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ABSTRACT

The online moral violence or cyberbullying caused by moral indignation contains the moral evaluation of the parties or perpetrators of the event, which implied a dichotomous public opinion position. For online violence or cyberbullying caused by morality, there is a potential for differentiation in public opinion. The specific conditions are, When the perpetrator's behavior is less harmful to the society, or the behavioral consequences are less malignant, the public opinion is more divided; but when the perpetrator's behavior has a large negative impact on the society, or the behavioral consequences are more malignant, the public opinion is more unanimous. Morality is the key factor to determine the public opinion of cyberbullying, and the weak law force is not the key factor to determine the public opinion of cyberbullying. The imbalance of law and morality in the influence of public opinion in cyber moral bullying reflects the tendency of the moral force in the network society to be significantly greater than the legal force, and the netizens' legal consciousness is indifferent. The construction of online legal system is urgent.

INTRODUCTION

Concept of cyber bully, as by Bill Belsey running in Canada website (http://www.cyberbullying.ca/) is put forward, namely "Cyberbullying involves the use of information and communication technologies to support deliberate, repeated, and hostile behavior by an individual or group, which is intended to harm others." Among cyberbullying, cyber moral bullying is cyberbullying which is caused by cyberbullying against the parties involved in the violation of morality or based on
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the naive justice view. Then, in different cases of cyber moral bullying, why is the moral evaluation of the victims of cyberbullying sometimes divided in the public opinion position, and at other times unanimous? For a long time, this problem has been reflected in the domestic and international cyberbullying phenomenon, but there are few answers. Based on this background, this paper takes many typical cases of cyber moral bullying on the Internet as an example to explain how the public opinion position of cyber moral bullying on the Internet is formed and what kind of occurrence mechanism does cyber moral bullying have, so as to better understand the role of moral evaluation in cyber moral bullying.

RAISING OF QUESTIONS

To answer the above questions, we first need to realize what cyber moral bullying is. Firstly, it is caused by emotional pain and joy, in order to maintain the moral norms held by an individual or group. Secondly, it is an aggressive moral evaluation of other individuals or groups using information technology. Thirdly, it transcends the limits of freedom of speech or the rule of law. This behavior mainly occurs in the digital environment dominated by computers and mobile phones, sometimes accompanied by offline related hostile behaviors. It has some of the characteristics of cyberbullying, such as anonymity, concealment, accessibility (victims can be reached at any time), spread rapidly, imbalance of power and other characteristics, and have some of their uniqueness. For example, in the cause, it is the network attack in the name of morality, which is the violence that occupies the "moral high ground" [1][2][3][4]. In form, it is mainly manifested as "moral judgment" [5][6][7]. Then, in other cases, in the process of "group polarization"[8], it is manifested as the distorted interpretation of moral emotion, such as recreational network justice [1], weakening moral self-discipline [9] and unmoral emotion venting [10].

Cyber moral bullying mainly originates from the maintenance of morality and justice, which requires the punishment of words and deeds violating morality. It includes moral evaluation of the parties involved. Moral evaluation, or moral judgment, is an evaluative judgment, "A type of evaluative judgement that is based on assessments of the adequacy of one’s own and others’ behaviors according to socially shaped ideas of right and wrong."[11] It is an activity in which people judge the good and evil of their own or others' behaviors according to certain social or class standards, indicating a positive and negative attitude[12]. All definitions of moral evaluation include judgment on the correctness or falsity of an action. Many researchers have pointed out that motivation and outcomes are factors that influence moral judgments of other people's behavior. The explanation of the difference of moral evaluation conclusion results in the introduction of theories such as motivation determinism, effect determinism and motivation-effect unification.

According to the theory of motivation determinism, moral evaluation draws the conclusion that behavior is justified mainly by examining whether behavioral
motivation is justified. The representative figures of this view are Kant and Hume, and the representative theory is deontology.

While according to the theory of effect determinism, moral evaluation draws a conclusion mainly by examining the result of behavior or the value of effect, and judges whether behavior is justified or not. This view is represented by Bentham and Mill, and utilitarianism.

After utilitarianism and deontology, many researchers have made a comprehensive study of both of them and come up with the motivation-effect unification, which puts the motive and effect together for moral evaluation. This view argues that motivation and effect are interdependent and closely related. The representatives of this view are Hegel and Marx.

It is not difficult to see that, although there are certain studies on the motivations and the effects of moral evaluation, there is a lack of research on the characteristics of moral evaluation in cyber moral bullying[1]. Since the recognized moral norms of the network environment have not yet been formed, everyone can judge events and parties in the moral standards they advocate. In case of a recognized standard vacancy, people tend to give different weights to the motivation and effect according to their own evaluation mode, and conduct moral evaluation on the parties involved in the event in the network. Obviously, different evaluation results will appear.

In terms of differences in moral evaluation, why does the tendency of moral evaluation appear to be differentiated and consistent in different incidents of cyber moral bullying? Previous studies have only discussed that the maintenance of morality may be the cause of cyberbullying. However, there is no empirical case study on the tendency of moral evaluation and the influencing conditions of moral violence on the Internet. Therefore, we will analyze the aforementioned problems on the basis of cases.

SPECULATION ON THE TENDENCY OF MORAL EVALUATION OF CYBER MORAL BULLYING

Compared with cyberbullying, cyber moral bullying in China today has the following characteristics: (1) Diverse Evaluation Criteria. As China is in a period of social transformation, the social contradictions, are increasingly outstanding. Influenced by the Confucian culture’s belief that moral evaluation standard depends on his own views, namely "to benevolence by the own" (wei ren you ji) [13] tradition, different individuals judge social phenomena according to their own conditions and moral concepts of personal understanding. (2) Simple Justice. Due to a certain injustice in the redistribution of interests in the transition period, Internet users express their own moral appeal. However, this kind of justice is only pursues outcome justice[4]. Netizens' moral judgment is usually based on the concept of justice and the standards of good and evil that they themselves think are moral or just[14]. (3) Arbitrariness. It is a typical feature of cyber moral bullying that the simple justice of motivation turns into blindness and conformity of action. Netizens
seldom think about the accuracy of information before making judgments[9]. Netizens are guided by the herd mentality and sometimes even rush to judge the unconfirmed truth of events[14]. These three characteristics have caused netizens to vacillate their attitudes, act rashly and sometimes provoke opposites in their evaluation of specific events.

Internet users conduct moral evaluation of specific events, mostly from the perspective of motivation and results. Compared with motivation judgment, behavioral results are easier to judge. From the perspective of behavioral consequences, people are easy to judge the degree of social harm or malignancy of the event, and certain judgment rules have appeared. For example, criminal laws in many countries judge the degree of malignancy of crime from the aspects of crime plot, social harm, subjective malignancy and personal dangerousness. From the perspective of moral judgment on the result, the degree of event malignancy can be understood from Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory. In today's Chinese society, due to economic development, most people's needs at a lower level of physiology and material level have been basically met, so people pay more attention to the needs at a higher level than physiological level, such as personal safety. Furthermore, the degree of malignancy of the event can be psychologically sorted according to the hierarchy of people's needs. The degree of malignancy of an event can constitute a continuum from low to high, as a result of the influence of easily identifiable personal safety and property conditions. The lowest degree of malignancy is only a minimal property loss and no personal injury. The highest degree of malignancy is not only just a major property loss, but also an event that caused personal injury and death.

The viewpoint of this paper is that in the network society, the cyber moral bullying may be divided in its moral evaluation public opinion. This differentiation results from the inconsistency in perceptions of the nature of the behavior of the cyberbullying object. From the point of view of public opinion, the existing cyber moral bullying incidents can be divided into two categories: one is "consistent cyber moral bullying", which is consistent in its public opinion standpoint of moral evaluation. Then, the other is "controversial cyber moral bullying", which is divided in its public opinion standpoint of moral evaluation. In our opinion, these two types contain two mechanisms to maintain their ecological characteristics: the mechanism with less negative consequences of the perpetrator's behavior and the mechanism with greater adverse consequences of the perpetrator's behavior. Under these two mechanisms, in the event that the negative impact of the perpetrator's behavior is smaller or less severe, the Internet moral evaluation will be more tolerant, potentially alleviating the moral condemnation of the client, and the network moral evaluation will be more severe and more inclined to be unanimous in condemning the events caused by the behavior of the perpetrator with a large degree of negative influence or malignant degree. Thus, the existence of these two mechanisms makes the cyber moral bullying in China show two different characteristics: Controversy and agreement in the public opinion of its moral evaluation. We can use multiple cases
to test whether these two mechanisms are working. If the above conjecture is true, then, in the Chinese context, the problem of the occurrence mechanism of cyber moral bullying can be explained at the level of moral evaluation.

THREE CASES OF CYBER MORAL BULLYING

The typical case for testing the above conjecture comes from mainstream media websites on the Chinese Internet, such as Tencent, People's Daily, Sina, Sohu and other media reports. In order to ensure the typicality of sampling events, this paper only selects the events with more than 10,000 search results in Baidu search engine. Previous studies have pointed out that cyberbullying represented by human flesh search has become increasingly prominent since 2006[15]. Since 2007, there has been an explosion of cyberbullying[14], so the case was selected from 2006 to April 2018. According to the violation of morality and regulations by the parties involved in cyber moral bullying, as well as the public opinion tendency after the event, the selected cases can be roughly divided into three categories:

The first is cases in which a party violates morality and regulations but generates some sympathy from public opinion. For example, the case of the mother who stole a chicken drumstick for a sick child, the case of Yu Huan's intentional injury, and the case of Zhang Koukou murder. Such incidents are often justified by the public because the actions of the parties appear to be motivated by the protection of humanity, affection and justice. This kind of event has also caused serious public opinion disputes, sympathy and even the function of system construction, which has triggered the reflection and adjustment of the existing system.

The second type is the case where the parties violate morality and regulations and condemn the main cases in public opinion. For example, Lin Jiaxiang indecent assault incident, Li Tianyi rape case, Purple Mountain Japanese military uniform photo incident. Such incidents break the moral bottom line of sexual morality, family virtue, national emotion and so on, and appear to be difficult to be accepted by the public in terms of moral emotion.

The third category is cases in which the parties violate morality but do not violate laws and regulations, and the public opinion condemns the main case. For example, the case of Hai Yi insult teacher, the case of Teacher Fan Meizhong who leaved pupils behind in 2008 Sichuan earthquake, the case of Edison Chen photo scandal. In such cases, although the parties did not violate laws and regulations, they still caused public outcries for serious violation of morality. Although the judicial authorities did not punish the parties, online public opinion still exerts great pressure on them and even causes offline harassment.

This paper selects one event from the above three kinds of events for typical analysis. In order to reduce the difficulty in judging the tendency of online public opinion, we judge the tendency of online public opinion by examining the number of netizens' comments on different positions in the news. All the sample news came from Tencent News(http://news.qq.com/), including the whole event review, so as to
provide a more comprehensive introduction of the event for netizens who browse
the news. There are greater than 100 comments per sample. After screening, three
news items that meet the above selection criteria were selected. For the comments of
the news, the comments irrelevant to the evaluation of the parties involved in the
event are excluded, and the same account is excluded from multiple comments and
different accounts comment on each other. A total of 50 comments are drawn for
each news item. After manual reading one by one, the positions of the comments are
classified. A total of 221 comment samples were collected, of which 71 were invalid
and 150 were valid.

3.1 The Case of the Mother Stealing Chicken Drumstick for Sick Child

Liu Jinxia, the mother of a seriously ill child, stole chicken legs, storybooks and
other items on the eve of the children's day, claiming to be giving her daughter a
holiday. The disclosure triggered sympathy and voluntary donations from netizens.
[16]. However, it was not long before public opinion pointed out that Liu Jinxia may
be a habitual thief[17]. These news reports have caused a huge social controversy,
and liu's information was published online and involved in online criticism.

For this case, the relevant news sample is the case of "Mother stealing chicken
drumstick: confronting a rescue defect is more important than a moral judgment". 50
comment samples were divided into 39 sympathetic views, accounting for 78
percent, and 11 critical views, accounting for 22 percent[18]. Sample examples are
as shown in Table I.

In addition, by referring to the results of the Sina investigation, it can be seen to
some extent that the public opinion of netizens is divided in the case of "Mother
stealing chicken drumstick". A total of 12,286 netizens took part in the online survey
by sina.com.cn, and they answered the question: "what do you think about stealing
due to the hardship of life?" Think "understandable because life difficult, forced to
steal" respondents, 7209 people, accounting for 58.7%, think "should not be,
anyway, it is illegal to steal" respondents have 4102 people, accounting for
33.4%[19].

In the above cases, Liu Jinxia, the target of cyber moral bullying, was subject to
low objective economic conditions and education level of culture. Compared with
the average city dweller, she had limited financial ability and resorted to stealing to
meet the needs of her children. The response of Internet public opinion shows that
when there are negative effects, but the perpetrator's behavior is less malignant,
public opinion position of cyber moral bullying will be divided. One view is that Liu
Jinxia, the mother who stole a chicken drumstick deserves sympathy and help to
improve the social assistance system. Another view is that the Liu Jinxia should be
severely punished, and human kindness is not the reason for breaking the law.
Moreover, the comparison of the number of views in this case that sympathy
outweighs condemnation also shows that people are more apt to agree with the
morality of an event than they are to agree with the law. Then, the following
conclusions can be drawn:
TABLE I. EXAMPLES OF COMMENTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentary positions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sympathy</td>
<td>&quot;A mother is willing to dare to climb a mountain of swords or plunge into a sea of flames for the sake of her child. People who talk about morality and law have not previously been parents. They don't understand the helpless situation of a mother.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condemnation</td>
<td>&quot;How old is the child? How mature is the woman? Can you go out and find a job now and make money and not live like this? Stealing causes public donations? Does your child know? What do children think when they are brought up? &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of cyberbullying caused by morality, if the target of cyber moral bullying violates laws and regulations and produces negative effects, but acts in a less vicious way, then Internet users will have disputes about how the authorities should handle the target of cyber moral bullying. At this time, cyber moral bullying public opinion position is not consistent, there will be differentiation. From the perspective of different opinions of Internet users, the view of paying attention to legal facts and investigating effects is slightly weaker than the view of paying attention to morality, human ethics and motivation. Although the real motives of the parties are difficult to ascertain and controversial, the behavioral results are easy to determine. Liu Jinxia, the mother who stole chicken drumstick was weak in her own family condition, and the negative influence caused by her behavior was less. Therefore, the incident is inadmissible in law, but excusable. Internet public opinion is more tolerant to Liu Jinxia in moral evaluation, and quite a few netizens express sympathy or understanding.

Now, we choose two cases that are comparable to the previous case for comparative study, so as to investigate their differences in public opinion positions and influencing factors.

The Case of the Man Who Fondled Girl at Nanjing South Railway Station

In January 2018, Duan, a young man, molested her sister in the waiting room of Nanjing South Railway Station, and other family members in the next seat did not stop him. The incident was uploaded to the Internet by netizens, causing netizens to complain.

For this incident, the relevant news sample of the study is "Nanjing south station obscenity incident: the girl is adopted daughter, and the indecent man has been arrested." All 50 comment samples were condemned, accounting for 100%[20]. Sample examples are as shown in Table II.
### TABLE II. EXAMPLES OF COMMENTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentary positions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condemnation</td>
<td>“People all have retribution, people are doing, god is looking, life cannot be too immoral!! The little brute has been reading the book for nothing! To feed without teaching is the father's fault. His father is not good either!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE III. EXAMPLES OF COMMENTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentary positions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condemnation</td>
<td>&quot;Why should I forgive you? Is your own conscience tolerable? As parents, are your parents still human when they say nasty things to a mother who lost her daughter to save her? Can the parents teach their children what is good? Do you understand transposition thinking? The mother Jiang Qiulian has to show extreme forbearance, for others to try and see how they react.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Liu Xin Family in the Jiang Ge Tokyo Murder Case**

The case of Jiang Ge was a murder in the early hours of November 3, 2016 in the nakano district of Tokyo, Japan. Jiang Ge, a Chinese student at Japan's Hosei University, was stabbed to death by a Chinese man, Chen Shifeng, in front of his apartment. Chen's classmate and ex-girlfriend, Jiang Ge's friend Liu Xin, were also present at the scene. After the crime, Jiang Qiulian, the mother of Jiang Ge, asked Liu Xin to help resolve the case, but was rebuffed, and Liu's family was hostile to her. Ms. Jiang posted information about Mr. Liu and his family online. The public was especially concerned about whether Liu Xin had entered the apartment first and locked the door back, making Jiang Ge, the victim, unable to escape. Liu Xin and her family's attitude of ignoring the victims and shirking responsibility have come under heavy criticism on the Chinese Internet.

For this incident, the relevant news sample is "The first time Jiang Ge's mother met Liu Xin, the case's witness, 300 days after the murder of the long version of Jiang Ge". All 50 comment samples were condemned, accounting for 100%[21]. Sample examples are as shown in Table III.

**Case Comparative Analysis**

In this section, we first analyze the last two cases and then summarize and compare the three cases. Duan, the man who fondled the girl at Nanjing south station, and Liu Xin, the target of cyberbullying in the case of Jiang Ge, both had made negative effects. The difference is that the former violates both law and morality, while the latter only violates morality, not law. Duan, as a brother, molested his sister in public places, and her parents still ignored and did not stop him after witnessing the act. Neither Duan nor his parents have done a good job of...
maintaining the basic responsibility of family ethics. From the perspective of the objective conditions and the cognition of adult to human ethics, Duan and his parents did not fulfill the most elementary moral obligations in the maintenance of family ethics. In the case of Jiang Ge, Liu Xin's family was not only indifferent and unwilling to testify, but also hostile and threatened Jiang Ge's mother with harsh words. Compared with LiuJinxia, the mother stealing chicken drumstick, Liu Xin's negative attitude towards the incident made netizens more prone to malicious inference about her behavior choices at the time of the incident, believing that her inaction brought the bad consequences of Jiang's death. Compared with the case of the mother stealing chicken drumstick for her sick child, the public opinion of cyber moral bullying against Duan and Liu Xin's family is mainly to condemn, regardless of whether their words and deeds are illegal or not. An important reason for this performance is possible that the negative effects of the client's actions are higher.

Before comparing the cases of the mother stealing chicken drumstick, the case of Duan, them an molesting a girl in Nanjing south railway station, and the case of Jiang Ge, it should be pointed out that all three cases occurred on the Internet in mainland China. Network beyond China's different regions of space and time, can let anyone anywhere at any time attention and comment on hot issues in China, and the occurrence of the event time interval spans only less than three years from 2016 to 2018. These characters show that different public opinion responses to the three events, as far as mainland China is concerned, can exclude the differences in culture, history, customs and other factors brought about by regional and time changes. Since all these three cyberbullying are all caused by morality, there is a significant difference in the tendency of public opinion. For comparison, the public attitude towards the event can be summarized as shown in Table IV.

Table IV shows that although they are all incidents of cyber bullying caused by violation of morality, they all involve the level of whether the target of cyber bullying violates the law, and the degree of the negative influence of the target's behavior. By comparison, the following results can be obtained:

Result 1: The incidents of cyber bullying caused by morality can be divided into two categories: one is that the cyber bullying object violate morality and law, and the other is that the cyber bullying object violates morality only.

Result 2: In the incidents of cyber bullying caused by morality, when the perpetrator's behavior has less negative influence on society or the vicious degree of the event is small, then the public opinion position of the cyber bullying will be divided.

Result 3: In incidents of cyber bullying caused by morality, when the perpetrator's behavior has a large negative impact on the society or the vicious degree of the event is big, then the public opinion position of the cyber bullying will be unanimous.

Result 4: In incidents of cyber bullying caused by morality, whether the perpetrators break the law or not has no significant influence on whether or not the public opinion standpoint of the cyber bullying is divided.
These results can be further simplified into the Table V.

TABLE IV. COMPARISON OF EVALUATION TENDENCY OF CYBERBULLYING CAUSED BY MORALITY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event name</th>
<th>Cyberbullying object</th>
<th>The Situation in which the object has violated morality or law</th>
<th>Negative effects on persons or property</th>
<th>The main tendency of public opinion</th>
<th>Position of public opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mother stealing chicken drumstick</td>
<td>Liu Jinxia</td>
<td>Violated morality and law</td>
<td>Minor loss of property</td>
<td>Sympathy and Condemnation</td>
<td>Divided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The man who fondled girl</td>
<td>Duan and his family</td>
<td>Violated morality and law</td>
<td>Personal safety threat</td>
<td>Condemnation</td>
<td>Unanimous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Jiang Ge Tokyo murder case</td>
<td>Liu Xin and her family</td>
<td>Violated morality only</td>
<td>Personal Injuries</td>
<td>Condemnation</td>
<td>Unanimous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in table V are confusing. Because we've shown that the three cases are similar in time and space and cultural backgrounds. Given these similarities, why are there significant differences in the tendency of moral evaluation?

It is the process of information processing that lies behind the evolution of public opinion tendency of cyber moral bullying events. This paper analyzes the mechanism of the emergence, spread and stability of cyber moral bullying. (1) Generation stage: Focus events occur and are uploaded to the Internet through news reports and social software. At this stage, the basic facts of the incident had not been widely known, and only a few people had paid attention to them. At this stage, netizens mainly get moral evaluation basis from the introduction of mainstream news media. The way in which the news media recorded the incident and the positive and negative attitude of the media's wording aroused the public to mobilize their own moral ideas and start thinking from the perspective of motivation and results. The comments were more diffuse. Moreover, there had not been a huge, consistent and obvious trend. (2) Diffusion stage: After a period of time, the event had been gradually known through social platforms and oral communication at this stage. Through the discussion in web comments, social platforms and we-media, there was an obvious tendency of one or more types of moral evaluation on the Internet. The number of comment participants increased. The debate between different moral positions began, and radical views began to rise. Supporters of radical ideas began to attack different views. In the debate, the dominant view of the trend started to absorb similar views. Many netizens who knew about the incident...
later followed suit in moral evaluation without judgment or with limited becoming more and more obvious. (3) Stabilization phase: The event had

TABLE V. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MORAL AND LEGAL VIOLATIONS, NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF THE BEHAVIOR OF THE OBJECT OF CYBERBULLYING, AND PUBLIC OPINION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Positio of public opinion</th>
<th>violated morality</th>
<th>violated law</th>
<th>Degree of negative impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divided</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unanimous</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Big</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

been well known at this stage. After differentiation, absorption, and integration, the mainstream view of moral evaluation of Internet space was finally stable under the guidance of public opinion leaders represented by academic researchers, well-known Internet writers and famous accounts of micro-blog. Public opinion could be influenced by irrational, negative emotions. In the name of maintaining morality, some netizens turned motivation of cyber moral bullying into network moral bullying.

In the above process, the motivation lies deep in the heart of the object of cyber moral bullying, and it can only seek speculation through the background of the event. The judgment of motivation is too difficult to be convincing, and the result of the event is objective and easy to compare. Various speculations and statements about motivation are always subject to the obvious outcome attribute. The above three cases and their comparative results reflect a basic feature of cyber moral bullying in China: The moral evaluation tendency of Internet users is not directly based on whether the words and deeds of cyberbullying objects are legal, but will take into account the background of events, objects’ own conditions, objects’ family conditions and the consequences of objects’ behaviors. Furthermore, netizens judge the consequences of the actions of the objects, choose their positions, and assess the objects. In the event itself, if the consequences of the party’s actions are less harmful, or even excusable, then, even if the objects of cyber moral bullying violate the law, it will also attract a considerable number of netizens to demand a light punishment, avoid punishment, and even sympathize with and support their actions. However, if the consequences of the parties’ actions are more harmful, then, the Internet public opinion is more severe and tends to condemn unanimously. Therefore, the foregoing speculation can explain this result.
CONCLUSION AND REVELATION

The conclusion of this paper is: In cyberbullying caused by morality, when the consequences of the perpetrator's behavior are less negative to the society, or the malignant degree of the event is less, then the network public opinion to the perpetrator would stands in a unanimous position. However, when the behavior consequence of the perpetrator has a large negative impact on the society or the malignant degree of the event is large, the Internet public opinion of the perpetrator would be divided. Whether the perpetrator's words and deeds are lawful or not has little influence on the differentiation and unification of the position of online public opinion.

This paper first studies the public opinion and its mechanism of cyberbullying from the angle of moral origin, and enriches the theory of cyberbullying. The study found that even in the case of cyber moral bullying, which is also caused by the maintenance of morality, different incidents still differ in the tendency of moral evaluation. Of course, the above conclusions are only based on the partial empirical facts, which need more rigorous testing and further theoretical refinement. Nevertheless, this paper provides a new approach to the study of cyberbullying in mainland China. The existing domestic and foreign literatures have classified the manifestations and tools of cyberbullying from the perspective of the whole phenomenon. There is a lack of research on process mechanism and public opinion orientation. Even though some domestic literatures have mentioned the role of morality in cyberbullying, there is a lack of research on the action mechanism of morality in the process of cyberbullying using multiple cases comparison. The conclusion of this paper indicates that the moral judgment of behavior may be a key variable influencing the tendency of public opinion on cyberbullying.

Furthermore, this conclusion reflects from the side that Internet users in mainland China rely more on morality to determine their behaviors, and morality plays a greater role than the law on the Internet. The change of public opinion position in cyberbullying indicates that netizens' legal consciousness still needs to be improved, and there is still a big gap between the ideal of rule of law and the reality of Internet society. While carrying out the construction of the offline legal system, it is still a long way to go to build the online government and comprehensively promote the online legal concept.
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