulation among various sources of evidence, and theoretical coherence by using established moral development theories to inform analysis. Reflexivity was also emphasized to provide for cultural and ideological considerations in comparing the contexts (Sithole, 2025).

3.5 Ethical Considerations

The study does not involve human subjects; thus, there are no confidentiality or consent concerns. Ethical responsibility was upheld through correct reporting of sources, avoidance of misinterpretation, and upholding academic and policy integrity through proper acknowledgment of scholarship and policy contributions.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1 Current State of Cyber Ethics and Digital Morality in Chinese Higher Education

The integration of cyber ethics and digital morality into Chinese tertiary education is still in a preliminary and lopsided stage. Policymaking shows the Chinese state has resoundingly reaffirmed assent for digital literacy and ethical governance. National policies emphasize the need to cultivate responsible digital citizens who combine technical competence with moral awareness (Yakovleva, 2023). The Ministry of Education has released guidelines for the strengthening of ideological and

political education, and the guidelines do refer to digital citizenship, digital conduct, and appropriate usage of technology (Malik, 2024).

At the institutional level, many universities have introduced policies such as safe internet use courses, information security courses, or artificial intelligence ethics courses. Others have organized seminars, workshops, or digital campaigns on issues such as cyberbullying, data privacy, or academic integrity (Yao et al., 2023). However, these initiatives are piecemeal and disorganized. As a result, many students gain basic knowledge of digital dangers but lack the deeper moral ability to reach responsible conclusions in complex or ambiguous digital situations (Nascimento et al., 2020).

In spite of the challenges that exist, Chinese higher education possesses some strengths that are useful as a foundation for the inclusion of cyber ethics. The historical background of moral education, particularly through ideological and political courses, provides institutional and cultural space to engage with value and morality (Ning, 2024). Finally, the focus on collective responsibility and social harmony in Chinese culture is something that aligns with most of the principles that receive an expression in digital morality. These cultural and institutional features point to the fact that China has the potential to create a model of integration combining international experience and native traditions (Tùng, 2020).

4.2 Challenges and Barriers

Institutional challenges result from the compartmentalization of the implementation process. General goals are set by national policies, but universities might not receive clear directives or financial allocations to translate objectives into action. The majority of institutions perceive digital morality as a secondary rather than a primary curricular commitment (Aliasari et al., 2024). Thus, initiatives are irregular, depending on certain departments or teachers, and frequently uncoordinated on the university level.

Pedagogical concerns are concerned with the problem of educating digital morality in practical terms. Ethical concerns in the digital environment are typically multifaceted, context-specific, and ever-changing. Teachers lack the necessary training to educate on concerns such as the ethical application of generative AI, boundaries of monitoring and pedagogical assistance, or the analytics ethics of big data (Le-Nguyen & Trung, 2023).

There are obstacles to technology brought about by the rate of innovation. Technologies will advance faster than the educational systems can keep up. Universities will struggle to keep curricula up to speed with advances in artificial intelligence, social networking, or digital platforms. There are also tensions between implementing technology to drive education forward and holding on to ethical fences (Shi & Zhang, 2023).

Structural issues lie behind the organization of moral education and digital literacy in higher education. Cyber ethics and digital morality are addressed at universities primarily as ad hoc initiatives like

voluntary lectures, awareness programs, or one-off projects. There is no systematic incorporation into mainstream curricula, and there is no attempt at long-term cohesion (Yao et al., 2023). Therefore, students can be given shallow access to ethical issues without establishing lasting moral ability and the power to generate ethics-based judgments in real-world digital settings (Nascimento et al., 2020).

Overall, these issues reveal the gap between policy goals and the actual situation of education. Therefore, integrating cyber ethics and digital morality into higher education not only requires policy guidance, but also necessitates changes in aspects such as the curriculum system, teaching methods, technological implementation, and cultural adaptation.

4.3 Opportunities and Strategies

Policy momentum is one of the core opportunities. The Chinese government has put education digitalization and moral governance at the forefront of the policy agenda. Policies demand the building of not only technically competent graduates but also morally competent citizens capable of serving national development and international exchanges (Tùng, 2020). The policy environment gives universities a good push to take digital morality seriously and bring pedagogical practice in line with national agendas.

Institutional capability offers another avenue. Chinese universities already have functioning mechanisms of moral education in the shape of ideological and political education courses (Ning, 2024). These can be organic places where discussion of cyber ethics and digital morality can be integrated. Instead of making digital morality an independent subject, universities can integrate it into working moral education mechanisms so that students of all walks of study are taught about ethical matters in digital spaces.

What has happened overseas has lessons to teach. Universities worldwide have tried out a range of models of digital morality, ranging from isolated courses to interdisciplinary modules and codes of conduct at the university level. Although these trials have their own limitations, they offer Chinese universities models to follow (Hay, 2022).

Technology can also be used to improve moral education. Digital environments can be used not only to deliver content but also to replicate ethical problems, facilitate discussion, and stimulate reflection. Virtual learning environments, for instance, can expose students to scenarios requiring ethical decision-making, allowing them to develop the use of principles in real-world contexts (Novikova & Strelchenko, 2021). Artificial intelligence software can also be used to provide feedback, track students' engagement with ethical materials, and personalize learning experiences.

As a response to the crises of the era, universities may pursue a variety of means to more effectively integrate cyber ethics and digital morality. Curriculum integration is one of them, where ethical issues are integrated throughout core courses across all departments rather than being confined to specialist

courses (Goetze, 2023). Training of faculty is also important and involves equipping teachers with the training and tools needed to teach digital morality confidently and effectively. At the same time, interdisciplinary collaboration must be encouraged in a way that computer science, humanities, social sciences, and law come together to tackle the multifaceted aspect of ethical issues (Temara, 2024). In an effort to create deeper learning, students' participation must be emphasized in the form of debates, discussions, and projects that require students to take an active role in creating ethical awareness (Yao et al., 2023). Finally, establishing an institutional culture of digital responsibility through codes of conduct, sensitivity campaigns, and leadership by example can set the stage for long-term and sustainable effects. Together, these steps create a path for Chinese universities to redefine existing setbacks as a prospect for innovation and world leadership in digital morality education (Samaranayake, 2024).

4.4 A Proposed Integrative Framework for China

Based on the analysis of the situation, issues, and opportunities in this study, an integrative model for institutionalizing cyber ethics and digital morality in Chinese higher education is offered. The model places special emphasis on four interconnected areas: policy, curriculum, technology, and culture.

Policy dimension: At the macro level, cyber ethics incorporation will be supported by recurrent policies based on evident goals, norms, and regimes of responsibility. University plans must then incorporate these country-level policies with particular targets for the deployment of each goal (Temara, 2024). Universities may establish particular committees or offices to manage digital morality projects so as to ensure uniform conformity of institutional practice with national objectives (Goetze, 2023).

Curriculum dimension: Universities should, at the meso level, integrate cyber ethics into curricula in an organized way. This involves creating special courses where appropriate, but notably, embedding ethical content within disciplinary and general education courses (Yao et al., 2023). Curricular integration ensures that all students, regardless of what they are majoring in, become aware and competent in digital morality.

Technology dimension: Technological tools need to be used responsibly and pedagogically at the level of operation. Learning environments need to be designed with privacy and openness, avoiding intrusive surveillance but allowing for learning for students (Temara, 2024). Technology can also be used creatively to teach ethics. Simulation programs, virtual reality, and electronic forums can place students in ethical dilemmas and facilitate moral reasoning in real contexts (Samaranayake, 2024).

Cultural dimension: Universities should at the very minimum create an ethical culture for digital conduct. That is not merely formal learning but informal custom, campus culture, and institutional management (Aliasari et al., 2024). By embedding digital morality in the life of the university on a daily basis, students will develop ethical values. Cultural activities may be student-led campaigns, ethics charters, and integration of digital morality in extracurricular programs (Malik, 2024).

The strength of the model is that it is holistic in nature. All four elements inter-support each other: policies provide guidance, curricula interpret values, technologies furnish learning and practice aids, and culture enables sustainability (Xu, 2025). Collectively, implemented as an integrated set, these dimensions can drive Chinese higher education from individual initiatives toward an integrated system of digital moral education.

5. Conclusion and Implications

The heightened digitalization of tertiary education has made cyber ethics and digital morality indispensable components of twenty-first-century education (Valeeva, 2024). This study has elaborated on the global and Chinese contexts, contrasted challenges and opportunities, and proposed an integrative framework for the incorporation of ethical components in Chinese tertiary education. The findings show that while China has made some progress in accepting the importance of digital morality, its implementation remains fragmented and inadequate (Malik, 2024). It must become more comprehensive and systematic if universities are to equip students with the moral capacity to handle the challenges of digital living (Temara, 2024).

While China's dominant institutional culture in higher education emphasizes moral development and national policies actively promote digital literacy and responsible citizenship, there are serious challenges (Shi & Zhang, 2023). Holistic frameworks for embedding digital ethics are not yet common in most universities, instructors struggle to stay ahead of digital dilemmas unfolding with lightning speed, and students must navigate the tension between global digital culture and local moral expectations (Aliasari et al., 2024).

Here, the integrative model proposed in this article discerns four intertwined dimensions—policy, curriculum, technology, and culture—as pillars of integration. Policy provides direction and alignment, curriculum ensures systematic exposure across disciplines, technology offers both tools and challenges, and culture sustains ethical values in the daily life of the university (Xu, 2025). By addressing all four dimensions together, Chinese higher education can move from fragmented initiatives toward a consistent and sustainable model of digital moral education.

5.1 Theoretical Contributions

This study contributes to theory in a number of ways. It expands debate about moral education. The study frames it as a process of development and learning that has to be incorporated within traditions of moral education. The study demonstrates how ancient theories can be utilized in contemporary digital contexts (Rosado Garcia et al., 2025). Integrating cross-cultural understandings into a universal-in-theory, specific-in-application model.

5.2 Practical Implications

Practically, the study makes suggestions for policymakers, university administrators, and educators. For policymakers, transform the overall national goals into specific and executable agendas, establish digital ethics education standards, implement them, and establish accountability mechanisms (Ning, 2024). For universities, Digital ethics need not be confined to specific courses. Teachers need to receive training, guidance and materials to lead students. For students, not only can one acquire technical skills, but also moral decision-making skills (Xu, 2025).

5.3 Limitations and Future Research

This study is theoretical in nature and does not enjoy empirical evidence. Despite enabling far-reaching theory and policy-oriented observations, this consequently implies that the operational effectiveness of the proposed framework remains to be established (Sithole, 2025). Additional research must explore how the framework can be translated into actual institutional settings and must gauge its impact on students' moral ability and digital conduct (Yakovleva, 2023). Comparative studies can further provide insights through examination of how similar problems have been treated by other countries and what, if anything, could be transferred to the Chinese case. Additional empirical investigations of student attitudes, faculty behavior, and organizational policy would enable further development of the framework and its transferability to real-world classrooms.

5.4 Final Reflection

The integration of cyber ethics and digital morality in Chinese higher education is a necessity and an opportunity. It is a necessity because students must be prepared to meet the moral challenges of a digitized world, where choices on privacy, integrity, and responsibility are unavoidable (Sithole, 2025). It is an opportunity because China's unique combination of moral education history, policy encouragement, and technological advancement puts it in a unique position to develop a different model of digital moral education that can contribute something new to international discourse (Lapteva et al., 2024). Through its departure from ad hoc action and embracing a strategic, multi-pronged approach, Chinese higher education stands to take the lead in defining not only capable graduates but also responsible digital citizens (Hervouet, 2022).

References

1. Aliasan, A., Muzaiyanah, M., & Razzaq, A. (2024). Digital ethics in higher learning institutions (pp. 61–70). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-2865-1.ch004>
2. Belchior-Rocha, H., Arslan, A., & Yener, S. (2024). Unveiling the ethical dilemmas of digital piracy: A comprehensive exploration of motivations, attitudes, and behaviors. *Advances in the Social Sciences*, 13(11), 579. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13110579>
3. Cserkó, J., Rajcsányi-Molnár, M., András, I., Benyák, A., Pongrácz, A., & Molnár, G. (2024). The transformation of digital culture and learning habits in higher education: Digital methods

- and tools (pp. 109–114). IEEE CANDO EPE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/cando-epe65072.2024.10772883>
4. Goetze, T. S. (2023). Integrating ethics into computer science education: Multi-, inter-, and transdisciplinary approaches. Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3545945.3569792>
 5. Gómez Mejía, S. (2025). Teoría del juicio moral de Kohlberg. *Con-Ciencia Boletín Científico de La Escuela Preparatoria No. 3*, 12(23), 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.29057/prepa3.v12i23.13774>
 6. Gurgu, E. (2022). Leadership on ethical bases in the university environment to improve standards in higher education (pp. 49–68). IGI Global eBooks. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-5195-3.ch003>
 7. Hafidurrahman, Moh., Arifin, S., & Sholehuddin, A. (2023). The dilemma of online education in building student character. *Journal of Islamic Education*. <https://doi.org/10.32806/dxt57m98>
 8. Hay, V. (2022). The experience of the People’s Republic of China in the development of the digital educational environment. *Научные Исследования и Разработки*, 11(3), 71–76. <https://doi.org/10.12737/2306-1731-2022-11-3-71-76>
 9. Hervouet, R. (2022). Investigating the integrative ethical education model in the first-year engineering classroom. 2022 IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference (FIE). <https://doi.org/10.1109/fie56618.2022.9962483>
 10. Kokuryo, J. (2022). An Asian perspective on the governance of cyber civilization. *Electronic Markets*, 32(2), 475–485. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-022-00523-5>
 11. Kostka, G. (2023). Digital governance in China (pp. 178–207). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800883246.00020>
 12. Kumar, S., & Choudhury, S. (2023). Cognitive morality and artificial intelligence (AI): A proposed classification of AI systems using Kohlberg’s theory of cognitive ethics. *Technological Sustainability*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/techs-12-2022-0047>
 13. Lapteva, E. A., Midaeva, A. A., & Luguayeva, A. S. (2024). A study on the moral education of students in a networked society. *Èkonomika i Upravljenje: Problemy, Rešeniã*, 8(149), 161–166. <https://doi.org/10.36871/ek.up.p.r.2024.08.08.021>
 14. Leftwich, B. M. (2022). Investigating the integrative ethical education model in the first-year engineering classroom. *Frontiers in Education Conference*, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FIE56618.2022.9962483>
 15. Le-Nguyen, H.-T., & Trung, T. (2023). Generative AI in terms of its ethical problems for both teachers and learners (pp. 144–173). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-0074-9.ch006>
 16. Liu, X. (2022). Investigating undergraduates’ perceptions of digital citizenship: A survey from China (pp. 60–64). IEEE International Conference on Educational Technology. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EITT57407.2022.00016>
 17. Ma, J., & Kim, S. J. (2024). Developing digital literacy for college students and establishing a new type of online lecture. *Asia Yeon’gu - Han’gug Asia Haghoe*, 27(2), 73–84. <https://doi.org/10.21740/jas.2024.5.27.2.73>
 18. Malik, K. (2024). Integrating digital citizenship education in the contemporary educational ecosystem (pp. 357–376). CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781032713366-25>
 19. Miller, S., & Bossomaier, T. (2024). Cybersecurity, ethics, and collective responsibility. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190058135.001.0001>
 20. Nascimento, W. R. D., Salviato-Silva, A. C., & Dell’ Agli, B. A. V. (2020). Desenvolvimento moral na cibercultura. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, 51, 107–115. <https://doi.org/10.23925/2175-3520.2020I51P107-115>
 21. Ning, W. (2024). Research on the value and path of integrating excellent traditional Chinese culture into ideological and political courses in colleges and universities. *The Education Review, USA*. <https://doi.org/10.26855/er.2024.01.010>
 22. Novikova, E. Yu., & Strelchenko, O. (2021). Ethical issues in e-education. *Социально-Гуманитарные Знания*, 1, 66–70. <https://doi.org/10.34823/sgz.2021.1.51515>
 23. Oktria, A. D., Musaffa, V., & Rachman, I. F. (2024). Peran literasi digital dalam membangun kesadaran dan moralitas peserta didik sesuai dengan SDGs 2030. *Morfologi: Jurnal Ilmiah*. <https://doi.org/10.61132/morfologi.v2i3.631>

24. Pierson, C. M., & Hildt, E. (2023). From principles to practice: Comparative analysis of European and United States ethical AI frameworks for assessment and methodological application. *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 60. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pr2.792>
25. Puran, A. (2024). Dimensions of artificial intelligence ethics from an international and EU perspective. *Agora International Journal of Juridical Sciences*, 18(2), 245–251. <https://doi.org/10.15837/aijjs.v18i2.6994>
26. Rosado Garcia, T. L., Chancay Chancay, M. M., Alcivar Vera, T. P., Acosta Marino, A. A., Cobena Cedeno, A. A., & Bernal Mendieta, C. J. (2025). Development of ethical values in digital education. *Universidad, Ciencia y Tecnología*, 29(Special), 114–123. <https://doi.org/10.47460/uct.v29ispecial.885>
27. Samaranyake, P. N. (2024). Navigating the moral prospect. *Journal of Ethics and Emerging Technologies*, 34(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.55613/jeet.v34i1.144>
28. Sari, H. B., Ningsih, N. M. A. P. C., Kristina, N. M. Y., Rismayanti, N. P. I., Thalib, E. F., Meinarni, N. P. S., & Julianti, L. (2024). Digital ethics and citizenship challenges in cyberspace: An overview from perspective morals and laws. *Jurnal Notariil*, 9(1), 33–39. <https://doi.org/10.22225/jn.9.1.2024.33-39>
29. Shi, J., & Zhang, X. (2023). Integration of AI with higher education innovation: Reforming future educational directions. *International Journal of Science and Research*. <https://doi.org/10.21275/sr231023183401>
30. Shi, M. (2024). Research on the ethical issues of digital communication technologies in the context of new media and their countermeasures. *Transactions on Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 13, 263–266. <https://doi.org/10.62051/1gxfsw57>
31. Sithole, A. (2025). Choosing a qualitative research paradigm for social sciences: A literature review for educational researchers. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(12), 3945–3954. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2024.812032>
32. Stenmark, C. K. (2025). Putting an ethics training program online: It may be more complicated than we think. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15562646251313577>
33. Temara, S. (2024). Ethics for responsible data research: Integrating cybersecurity perspectives in digital era. *OSF Preprints*. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/xsjt7>
34. Valeeva, G. V. (2024). Ethical issues and risks of digital transformation of a higher education teacher. *Общество: Философия, История, Культура*. <https://doi.org/10.24158/fik.2024.5.9>
35. Wang, M. (2024). The current situation and improvement research on the dissemination of Chinese culture in college English education in China. *Education, Society and Human Studies*, 5(1), 53–60. <https://doi.org/10.22158/eshs.v5n1p53>
36. Xu, Y. (2025). Research and practical exploration of an integrated online and offline industry-education fusion teaching model. *Journal of Education and Educational Research*, 12(1), 76–79. <https://doi.org/10.54097/8xwec820>
37. Yakovleva, A. V. (2023). Legal support for strategies to increase digital literacy: The experience of China. *Pravo i Gosudarstvo*. <https://doi.org/10.33693/2072-3164-2023-16-7-024-031>
38. Yao, J., Lai, G., Wang, H., Chung, K. L., & Huang, S. (2023). Popularization and advancement of cybersecurity in China: Status and measures (pp. 1–4). *IEEE International Conference on Electronic Information and Communication Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/iceict57916.2023.10245973>
39. Ye, W. (2022). *Moral education in China*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003367345>