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ABSTRACT

Social media and social networking have been embraced by the world with unsurpassed enthusiasm. Blogs, Facebook, Twitter, and other social networking sites (SNS) are transforming the way individuals share information and communicate. The purpose of the study was to investigate graduate social work students' attitudes about the use of social media in social work and the possible ethical implications of such use. The study used an exploratory quantitative survey design with self-administered questionnaires. Data was collected from 56 graduate social work students at California State University San Bernardino. Participants in the study were provided a six-page questionnaire, including demographic questions and eight hypothetical vignettes, involving ethical choices.

This study's findings indicated that the great majority of students used social networking sites and of those sites, they used Facebook the most. In addition, the study found that the great majority of the participants felt that posting client's information online was completely unethical. However, participants' views were split on the issues of seeking professional
knowledge and information online, responding to an online friend request from a former client, and conducting a Facebook and/or Google search on a client.

A need for future empirical research is evident as there are no previous studies examining SNS use with social workers or social work graduate students. The graduate social work students are relatively unaware of the ethical dilemmas that SNS use could create, or how to appropriately react to the situations. This study also illustrates the importance of ethics trainings specific to social media use for all employees in child welfare and social work, and the urgent need for the National Association of Social Workers to create ethics standards that are specific to social media use.
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Social media and social networking have been embraced by the world with unsurpassed enthusiasm. Social media provides an easily accessible, no-cost global platform to educate, mobilize, alert and improve the world (Robb, 2011). Blogs, Facebook, Twitter, and other social networking sites (SNS) are transforming the way individuals share information and communicate. Certainly, social media represents one of the most significant cultural milestones in recent years (Robb, 2011).

Employers and other professional groups are alarmed at the potential abuse of the technology as social workers use social networking at work and home (Arce & Morin, 2011). As stated in Reardon (2011, p.11), Lynn Grodzki, LCSW, MCC, of Private Practice Success, states, "We're still learning about technology as a profession. Perhaps the most important piece of advice right now is to just be careful." Everything that is posted on the Internet is public information or can be made public. For example, a social worker may set their personal
Facebook account’s privacy settings to “friends only.” However, there is no assurance that a “friend” will not disseminate any information (postings or pictures) to “nonfriends” via email or other social media outlets (Arce & Morin, 2011). Employees should use good ethical judgment and common sense when using social media (Arce & Morin, 2011; Nosko, Wood, & Molema, 2010; Reardon, 2011; Robb, 2011).

Off-duty social networking use may be grounds for an employer to discipline its employees. This is especially true if the use undermines the agency’s purpose, mission and credibility with the public (Arce & Morin, 2011). Social media use by social workers violates agency rules and policies when confidential information is disclosed. Confidential client information divulged by employees can also lead to invasion of privacy claims in a court of law against the employer and employee (Arce & Morin, 2011).

When helping professionals misuse social media tools, they may irreparably damage clients, sabotage their careers, and jeopardize the social work profession (Robb, 2011). While the digital age materializes, alarmed ethicists fear the emergence of a new kind of
social worker, the turncoat blogger. These individuals' covert, unethical disclosures and extreme rants suggest an acceptable behavior and a new normal in the profession (Robb, 2011). However, the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) Code of Ethics stresses the importance of client confidentiality, and all social workers have a responsibility to abide by the code.

Innovative technology can and should be embraced as it can allow helping professions to make a positive impact. It can help educate clients and make interactions with clients easier (Reardon, 2011). For example, clients who may not be comfortable with face-to-face contact can utilize instant messaging with their social worker. This is also true for clients who moved away but wish to continue receiving services from their current provider via Facebook chat, or Skype (video messaging), or Google chat options (Reardon, 2011). However, it is also important to be aware of how much technology can affect clients' lives, especially in communication and relationships. It is necessary for social workers who have a presence online to stay current with both the trends and potential pitfalls of social media use. As an advocate for clients, social workers
must remember that connectedness in clients is a primary element that can be increased (Reardon, 2011).

Currently, one can do a simple Internet search for social worker blogs and find several social workers depicting their daily activities, their anger and frustrations with clients, and highlights about the nature of the job. For social workers, venting about clients in work lunchrooms and hallways is not a new occurrence (Robb, 2011). These actions have always been in ethical conflict with the professional practice of social work. In addition, social media has not created these ethical dilemmas, as they have always existed. Social media simply brings a new focus to the ethical challenges (Robb, 2011). The privacy and confidentiality protections that the social work field customarily provides its clients are challenged when social media provides outlets for dissemination of personal information (Reardon, 2011). The activities of the social work renegade blogger jeopardize confidentiality, and empirical research in this area can help know if social workers are truly abiding by ethical standards. This study is needed because of the lack of empirical research on this issue. It has become necessary to
evaluate whether the benefits of using social media outweigh the risks, and this study initiates that discussion.

Practice Context

There is a need for empirical discussion about ethics and the responsible use of Facebook, YouTube, blogs, message boards and Twitter by social workers. Helping professionals may need some help navigating the intersection of the digital world and ethics. There are the social work professionals who are in breach of the NASW Code of Ethics and go off course (Robb, 2011).

Robb (2011) gives examples of bloggers:

Since January 2009, one social worker (a self-described Capricorn) has been blogging the intimate details of her clients' lives, including an incident in which an ostensibly intoxicated baby was placed in her office after a "drug raid."

One month prior to referencing a patient who "could only be described as a little meth-y," an Oregon-based medical social worker wrote, "Same problem as usual...how to talk about some of my experiences without breaching patient confidentiality."
Affixed to this "youngish" social worker's blog is a disclaimer attesting to "altered names, places, and other identifying information...to protect [client] privacy." The postings that follow reveal excruciating details about the social worker's foster care clients. (p. 9)

It appears many social workers believe that the NASW Code of Ethics and the state licensing boards allow client information to be shared as long as identifying information is not given (Robb, 2011). However, maintaining confidentiality is at the core of the social work profession. As cited in Robb (2011), NASW General Counsel Carolyn Polowy stated:

On this matter, the code is unambiguous. We must respect the inherent dignity and worth of the individual as sacrosanct. Sharing personal information is anything but respecting the client’s dignity. Why would anyone even want to give the appearance of compromising social work’s core values? (p. 10)

Frederic G. Reamer, a professor of social work at Rhode Island College and prominent ethicist has written on ethics and social media extensively. Throughout his
literature, he states that when social workers choose to not abide by the Code of Ethics, they are headed towards a path of ethical misconduct (Reamer, 2005; Robb, 2011).

Reamer (2008) found the following:

As a general guide, social workers who use social media need to think very carefully before they post anything. We must adhere not just to the letter of the code but also to its spirit. Sliding underneath the code by doing something technically permissible or debatable does not mean you are acting ethically or that your actions are not potentially harmful. (as cited in Robb, 2011, p. 9)

An additional concern about the use of SNS is that the identity of the renegade bloggers can easily be found out via a Web 2.0 (social media) tool kit. Robb (2011) stated that he was able to uncover a specific bloggers name, city of residence, education, past and current employers, resumes and photographs. A client may be able to just as easily discover the same information (Nosko et al., 2010). Renegade bloggers can also be exposed by site hackers, alienated coworkers, estranged friends and previous lovers involved in divorce or custody battles, and website leaks. Robb (2011) found the following:
Elizabeth H, an MSW student, shared her opinions about the security risks of using SNS. I did everything right, including the tightest privacy settings [on Facebook] to limit what people had access to. All it took was a keylogger [spy software program] and everything about me was exposed. (p. 10)

Policy Context

New technology in the field of human service has presented ethical challenges before. When the fields of professional ethics and modern bioethics developed in the 1970s, practitioners and researchers struggled with a variety of ethical dilemmas, especially in healthcare (Reamer, 2011). For example, when the new technology to transplant organs was developed, surgeons found themselves having to make difficult ethical and moral decisions about who would receive the only organ available that day or night. Therefore, today's challenges faced by social workers who use social media are simply the latest chapters in helping professionals' efforts to use technology appropriately (Reamer, 2011).

The current NASW Code of Ethics was ratified in 1996, and may be in need of an update to include social
worker's use of social media and the internet to find out more information about their clients (National Association of Social Workers website, n.d.). Electronic search engines did not yet exist in 1996. There is a need to create an ethics-based social media policy, so that clients are made aware that their social worker will not conduct an Internet search on them. One exception to this would be if there was an emergency where information transmitted electronically would help keep the client safe (Reamer, 2011).

Employees have the right to discuss their working hours, wages and working conditions. Therefore, social media policies should balance the employer's needs with the employees' rights. Appropriately worded policies may help prohibit employees from making disapproving, defamatory or abusive statements (Arce & Morin, 2011). For example, Orange County Social Services Agency (OCSSA) based in Orange County, California, uses a Confidentiality of Client Information form that all employees must sign as a condition of their employment. Orange County Social Services Agency's (1996) form states:
...information pertaining to clients of the agency shall not be disclosed to anyone, in or out of the workplace..., nor shall it be published, or used by any employee, except for the purposes directly connected with the administration of agency programs... (Orange County Social Services Agency, 1996, p. 1)

The social media movement has created situations with unique ethical and clinical challenges for both clients and practitioners. It will be necessary to ensure compliance with existing and updated ethical standards related to confidentiality, privacy, informed consent, and documentation (Reardon, 2011). It is necessary for social work practitioners to develop comprehensive social media policies and to review them with clients (Reamer, 2011). While technology changes rapidly, professional organizations may have difficulty providing guidelines to their employees about how to respond ethically to the unique situations social media use can present. However, this does not mean that the existing guidelines (i.e., the NASW Code of Ethics) do not apply (Reardon, 2011).
The prominent use of social media by social workers and its ethical impact cannot be ignored. This is why it is important to understand the problem further and to conduct empirical research on the subject, beginning with assessing the attitudes of graduate social work students. As an MSW student and Title IVE recipient (child welfare emphasis), I am concerned about the problem and social service agencies and clients should be concerned as well. Currently, there are no studies that address social workers use of SNS and how it may ethically impact the profession.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine graduate social work students' attitudes toward the use of social networking sites and the possible ethical implications of such use. Due to limited research regarding this topic, the most suitable design for this study is an exploratory quantitative survey. Vignettes involving ethical choices have been created to assess the attitudes of the social work students toward the use of social networking sites and possible ethical implications. The vignettes and measurement instrument have been created to specifically
measure the perceptions of SNS use by graduate social work students, and their knowledge of the NASW Code of Ethics.

Graduate social work students' attitudes about the use of SNS can be scrutinized to get a better idea of its impact on the field. This is a new research area and findings can help evaluate the NASW Code of Ethics and perhaps re-examine confidentiality rules. There are dangers of using social networking and it is necessary to wake up to the ethical, legal and professional implications for social workers. A significance of this study's use of graduate students is that it may help address generational rifts in the profession. Older professionals may understand the warnings a social service organization heeds about social media use. On the contrary, younger social workers may not comprehend why something so integral in their lives (social media) has to be scrutinized at all (Reardon, 2011). This study can serve as an initial starting point for discussion among the generations.
Significance of the Project for Social Work

The findings from this study will provide information about graduate social work students’ attitudes about the use of SNS, and the possible ethical implications. With the potential results of the study, employers in social work and child welfare can be more aware of the impact of social media use by employees and the confidentiality implications for the agency’s clients. This study will directly contribute to child welfare practice because the issue being addressed deals specifically with current problems facing child welfare agencies and their employees. Robb (2011) states that in a child welfare court case, or other liability lawsuit, attorneys may ask a social worker if he/she has ever blogged about clients or posted any client information online. Currently, child and parent’s attorneys (public defenders) in child welfare cases in the OCSSA have begun to conduct Facebook searches of the case social worker to gather damaging information about the worker and to discredit their expertise and/or recommendation to the Juvenile Dependency Court (Orange County Social Services Agency Children and Family Services [OCSSACFS], n.d.).
For example, if the attorney finds online pictures of the social worker enjoying some alcoholic beverages with friends, then the public defender is likely to suggest to the court that the social worker's behaviors put into question their abilities to label a mother as an alcoholic and to say that the mother's behaviors impair her parenting abilities resulting in removal of the child (Orange County Social Services Agency Children and Family Services [OCSSACFS], n.d.).

These potentially embarrassing and damaging situations are a very real possibility for child welfare workers. The findings of this study may also help child welfare workers re-educate themselves on the NASW Code of Ethics, specifically about informed consent, privacy and confidentiality, service, social justice, the dignity and worth of a person, the importance of human relationships, integrity and competence (National Association of Social Workers website, n.d., p.1). The results of this study may influence a change in the NASW Code of Ethics, should there be evidence to support unethical use of SNS by social work students. In addition, the findings may initiate open discussion about child welfare policy guidelines and then incorporate them into child welfare
practice. The findings will allow for other policies to be created that deal specifically with inappropriate and unethical actions on the part of the child welfare workers.

Overall, this study will provide information on a controversial and timely topic, greatly contributing to the field of social work. All phases of the generalist model of social work practice will be addressed through this study as its topic has the potential to affect all stages. This study’s research question is: “What are graduate social work students' attitudes about the use of social networking sites and the possible ethical implications of such use?”
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter covers the literature surrounding social media use by professionals, confidentiality issues and ethical dilemmas. The literature seeks to understand the general use of social media, the technological impact of social media, the current NASW Code of Ethics, and theories about ethics in social work. The chapter is divided into several sections that will address general use of social media, privacy and ethical concerns, and theories guiding conceptualization of the problem.

General Use of Social Media

Social media provides a way for more than a billion people around the world to be connected. Both collaboration and communication have provided a new path to social networking (Nosko et al., 2010). Individuals support one another through blogs, podcasts, discussion posts and comments. Facebook, Twitter and other similar online social networking sites provide online opportunities to create profiles and connect to others to
create networks. Social interaction and connection are the objective of social media (Cheung & Lee, 2010). These opportunities provide a means for individuals to share stories, in pictures, words and videos with their friends. People connect with others who live, study and work around them. People learn about parties, events and other social gatherings. Participation in online social networks is a social phenomenon that is largely dependent upon interactions with others in a personal network. Studies have recently begun to examine online technology use and those behaviors and attitudes that are associated with online communication (Nosko et al., 2010).

Cheung and Lee (2010) conducted an empirical study of 389 Facebook users and found that collective intention (intentional social action) for those who use social networking sites is the direct result of both social identity and subjective norm versus group norm. The measures were We-Intention (to use a social networking site), Subjective Norm, Group Norm, Cognitive Social Identity, Affective Social Identity, and Evaluative Social Identity (Cheung & Lee, 2010, p.25). The constructs were measured with perceptual scales. Respondents were student groups on Facebook and they were
administered an online survey about their use of Facebook. This study was one of the very first to measure social behaviors by the collective in the online social network context. The study used a research model that is based on social influence theory. The findings supported the idea that intentional social action is explained by social influence processes (Cheung & Lee, 2010).

Although there is no previous empirical research on social workers' attitudes about SNS use and the ethical implications, researchers have begun to explore self-disclosure and online communication. As of yet, child welfare agencies across the country have not studied this study's specific topic. This author has included peer-reviewed journal articles about the increasing use of social media in other helping professions and the ethical challenges professionals are confronted with.

Technological Impact

With the technology that is available today, helping professionals may have easy access to client information outside of a clinical setting (Tunick, Mednick & Conroy, 2011). The Internet provides a two-way highway for
clients to find the professionals and for the professionals to have access to community services; however, it can also serve as a means for helping professionals to have access to client information, and for clients to find out information about their helping practitioners (Tunick et al., 2011). Online therapeutic relationships may allow clients with boundary issues to find out personal information about their social worker and this may create a dual relationship. This in turn can be very problematic in that dual relationships go against the NASW Code of Ethics, and they can jeopardize the therapeutic interventions in place (Tunick et al., 2011).

Recently, many studies have examined the use of social networking among doctors and doctors-in-training. Findings suggest that many of the professionals do use SNS, do not utilize privacy settings on their online profiles and many post potentially damaging information online such as photographs depicting alcohol use and intoxication, sexually provocative photographs, client clinical information and offensive group membership (Tunick et al., 2011). As a result, the term "e-professionalism" was created to define the intersection of professional action and online behavior. This has
resulted in discussion about the need for the application of ethical guidelines and professional standards with the advancement of access to technology (Tunick et al., 2011).

Privacy and Ethical Concerns

Robb (2011) authored an article in Social Work Today, about social workers using social media responsibly. While he did not conduct empirical research on the subject, he did gather 11 individuals comprised of social workers, technology/legal experts and social work students to discuss the responsible use of social networking sites and ethics. The group agreed that guidelines should be created and implemented to help professionals navigate social media use and ethics. They were very quick to judge those social workers who have chosen to violate the NASW Code of Ethics and go rogue. The intended audience for this article is the social work professional (Robb, 2011).

Reardon (2011) also authored an article in Social Work Today, about how to build a private practice in today's digital world. Like Robb (2011), this article does not serve as empirical research but rather as
general information to social work professionals. This article offers advice on how to use new technology tools, how to avoid the potential pitfalls of social media use, and how to attract clients responsibly and ethically (Reardon, 2011). Both Robb (2011) and Reardon (2011) offer sound advice and suggestions about the growing impact of social media use on the social work field.

According to Acquisti and Gross (2009), existing research on Facebook has focused on identity presentation and privacy concerns. They also argue that users may be putting themselves at risk both offline and online because of the amount of information participants provide about themselves, the open nature of the information, and the lack of privacy controls enacted by the users. They found a correlation between individuals' Social Security numbers (SSN's) and birth data, and for younger people, SSN's could be predicted through statistical inference. This is due to the public availability of data from the Social Security Administration's Death Master File, SNS and data brokers. Their results highlight the privacy risks of sharing information in public forums (Acquisti & Gross, 2009).
Gewirth (2001) discussed confidentiality in child welfare in general terms. According to the author, the confider of information is both the subject and the client and the caseworker is the recipient of information. The author further stated that the client has a right to know that the content he or she discloses to the helping professional will not be divulged to others without their consent. Likewise, the helping professional has a responsibility to not share this content with any unauthorized persons. However, the author contended that there are some exceptions when confidentiality should be justifiably overridden (Gewirth, 2001). This article is relevant as it discussed how the practice of child welfare presents difficult confidentiality situations. However, there is no mention of social networking use and confidentiality issues. Yet, confidentiality is a standard in the NASW Code of Ethics that all social workers must abide by, so its relevance is important. This article serves as general background information.

Taylor, McMinn, Bufford, and Chang (2010) conducted a survey study of 695 graduate psychology students and psychologists about their current use of SNS, their
opinions regarding the online regulation by American Association of Psychologists (APA), and clinical work interaction as a result of the online activities. The study concluded that established psychologists rarely used SNS, and they did not have the experience to provide supervisory guidance in this matter. Also, there was no consensus about the APA guidelines. Continued training and education were suggested to help deal with the use of SNS (Taylor et al., 2010).

Another study similar to Taylor et al. (2010), was done by Lehavot, Barnett & Powers (2010). They surveyed graduate psychology students also and found that most of them use SNS and do not use privacy settings. Further, 67% of the respondents admitted to not concealing their real name, 20% admitted to posting photographs and 37% admitted to posting personal information they would like to keep from clients. In addition, 27% of the survey respondents admitted to looking up client information online. They did so because they were either curious or trying to seek the truth about their clients (Lehavot et al., 2010). The authors reported that this behavior is unethical because the information was obtained without the client consent. These actions also jeopardize the
ability to form and maintain a trusting client relationship, and the intent to do no harm to the clients (Lehavot et al., 2010).

Tunick et al., (2011) conducted a questionnaire study with 246 pediatric and child psychologists and psychologists-in-training. The subject of the study included the respondent’s personal use of SNS and blogging and client use of SNS. The most used social networking site was Facebook (95%), 56% of the respondents had been using SNS for no longer than a year, and 70% of the participants checked their SNS multiple times a week. In addition, 25% of the survey respondents reported that they have received “friend requests” online from former clients; yet, responses to these situations varied. Most clinicians declined the invitation, some made decisions based on the individual situation, and others admitted to accepting the request. In addition, the authors reported that there were significant relationships between restricted SNS and blog access and posting material that they would not want clients to see (Tunick et al., 2011).

As to viewing client’s social networking sites, 32% of the survey respondents admitted to “googling” their
clients and more than half of them asked their clients or informed them beforehand. For those professionals who found disturbing information on their client’s websites, those concerns were ultimately addressed in therapy. However, only 35% of the survey participants stated that they talked with their underage clients about privacy and safety while using the Internet. This study highlights the importance of how social media usage by both clinicians and clients can jeopardize the delicate therapeutic relationship, especially when those clients are underage (Tunick et al., 2011).

Student therapists’ attitudes and behaviors about the use of search engines to gather more information about clients were examined by Dilillo and Gale (2011). A sample of 854 psychology doctoral students was surveyed about their opinions, online activities, and frequency of looking for client information online. The study results showed that the students regularly used the Internet, including search engines and social networking sites. The study found that 66.9% of the participants reported that using online search engines to search for information on clients was “always” or “usually” unacceptable. However, 97.8% stated that they used a
search engine to gather information on a client in the last year. In addition, 94.4% of study participants admitted to searching for client information on social networking sites (Dilillo & Gale, 2011). This study highlights a discrepancy between the respondents' attitudes and actual behaviors. Dilillo and Gale's (2011) study is also a first of its kind to examine this issue.

An exploratory study conducted by Mansfield et al. (2011) examined the ethical dilemmas facing health professionals and their use of social networking sites. The authors were specifically interested in confidentiality and doctor-patient boundary issues. They formed a group of medical professionals from various Australian and New Zealand medical associations and created guidelines regarding the use of social media. The authors stated that more research is needed, especially as the impact of social media continues to grow. The authors would like to further explore both negative and positive outcomes of social media use in the health care profession and update their existing guidelines (Mansfield et al., 2011).
Ethical dilemmas in the field of social work emerge when competing duties, values and obligations are encountered by practitioners. These dilemmas can occur in all domains of social work (Reamer, 2005; Robb, 2011). This study's subject matter concerns the NASW Code of Ethics privacy and confidentiality ethical standards (1.07[c] and [i]), as well as those standards related to informed consent and conflicts of interests (1.03[a] and [e] and 1.06[a] and [c]) (See appendix A).

While the Code of Ethics was approved by the 1996 NASW Delegate Assembly and revised by the 2008 NASW Delegate Assembly, it is still necessary to note that these standards do not include specific social media and Internet use (National Association of Social Workers California Chapter website, n.d.). Yet the Internet is a public place where any and all information shared on it can be viewed and accessed (Arce & Morin, 2011). This is where a necessary change in social work policy and practice may be needed, pending this study's results and other future empirical research. None of the ethical standards addressing confidentiality, informed consent,
privacy and/or conflicts of interest address social media use specifically. Therefore, it is necessary for this study to be completed so that a possible revision of ethical standards in the NASW Code of Ethics regarding the use of social media can be considered and therefore implemented.

Lehavot (2009) examined the American Psychological Association's ethical standards as they relate to confidentiality and privacy, boundaries and informed consent. In her article, she addressed psychology graduate students' use of the Internet to post information related to their academic pursuits and activities. For example, Lehavot (2009) questioned how online information was being used by faculty for the purposes of screening graduate school applicants and to learn more about their student activities. She also used case examples, one of which highlighted psychology students' own caseload of clients and how those clients may have accessed the student therapist's personal webpage, profile or blog. While she reported that the graduate students and all users of the Internet have the right to post information online, self-determination might be limited due to either a social and/or
professional context. She also highlighted the point that those who use the Internet should have no expectation of privacy; therefore, what others search for and find is information that can be used like any other information found. Although she made these arguments specific to the psychology profession, similar reasoning could be applied to the social work profession and use of social media. While individuals may have a certain expectation of privacy in particular situations and when they put specific precautions in place, a schema is necessary to define the boundaries of Internet use and what can be used and shared (Lehavot, 2009). Her recommendations included graduate programs establishing guidelines about looking for information online and using that information to screen prospective graduate students. Secondly, graduate students should be cognizant about what they post online while being considerate of their fellow students, faculty and prospective clients (Lehavot, 2009).

Theories Guiding Conceptualization

Social work literature includes cited frameworks that social workers can use to work through ethical
decisions. These frameworks typically consist of systematic applications of ethical standards, ethical theories and social work values. Ethical theories are predominately based on moral philosophies of what is right and wrong (Reamer, 2005).

Reamer (2005) summarized the relationship between ethical and legal standards in the United States. His discussion focused on five sets of guidelines and requirements: regulatory law, constitutional law, statutory law, common law, court-made law and executive orders. Legal standards as they relate to professional negligence have existed in courts of law for hundreds of years, and are applicable to social workers' ethical decisions and judgment (Reamer, webinar, 2012). When helping professionals use electronic communication and social networking sites with clients, the nature of the professional's duty may be called into question at any time. Social workers must always be cognizant of any possible harm to the client in all interaction. Further, in a court of law, therapeutic exchanges may be examined for a causal connection between a breach of duty and damage or injury to the client (Reamer, webinar, 2012).
Ethical theories are typically classified as deontological or teleological. Deontological theories are those that claim that certain actions are inherently right or wrong, or good or bad, without regard for their consequences (Reamer, 2005, p. 165). According to this theory, regardless of the consequences, social workers must always be law-abiding (Reamer, 2005).

Teleological theories in contrast emphasize the idea that actions are determined by consequences. Therefore, a social worker can justify violating an unjust law if more good than harm is produced (Reamer, 2005). These theories provide a framework basis for ethical and legal conflicts in social work practice. In addition, Reamer (2005) stated that social workers actions may not be consistent with the legal laws and/or the ethical standards of the profession. Social workers actions may be acts of commission including deliberately violating the law to in order to complete their ethical duty. Moreover, social workers actions may also be failures to act. This occurs when social workers do not take the necessary action to comply with a law in order to complete their ethical duty (Reamer, 2005; Reardon, 2011).
These theories are related to the topic of social workers using social media because they highlight the challenges of helping professionals not being able to easily compartmentalize their professional and personal lives. In addition, because there is no guaranteed safety and anonymity in the use of social media, social workers must be extremely careful in using SNS to discuss clients and/or themselves (Robb, 2011). The renegade bloggers who seemingly exploit the gray areas of the NASW Code of Ethics are jeopardizing the social service agency, the clients, the employees and the profession. As a result, these defiant social workers will have no defense against an ethics committee. Conversely, instead of creating any possibility of misunderstanding, some social workers may choose to not engage in the use of social media at all, regardless of any consequences (Robb, 2011).

Summary

As previously stated, there are currently no empirical studies relevant to social workers' perceptions of SNS and possible ethical implications. However, there are several studies that have recently emerged concerning
ethical dilemmas in other helping professions. In addition, the NASW Code of Ethics does not clearly identify the use of social media as a possible ethical violation of privacy and confidentiality standards. Therefore, the necessity of this study is evident, as its topic is worthy of empirical examination.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

Introduction

The following chapter will cover an outline of the research methods utilized in this study concerning social work students' attitudes about the use of social media and possible ethical implications. Topics addressed include the study's design, the sampling methods, the data collection and testing instrument, the procedures, the protection of human subjects and the data analysis.

Study Design

This study sought to understand the attitudes of social work students about the use of social networking sites in social work and the possible ethical implications of such use. An exploratory quantitative survey design was used to identify the attitudes of social work graduate students. Practical methodological implications and limitations of the study included developing a new instrument that accurately assessed the attitudes of social work students. This study used a convenience sample of graduate social work student
cohorts who are currently attending California State University San Bernardino, a comprehensive four-year university in Southern California, with an estimated population of 17,500 students. Cohorts were divided into full-time (1st year and 2nd year), part-time (1st year, 2nd year, and 3rd year), and then further divided into Title IVE and non-Title IVE students. The questionnaire consisted of 19 demographic questions and eight vignettes (see Appendix B). Students, through the hypothetical vignettes, were asked about their perceptions of social networking site (SNS) use in social work and child welfare and the ethical challenges it can create. The participants were asked to read the vignettes and answer the corresponding questions. The sample for the study included 55 participants.

One of the limitations of this study was the lack of standardized instruments concerning ethical choices in the use of SNS for social workers. Since there were no current instruments pertinent to this topic, an instrument was created for the purposes of this study. Therefore, the validity and reliability of this instrument are unknown. As a result, the validity and reliability may have suffered, due to the inability to
test the instrument extensively. However, a pretest was conducted on November 2, 2011 with three undergraduate social work students did not participate in the study. Another limitation of this study was that the study used a convenience sample, which impacted the generalizability of the findings. This limited the study's ability to generalize the results to the total population of social work students as a whole. In addition, since the sample was comprised of the social work students' cohorts, there might have been discussion amongst participants as to the content of the instrument, which can impact the results of the study. An advantage to the research-designed instrument is that it is customized; it is relevant and appropriate to the issue being studied. Additionally, others who are interested in addressing the issue of SNS use in child welfare and social work and the possible ethical implications of such use can use this instrument in the future. No hypothesis was formed concerning this study's subject matter due to a lack of empirical research on the issue.
Sampling

The sampling frame consisted of both male and female graduate social work students in the social work department at California State University San Bernardino (CSUSB). The sample consisted of a range of ethnicities and ages. A total of 161 surveys were distributed with a response from 56 students. This sample size still provided a valid representation of the graduate social work student population on campus, as evidenced by the demographic findings.

The sample in this study was comprised of 56 California State University San Bernardino (CSUSB) School of Social Work graduate student cohorts, both full-time and part-time students, as well as Title IVE and non-Title IVE students. The only criterion for the sample was that the participants were attending CSUSB in the graduate social work department. Gender, age, level of education, years of experience, internship placement and use of social media were factors that varied amongst the participants. The participants were asked to complete the questionnaire, answering demographic questions and questions concerning scenarios about the choices of social workers who use social networking sites.
Data Collection and Instruments

Data was collected using self-administered questionnaires. The questionnaire was distributed to graduate social work students who were attending California State University San Bernardino during the Winter Quarter of 2012. Participants in the study were provided a six-page questionnaire, including demographic questions and eight vignettes. The vignettes were designed to measure the actions of posting online about another worker's clients, conducting online searches for client background information, accepting online friend requests from former clients, general online venting about social work issues, posting a blog disclaimer about changing client information and then revealing case details, using SNS to vent when unable to debrief difficult cases with a supervisor or co-worker, using Twitter (an online blog) to communicate with clients about appointments and to provide therapy, and having two social workers use SNS to discuss cases, goals of treatment and levels of intervention. Questionnaires were printed in English. The questionnaire contained no identifying data to maintain confidentiality. The
The estimated time to complete the questionnaire was 10-15 minutes. The questionnaire's purpose was to measure the perceptions of graduate social work students about the use of social networking sites in the field of social work and the possible ethical implications of such use. The questionnaire utilized a nominal level of measurement for the demographic questions and an ordinal level of measurement for the vignette questions.

The vignettes used a Likert-type scale, indicating the level of magnitude of ethical agreement or unethical agreement of the respondent to the vignettes. Respondents were asked to select a response from the following: 1 (very ethical), 2 (somewhat ethical), 3 (somewhat unethical), 4 (completely unethical) and 5 (don't know). Each vignette revolved around the actions of child welfare workers/social workers who used SNS and the possible ethical challenges it created. The demographic variables included gender, age, ethnicity, level of education, job title, length of work experience, internship placement and experience, Title IVE and non-Title IVE status, student cohort and use of social media. Overall, this study used quantitative methods to explore graduate social work students' attitudes. However, space
was provided after each vignette for respondents to explain their answer and most of the participants gave additional reasoning for their selections. This data is qualitative in nature and content analysis was completed, identifying the major categories and patterns in the data.

Procedures

The data collection procedures for this study involved distributing questionnaires to graduate social work students who were attending California State University San Bernardino via distribution of the questionnaires into the student's mailboxes at the School of Social Work in early January 2012. Every graduate social work student has an assigned mailbox labeled with their name in the social work resource room located on the third floor of the Social and Behavioral Sciences Building on campus. The resource room serves as a gathering place for social work students to study, hold informal meetings, conduct internet research and collect mail. The room is open only to social work students and is accessible through a door lock with an entry code. During the third week of January 2012, this researcher
placed one questionnaire with an attached envelope, an informed consent form, a debriefing statement and a recruitment flyer into each graduate social work student’s mailbox. The questionnaire contained 19 demographic questions relating to gender, age, ethnicity, level of education, job title, length of work experience, internship placement and experience, Title IVE and non-Title IVE status, student cohort and the use of social media. The questionnaire also included eight vignettes about the ethical dilemmas that social workers and child welfare workers who use SNS may face. The participants were asked to read the vignettes and to indicate the degree to which the situation in the vignette is ethical. Once they completed the questionnaire, students placed it into the included envelope and then sealed it to help ensure that anonymity was intact. Next, the students took their questionnaire to the main office of the social work department (located on the fourth floor of the Social and Behavioral Sciences building), which is open Monday through Friday during the hours of 9:00am and 5:00pm. When they went to the main office, the students asked the office staff for the social media questionnaire collection envelope, which the office staff agreed to
keep safe and secure at all times in a filing cabinet located in the office. Only the office staff had access to the secured filing cabinet and collection envelope. The students placed their sealed questionnaire into the collection envelope, and then the office staff returned the collection envelope to the secured filing cabinet. If it was after hours, the students slid their sealed questionnaire under the locked office door. This investigator picked up completed questionnaires at least twice a week from the office. Respondents were given seven days after distribution to complete the survey and return it to the main office. In early February 2012, a reminder flyer was put into each student’s mailbox asking them to complete the survey and turn it into the main office of social work as soon as possible. Approximately two weeks later, with the permission of the class professors, this researcher spoke to graduate social work students in their classrooms about the purpose of the study, and to ask for their assistance in completing the survey. Data collection was complete by the end of March 2012. Prior to the distribution of the questionnaires, this investigator received approval from Dr. Laurie Smith, Director of the School of Social Work at
California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB). This step was completed on November 29, 2011 and the School of Social Work encouraged participation in the study.

At the conclusion of data collection, 161 surveys had been distributed into student's mailboxes in the social work resource room on campus and 56 completed questionnaires were returned. Each survey was voluntarily completed by the students. In February 2012, in the midst of data collection, all of the graduate social work students at CSUSB received an email from the School of Social Work warning them about breaching client confidentiality while using social networking sites. This email was in response to a social work intern (not a student of CSUSB) who posted client information on her Facebook page. This researcher was interested in finding out if this study breach might contaminate the respondent's survey answers, especially for those students who hadn't completed the survey yet but were planning on doing so.

A packet containing an informed consent form (Appendix B), along with the debriefing statement (Appendix C) and questionnaire (Appendix D) was given to
each participant. Participants were informed that all information given is confidential and that their identity will remain anonymous. Discontinuing participation and refusal to participate was allowed and the participants were given the necessary information should they wish to learn the outcome of the study. The researcher inputted the data into an SPSS computer program. Data collection began in early January 2012, with data entry occurring in February and March 2012. Data analysis began in March 2012. The results of this study are available after June 2012.

Protection of Human Subjects

To protect the identity of respondents, questionnaires did not request names. The identity of the participants in this study remained strictly confidential and anonymous. Any information obtained in connection with this study remained confidential and will be disclosed only with participants' permission or as required by law. When the questionnaires were collected, and the data was entered into a computer file, the questionnaires were shredded. All of the participants also received a letter of informed consent, stating the
purpose of the study and explaining that their participation in the study was completely voluntary. In addition, the informed consent form explained the risks and benefits to the participants, explained whom to contact for answers to pertinent questions about the research and research subjects' rights, and whom to contact in the event of a research-related injury to the subject, and explain where the study results could be obtained after the completion of the study. If the participant's desired, they had the option of marking an X on the informed consent form, rather than signing their name. Additionally, the participants received a debriefing statement and the name of the research supervisor should they have concerns following their participation in the study. The study's purpose was clearly stated on both the debriefing statement and informed consent. There were no long-term risks projected to occur to respondents.

Data Analysis

This study employed quantitative and qualitative data analysis techniques. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the demographic characteristics of the
sampled participants. Descriptive statistics were comprised of univariate statistics such as frequency distribution, measures of central tendency and variability. As to the qualitative data, this researcher completed content analysis, looking for similarities and differences among the data to identify patterns and themes. These procedures were important to help describe what the research question was looking to explore.

Summary

As previously stated, this study sought to examine the attitudes of social work students about the use of social networking sites and the possible ethical implications of such use. This chapter reviewed the research methods to be utilized in the proposed study. The findings of this study will contribute to the body of knowledge regarding social media use and social work practice. This chapter also addressed several precautions that were taken to protect human subjects involved with data collection. The data collection and analysis process were handled with great consideration and the protection of the participants was of the utmost importance throughout the study.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS

Introduction

The chapter is a presentation of this study's findings of graduate social work students' attitudes about using social networking sites (SNS) in social work and the possible implications of such use. The chapter begins with demographic information about the respondents and their response frequencies for the vignettes, followed by frequency tables. Next, a narrative summary of the qualitative data is presented, followed by a summary.

Presentation of the Findings

At the conclusion of data collection, the sample size consisted of 56 completed questionnaires. In Table 1, the demographic characteristics of the respondents are listed including age, gender, ethnicity, education level, school program, Title IVE status and survey submission timeline. The sample age range is from 22 to 60 years old and the mean age is 32.04 years old. Approximately half of the respondents (54.5%) are between the ages of
22 and 30, 23.6% are between the ages of 31 and 40, 16.3% are between the ages of 41 and 50 and 5.4% are between the ages of 51 and 60. Over 89% of the respondents are female and 10% are male. Of the respondents, 39.3% are Hispanic, 37.5% are White, 12.5% are African-American, 5.4% identified as Other, 3.6% are Asian/Pacific Islander and 1.8% are Native American.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (N=56)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender (N=56)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity (N=56)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Level (N=56)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. (Cont’d) Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Program (N=56)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time 1st year</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time 2nd year</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time 1st year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time 2nd year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time 3rd year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title IVE (N=56)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Submission (N=56)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before confidentiality email</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After confidentiality email</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The education level of the respondents was either a completed bachelor's degree or a completed master's degree. More than half (83.9%) had a bachelor's degree, while 16.1% had a master's degree. Almost half (48.2%) of the respondents are full-time students in their second and final year of schooling and 32.1% are full-time first year students. Some of the respondents are part-time students, with 10.7% being third year part-timers, 5.4% being first year part-timers and 3.6% being second year part-timers. Title IVE status was divided almost equally among the respondents, with 51.8% as Title IVE (child...
welfare emphasis) and 48.2\% not Title IVE (no child welfare emphasis). Finally, the majority of the respondents (58.9\%) submitted their completed surveys after the breach of confidentiality email was sent out, and 41.1\% submitted it beforehand.

Table 2 shows the employment and internship characteristics of the respondents.

Table 2. Employment/Internship Characteristics of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed in child welfare (N=56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County in which employed (N=56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title (N=56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Protective Services Intern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Service Social Worker V</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship in child welfare (N=56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. (Cont'd) Employment/Internship Characteristics of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internship county (N=56)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Co</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount of child welfare internship experience (N=56)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1 year</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the students (89.3%) reported that they were not employed in child welfare. Of those who were employed, 3.6% worked for Riverside County and 10.7% worked for San Bernardino County. Although two of the respondents stated that they were employed by a local county (Riverside or San Bernardino), they did not work in child welfare. Most of those respondents who were employed by a local county had the job title of Social Worker II (7.1%). Also, for those who were employed in child welfare, two respondents had 4-5 years of work experience.
and two respondents had 8-11 years of experience. The majority of the students (57.1%) did not currently have an internship in child welfare, while 42.9% reported that they did. Most of those with a child welfare internship (32.1%) were with San Bernardino County and 21.4% were with Riverside County. For those with a child welfare internship, 28.6% had less than one year of experience and 14.3% reported one to two years of experience.

Table 3 depicts the social media use characteristics of the respondents. Out of 56 respondents, only one person reported that they do not use social networking sites (SNS). For the respondent who stated she was not currently using SNS, she also reported that she was not likely to start using SNS in the future. Almost every respondent (94.6%) reported using Facebook, and more than half of the students also used YouTube (58.9%).

Table 3. Use of Social Media Characteristics of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use social media (N=56)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. (Cont’d) Use of Social Media Characteristics of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facebook (N=56)</strong></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Twitter (N=56)</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MySpace (N=56)</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youtube (N=56)</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Google+ (N=56)</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blogs (N=56)</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Message boards (N=56)</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SNS used most (N=56)</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youtube</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How likely to use SNS if not currently using (N=56)</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very likely</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. (Cont’d) Use of Social Media Characteristics of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often use SNS (N=56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a day</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a day</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of using SNS (N=56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How safe is personal information (N=56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat safe</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unsafe</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsafe</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-fourth (25%) used Google+, 12.5% used MySpace and Twitter each, 10.7% used blogs and 7.1% of the respondents used message boards. The most frequently used social networking site was Facebook (92.9%) and many of the students used SNS several times a day (66.7%), once a day (13.0%), or several times a week (13.0%). Over half (53.6%) of the respondents used SNS for
personal use, while 37.5% used SNS for both personal and professional use. Almost half of the students (42.9%) stated that they felt their personal information was somewhat safe online and 33.9% of the students felt that their information was somewhat unsafe. Only nine of the respondents felt that personal information online was very unsafe.

Table 4 displays the hypothetical vignettes that were used to assess the graduate students’ perceptions of SNS use in social work. The answers to the vignettes were based on each student’s ethical perspective. For each vignette, respondents chose one of the following answers: “Very Ethical;” “Somewhat Ethical;” “Somewhat Unethical;” “Completely Unethical;” or “Don’t know.”
Table 4. Social Media Vignettes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee uses Twitter about methamphetamine exposed child (N=56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Ethical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat ethical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unethical</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely unethical</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook vent (N=56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very ethical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat ethical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unethical</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely unethical</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclaimer (N=56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very ethical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat ethical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unethical</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely unethical</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSW Twitter (N=56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very ethical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat ethical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unethical</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely unethical</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook friend request (N=56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very ethical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat ethical</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unethical</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely unethical</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog vent (N=56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very ethical</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat ethical</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unethical</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely unethical</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. (Cont’d) Social Media Vignettes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Google/Facebook search (N=56)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very ethical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat ethical</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unethical</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely unethical</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Therapist message board (N=56)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very ethical</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat ethical</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unethical</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely unethical</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vignettes in table 4 are presented in the order of highest “completely unethical” percentages. Also, additional space was provided for the respondents to explain their answer about the social worker’s actions depicted in each situation. Therefore, open-ended responses (qualitative data) were collected with the scale of ethicalness (quantitative data) in each vignette.

Vignette 1 describes a work situation where a social worker accesses Twitter to blog about a co-worker’s client. Most of the respondents agreed (87.5%) that the
actions of the social worker were completely unethical and some sample responses from March 2012 included: "A social worker does not need to share their client’s information and experiences online" (Participant 1), "If any identifying information is included, some individuals may recognize who this person is. Therefore, this is breaching confidentiality" (Participant 3), "It could be traced back to the client if others in the office see the Twitter message" (Participant 13), "It is a violation of the client's rights. It could put both workers at risk if the family was aware of the post and they could face disciplinary action at work" (Participant 20), "Violates client confidentiality even if the child's name and age are not posted" (Participant 22), "Clients are confidential and friends do not need to know" (Participant 31), "It's simply unnecessary" (Participant 56), and "Client info should never be posted online. Colleagues/supervisors and people within your department should be used to debrief about it" (Participant 29).

For those respondents who stated that the social worker’s actions were somewhat unethical (10.7%), some of their answers were, “This individual should not blog about clients. I would have said completely (unethical)
had she used the clients name or personal information” (Participant 6), “If the co-worker did not identify the child in anyway, there is no breach. Somewhat (unethical), because you are talking about a child's misfortune and on a social networking site, anyone can get that information” (Participant 14), “I am assuming no names or personal information was addressed. And I am a little concerned about whether information like this should be posted” (Participant 18), “Not ethical, but would be worse if she disclosed specific details” (Participant 37), “I would want to know if the child's identity was used. Also online social networks can identify current location. That can break client confidentiality” (Participant 28), and “Child should be autonomous and can't reveal where the (meth) lab was” (Participant 46).

Vignette 2 describes a child welfare employee who completes a Google/Facebook search on a client to gather more information. Responses were divided with 28.6% choosing “completely unethical,” 23.2% choosing “somewhat ethical,” 25% choosing “don't know,” 14.3% choosing “somewhat unethical,” and 8.9% choosing “very ethical.” Those who chose “completely unethical,” explained their
answers in March 2012 with, “Does not protect client right to privacy” (Participant 7), “I don’t know why, it just seems wrong” (Participant 12), “There are protocols and legal methods for gathering information and some of the information may not even be relevant...plus, how does the worker document where she found this information?” (Participant 35), “People put things that are untrue on there all the time, not credible” (Participant 17) and “Need to obtain informed consent before going through client personal information” (Participant 38).

The “somewhat ethical” answers were explained with, “I think it’s okay to look and see what the child says about themselves” (Participant 5), “If the profile is public then it is not unethical since the client freely shares this information publically” (Participant 6), “If approved by the agency, then okay. Some professional agencies conduct these types of searches on their employees and clients” (Participant 16), “It is a good resource to get information” (Participant 26) and “It’s online, its fair game” (Participant 46).

Those students who answered with “don’t know” stated, “This might give the worker a more rounded picture of the client, but is there damaging information
on there?” (Participant 3), “If it is required by CPS to do this (depends on policy)” ( Participant 13), “The worker is trying to gather info on the client. However, I would try not to rely on this kind of source” (Participant 15), “Not sure if the internet sources can be used in court as supporting evidence in a child welfare case” (Participant 43), and “It depends on the information. Looking for a runaway child would be okay. Looking for personal information on a client would be unethical” (Participant 47).

“Somewhat unethical” answers were explained as “You cannot trust websites to be honest and true, not a professional way to do a psychosocial assessment” (Participant 8), “Additional information and personal photos are available and should not be viewed” (Participant 21), “Not our job to search, if the client wants to show us, that's fine. But not to go investigate. The client will feel violated if you bring up the information in session” (Participant 31).

“Privacy violation but all resources should be available to protect the children” (Participant 40), “This should only be done if the CPS employee is trying to gather information regarding safety or location of client”
(Participant 44) and "I'm not sure what the rules are about this, but it does not seem appropriate. It could be useful though if you have limited information" (Participant 36).

Finally, for those respondents who selected "very ethical," explanations included, "Having as much info as possible helps the worker come up with a case management plan" (Participant 4), "What she is doing is public information and not illegal. However, there must be limits placed on personal information about people" (Participant 24) and "If the search is conducted in agency office with staff trained to locate absent relatives or criminal checks" (Participant 30).

The third vignette is a situation in which a social worker receives a Facebook friend request from a former client and the social worker accepts the request because the person is no longer a client of the agency. More than half of the respondents (53.6%) chose "completely unethical," 28.6% chose "somewhat unethical" and 12.5% chose "somewhat ethical." Those students who selected "completely unethical" in March 2012 justified their answers with "The worker should only have a professional relationship with the client and Facebook is not
professional" (Participant 6), "Shouldn’t be friends with a client even if it is an old client" (Participant 11), "Social worker should know what to do when this happens, do not accept it" (Participant 17), "The client is at risk because the social worker is familiar with the clients background" (Participant 29) and "Weird, clients are not our friends" (Participant 55).

"Somewhat unethical" explanations were "This person may return as a client, it confuses the worker-client relationship" (Participant 1), "Although they are no longer in a professional relationship, the power balance may still be uneven. Should wait 3 years, then they can be friends" (Participant 3), "Well it’s been a few years but you never know what kind of conflict can exist and be used against the social worker in the future. Better safe than sorry" (Participant 45) and "Depends on how long the client has been terminated for" (Participant 53).

Those respondents who chose "somewhat ethical" stated "I know Children and Family Services (CFS) says this is unethical, but personally I don’t see what would be wrong with this" (Participant 5), "Because the person is no longer a client of the agency, and as long as the
worker isn’t posting negative things about clients or the agency” (Participant 18), “If the client is no longer part of the system. Should have been a minimum of 5 years” (Participant 46) and “As long as it will cause no harm to the client” (Participant 37).

Vignette 4 is a situation in which a social worker with an MSW degree blogs online about her frustrations with clients, without using any identifying information. Less than half (44.6%) of the students indicated that the social worker’s actions were “completely unethical,” and 28.6% indicated that it was “somewhat unethical.” The rest of the students were divided in their answers, 10.7% for “very ethical,” 10.7% for “somewhat ethical,” and 5.4% chose “don’t know.”

The “completely unethical” choices in March 2012 were paired with qualitative responses including “A blog is public and therefore a prior or current client may see this post. People may jump to conclusions about the subject of the blog” (Participant 6), “Work needs to be kept at work. Statements like hers are discriminating and insulting. She should vent to her supervisors” (Participant 16), “The worker is attempting to vent about her issues but this is not an appropriate way to do so”
(Participant 19) and "Although it is fine to be upset, it is unethical to post things about clients. I feel that this is a worker who may need some time to reevaluate her career" (Participant 36).

Respondents who chose the "somewhat unethical" response offered the following reasons: "As long as she doesn't describe specific clients/situations, venting may be appropriate" (Participant 1), "She needs to put personal issues aside. Everyone is battling something on a daily basis. But she does need catharsis and an outlet" (Participant 3), "It's sending a negative message to all of those who will read her post regarding social workers" (Participant 15), "She is not speaking about a particular client or a particular case/situation. However, blogging about it for anyone to read is wrong" (Participant 24) and "The code of ethics (once we become a social worker) should guide our life" (Participant 53).

The respondents who chose "very ethical" and "somewhat ethical" were similar in their written answers. Many of them stated, "She didn't give out any information" (Participant 4), "She's venting, leave her alone" (Participant 13), "As long as she did not name any specific clients, I think it's okay, but she should
respect the difference between her professional life and private use of SNS" (Participant 12) and "She has the right to free speech. Social worker does not equal a saint" (Participant 37).

The fifth vignette depicts a long-time employed social worker who uses a disclaimer on his online blog to change client identifying information, and then reveals personal information about his clients. More than half of the respondents (66.1%) found this scenario to be "completely unethical," 16.1% found it to be "somewhat unethical," 7.1% found it to be "somewhat ethical" and 5.4% found it to be "very ethical." In March 2012, the majority of those students who thought the scenario was "completely unethical" indicated that, "Unless the social worker has consent from the client, they shouldn't discuss anything" (Participant 10), "Personal details or not, he has no right posting facts about his clients on his blog without their consent" (Participant 14) and "Sometimes cases can be identified although names and locations are changed" (Participant 29).

"Somewhat unethical" choices were paired with answers such as "If the clients privacy is protected, then it may be okay, otherwise these specifics are not
appropriate" (Participant 1), "I personally think that if one is in this field, they should never post, blog or tweet about their job or clients. However, there is no identifying info" (Participant 45) and "There is never a need to blog about your clients regardless of the disclaimer. Blogs are often misunderstood" (Participant 52).

"Somewhat ethical" and "very ethical" explanations included "If the blog is for informational purposes, the social worker is taking actions to protect privacy" (Participant 24), "If the information was changed and his blog may be to help others, I think it could be alright" (Participant 54) and "If people know where this person works, confidentiality is at stake" (Participant 3).

Vignette 6 describes a situation in which a Child Protective Services social worker uses their personal Facebook page to vent about clients after an upsetting day. Two-thirds (75%) of the respondents felt that this social worker's actions were "completely unethical," 19.6% reported "somewhat unethical," and 5.4% reported "somewhat ethical." While the majority of choices were "completely unethical" and "somewhat unethical," narrative answers in March 2012 included "Should not put
where he works. Might have negative repercussions” (Participant 3), “This person is blasting their agency out to the public. This tarnishes the agency’s name because this shows that they are employing someone who would discuss personal matters within their caseload on SNS. Again, not the appropriate venue” (Participant 14), “Not a healthy way or most effective way to cope with feelings. This is not self-care and the social worker should do what is necessary to receive needed supervision” (Participant 28) and “The social worker knew what he/she was getting into, get out of the profession” (Participant 50). “Somewhat ethical” answers were paired with “If no other information is provided, then they are just venting” (Participant 21) and “Again, venting with no specific information” (Participant 27).

The seventh vignette is about an LCSW who uses Twitter to communicate with clients to set appointments, provide crisis intervention and general therapy. Most of the respondents (62.5%) reported that this vignette was “completely unethical,” 14.3% chose “don’t know,” 10.7% chose “somewhat unethical,” and 8.9% chose “somewhat ethical.” In March 2012, the narrative answers paired with “completely unethical” choices included “Individuals
who may follow the client will be able to see
intervention and therapy notes. Plus how can you fit a
session into 140 characters?” (Participant 3), “They need
their license stripped away and burned! Totally
inappropriate forum for that sort of client interaction.
There is no privacy or protection for the client”
(Participant 14), “Do not use SNS to communicate with
clients. They are not your friends” (Participant 17) and
“I’m not sure, but if clients are posting their names for
appointments and the LCSW is providing
intervention/therapy and all users can read it, then
that’s violating confidentiality” (Participant 24).

“Don’t know” narrative answers were “I don’t know
how this form of SNS works, including privacy, etc.”
(Participant 27), “If a client agrees, it might be okay
but I don’t think it’s proper” (Participant 31) and
“Depends on security of website and privacy of LCSW’s
page and conversations” (Participant 43). “Somewhat
unethical” selections included “I wouldn’t do that. If
allowed by the agency, then I could see the use”
(Participant 16), “Process should be formal so that
client takes treatment seriously” (Participant 34) and
“Setting appointments seems okay, worded carefully, but
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that's about it" (Participant 49). Finally, "somewhat ethical" choices were paired with narratives such as “If the clients are comfortable with it and no private information is revealed, it's okay” (Participant 1), “I think as long as the advice and crisis intervention is not geared towards specific people it’s okay. Not okay to schedule appointments” (Participant 5) and “The LCSW is making herself available, however this may indicate the LCSW and client are friends, which might not be a good thing” (Participant 33).

The final vignette is about a therapist who does not know how to proceed with a domestic violence victim and the therapist seeks advice from an online social work message board. The responses were divided with most students (23.2%) choosing “somewhat unethical,” 21.4% choosing “very ethical,” 19.6% choosing “somewhat ethical,” 17.9% choosing “completely unethical” and 16.1% choosing “don’t know.” In March 2012, narrative answers for “somewhat unethical” include “Seek advice from supervisor first, colleagues next and go from there. You don’t know if the site is public or restricted access” (Participant 8), “Is the blog locked to the public? Has a confidentiality agreement been signed? Is this an
agency approved practice?" (Participant 16), "It would have been more appropriate to call or email the other therapist so as not to expose the client's information" (Participant 20), "May be viewed by others, there are plenty of internet hackers" (Participant 26) and "The social worker is potentially exposing her client's confidential information which can cause repercussions for the domestic violence victim" (Participant 29). The next set of narrative answers for "very ethical" and "somewhat ethical" include "As long as no identifying information was given, she is merely consulting" (Participant 3), "As long as privacy is kept, the social worker is doing his/her best to provide proper assistance to the client" (Participant 34) and "As long as it's a secure board which requires proof of professional credentials with licensed moderators present, it's appropriate to discuss redacted information" (Participant 38).

"Completely unethical" narrative answers included "Once again, no protection for the client. The fact that she is a victim of domestic violence should tell any worker that the client's protection is crucial and everything should be done to protect that client"
(Participant 14) and "Breach of confidentiality is likely on a social work message board. Why not use an email with HIPPA confidentiality disclosures?" (Participant 30). Finally, the last set of narrative answers paired with "don't know" include "Depends if the message board is visible by the public or not" (Participant 12), "As long as she's not disclosing the name or personal identifiable information. Professionals always consult with each other" (Participant 15) and "Are these message boards secure? Is it public information? I want to say it's better to communicate directly and confidentially" (Participant 35).

Summary

The study presented here stems from the exploratory design of this study, examining the attitudes of graduate social work students' about the use of social networking sites (SNS) and the possible ethical implications of such use. This chapter described the characteristics of study sample participants, participants' ethical perceptions of the vignettes presented and qualitative responses. These results indicate some differential attitudes towards the use of SNS in social work and child welfare.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Introduction

In this chapter, the study's findings will be discussed in greater detail, as well as the limitations of the study, recommendations for social work practice, policy and research and the conclusions. In addition, the qualitative data is discussed as it relates to the eight hypothetical vignettes.

Discussion

The goal of this study was to explore the attitudes of graduate social work students about the use of social networking sites and the ethical implications of such use. The sample size for this study consisted of 56 graduate social work students attending California State University San Bernardino. The sample was mostly female and equally consisted of both Caucasian and Hispanic students; however, African-Americans, Asian/Pacific Islanders and those students who identified as Other were also represented. Most students had at least a bachelor's degree, and almost half of the respondents
were full-time students who would be graduating in June 2012. The sample was divided almost equally for Title IVE (child welfare emphasis) and non-Title IVE status and the majority of the students submitted their questionnaires before the breach of confidentiality email was distributed.

This study's findings indicated that the great majority of students (55 out of 56 respondents) used social networking sites and of those sites, Facebook is used the most. In addition, most respondents reported that they accessed SNS several times a day, which might imply that access occurred while on both professional and personal time. This study found that over one-third of the students used social networking sites for both personal and professional use. Of note, almost half of the respondents reported that they felt their social networking site postings and information were "somewhat safe" compared with only nine respondents who selected "very unsafe." Yet in nearly every vignette, the majority of the students chose "completely unethical" to describe the hypothetical social worker's SNS use. These findings may indicate that the majority of the student
sample is quick to ethically judge other social worker's actions for similar SNS use.

Certainly, in any of the vignettes, client information could have been discovered from a source that is not Internet-related. However, the ease and accessibility of the Internet and social media means that it is more likely to be the source of the information and this is also more common. It is important for any of the social workers depicted in the vignettes to find a balance between their personal desires and professional judgment. When presented with the unique ethical dilemmas that social media use sometimes creates, the helping professional may have to sacrifice their personal choices. As a result, the autonomy of the professional is justifiably restricted for the betterment of the client, the therapeutic relationship, the treatment intervention and the perception of the social work profession as a whole (Lehavot, 2009).

The study found that participants were ambivalent towards the social worker conducting a Google and/or Facebook search on a client. There was an equal distribution of "completely unethical," "somewhat ethical," and "don't know" answers. Some students felt
that the scenario was a confidentiality breach, while others said that if it was an agency practice, then it was acceptable. Others stated that the information was unreliable either way. These responses illustrate that some professionals and graduate students may believe that because the Internet is a public forum, anyone who posts something online forfeits their right to privacy. One could argue that individuals who engage in this type of activity are doing something that is no different than other public behavior (Lehavot, 2009). This can lead to some important questions: Can information learned through the Internet about a client be considered confidential? And can it be used in a professional manner? Should the information be considered public or private? Lehavot (2009) explains it well: "...privacy is a subjective state that individuals may expect under certain conditions and when they exercise specific precautions" (p. 131). Without obtaining informed consent, the clinician's actions are unethical. However, "Googling" may be acceptable as long as helping professionals notify their clients about this practice. The survey respondent answers to this particular vignette were intriguing.
The study also found that participants' views were very mixed on a vignette describing a therapist who does not know to proceed with a domestic violence victim so she seeks advice from an online social work board. This scenario highlights how the Internet is a pathway for communication among colleagues and professionals and how it is growing, instead of diminishing (Lehavot, 2009). In fact, the use of the Internet has been engrained into the social work profession. Responses for this vignette were also in fairly equal amounts, between "somewhat unethical," "completely unethical," "very ethical," "somewhat ethical" and "don't know." Some students felt that the information exchanged might be viewed by others or hacked somehow, while other students felt that the consultation was acceptable as long as no identifying information was given. For those students who selected "don't know," they questioned if the message board was secure or public. The social work profession is very likely to continue to face online communication that threatens the ethical and professional standards. Therefore, training and education on the ethical implications of online communication will be necessary to properly equip helping professionals.
The study revealed that half of the respondents believed accepting a Facebook friend request from a former client was completely unethical. However, the other half of the respondents chose either "Very ethical," "somewhat ethical," or only "somewhat unethical." A few of the students stated that Facebook relationships with clients are not professional. Others said that as long as at least three years had passed, then the worker and client could be online friends. Finally, other students defended the social worker's actions by saying that because the person was no longer a client of the agency, then it was an acceptable behavior.

Online interactions between helping professionals and clients can be ambiguous in nature due to the lack of distinction between professional exchanges and personal ones. This vignette demonstrates how the ambiguity may make it a challenge for those helping professionals to interpret the NASW Code of Ethics (Lehavot, Barnett & Powers, 2010).

This study's results indicate that social networking site use is in fact widespread and an emerging trend. The findings also highlight the importance of not only working professionals in the social work field, but also
that of graduate social work students who have an internship in social work and/or child welfare, and will eventually graduate with an MSW degree. Although the findings demonstrate some general knowledge of the NASW Code of Ethics of these soon to be graduates, the results also highlight how ubiquitous social media use is. Qualitative responses associated with the eight hypothetical vignettes illustrate the need for further research and education among MSW students.

Limitations

This study faced several limitations. One limitation is the low response rate. Out of 161 questionnaires that were distributed to the students, 56 were returned and this resulted in a 33% response rate. The small sample size may reduce the ability to generalize this study's findings to all graduate social work students. Another possible limitation of the study is the fact that the entire sample is comprised of graduate college students. Therefore, it is likely that they all have been exposed to computer use and possible social networking site use. Such a widespread use is different from working
professionals who may have less exposure to SNS and may have differing opinions about its use.

A very important limitation of this study is the lack of empirical research regarding graduate social work students' attitudes about the use of social networking. While this researcher was not able to locate journal articles about social workers and social media use specifically, there are a few studies that used psychologists or psychiatrists as a sample on their SNS use. However, these studies did not use hypothetical vignettes. Without an established body of empirical knowledge to compare this study's findings to, it is not possible to make a worthy comparison.

The final limitation is in regards to the design of this study. As noted above, no research exists regarding this study's topic. As a result, no standardized instrument was available for use. This researcher created an instrument based on her subjectivity and both the validity and reliability of the study's findings may have suffered as a result.
The prevalent use of social media in today's society has changed interpersonal communication on a substantial level. These changes have the potential to affect the social work profession's ethical standards, especially as they relate to confidentiality, informed consent, self-determination and self-disclosure (Tunick et al., 2011).

How do helping professionals ensure the safety and protection of clients, while defining the limits of social workers' responsibility to their welfare? When helping professionals choose to view client information online, outside of the clinical setting and/or without their permission, this too jeopardizes the treatment protocol and threatens the therapeutic relationship, while compromising professional boundaries (Tunick et al., 2011).

This study's results, including the qualitative data, indicate that graduate social work students are in need of more training, education and experience in the ethical use of social networking sites. The findings are also indicative of the need for the NASW Code of Ethics to create specific ethical standards as they relate to
the use of SNS. Some examples would include developing
guidelines about receiving online friend requests from
clients, conducting Facebook/Google searches on clients,
seeking professional knowledge and information online and
posting client’s information online.

Once the NASW Code of Ethics has been updated to
include ethical standards that relate to SNS use, child
welfare agencies will likely need to provide training and
guidance to their employees. Perhaps they should make it
mandatory to ensure their employees are in compliance
with the ethical code. Not all employees of child
welfare agencies are defined as social workers, nor are
they members of the National Association of Social
Workers. However, this study illustrates the importance
of ethics trainings specific to social media use for all
employees in child welfare and social work.

The prospective damage to clients as the result of
social workers who misuse social media is concerning. In
addition, the motivation of professionals who engage in
the unethical use of SNS should be examined as well. A
need for future empirical research is evident as there
are no previous studies examining SNS use with social
workers or social work graduate students. This study’s
results indicate that further empirical examination needs to occur with social workers specifically. The graduate social work students are relatively unaware of the ethical dilemmas that SNS use can create, or how to appropriately react to the situations.

The popularity of SNS use will only grow and it does not appear to be diminishing anytime soon. Specific to social work and child welfare, certain practices like electronic communication may become ethically questionable. Lehavot (2009) provides good questions for those students and/or professionals who use social media: What are the benefits and risks associated with posting information on the Internet? Is it likely that clients, colleagues and the agency I’m employed with will be profoundly and negatively impacted by my online activities?

In today’s world, technology is changing rapidly, and this may make it difficult for professional agencies and associations to create and provide ethical guidelines about how to appropriately respond to social media related issues. However, this study’s subject matter should serve as a reminder that the current NASW Code of Ethics is still applicable. Unethical social media
practices increase the likelihood of social workers having to face ethics committees, licensing boards and lawsuits. Constructive responses including the creation of an ethical social media policy can be extremely useful to help protect both clients and practitioners. Policy creation can help reduce the risk to social workers, help prevent any future ethical errors and it holds the social work profession accountable.

Conclusions

The findings from this study are indicative of some confusion and ambivalence towards the use of SNS among the graduate social work students. For those students who use SNS, they may find themselves in ethical predicaments, not knowing how to appropriately respond. The quantitative data illustrated high use of social media, and specifically Facebook by the students. The hypothetical vignette data were more contrasted with some respondents siding with the "completely unethical" viewpoint on every vignette, and other students who were more varied with their ethical selections. Participants' views were split on the issues of seeking professional knowledge and information online, responding to an online
friend request from a former client and conducting a Facebook and/or Google search on a client. This study has hopefully contributed to the already started discussion regarding SNS use among social workers and social work students.
APPENDIX A

CODE OF ETHICS
Code of Ethics

On privacy and confidentiality:

(c) Social workers should protect the confidentiality of all information obtained in the course of professional service, except for compelling professional reasons. In all instances, social workers should disclose the least amount of confidential information necessary to achieve the desired purpose; only information that is directly relevant to the purpose for which the disclosure is made should be revealed (National Association of Social Workers website, n.d., expression 1.07).

(i) Social workers should not discuss confidential information in any setting unless privacy can be ensured. Social workers should not discuss confidential information in public or semipublic areas such as hallways, waiting rooms, elevators, and restaurants (National Association of Social Workers website, n.d., expression 1.07).

The NASW Code of Ethics privacy and confidentiality standard (1.07[m]) further states:
(m) Social workers should take precautions to ensure and maintain the confidentiality of information transmitted to other parties through the use of computers, electronic mail, facsimile machines, telephones and telephone answering machines, and other electronic or computer technology. Disclosure of identifying information should be avoided whenever possible (National Association of Social Workers website, n.d., expression 1.07).

As to informed consent and the use of technology,

(a) Social workers should provide services to clients only in the context of a professional relationship based, when appropriate, on valid informed consent. Social workers should use clear and understandable language to inform clients of the purpose of the services, risks related to the services, limits to services because of the requirements of a third party payer, relevant costs, reasonable alternatives, clients' right to refuse or withdraw consent, and the time frame covered by the consent. Social workers should provide clients with an opportunity to ask questions (National
Association of Social Workers website, n.d., expression 1.03).

(e) Social workers who provide services via electronic media (such as computer, telephone, radio, and television) should inform recipients of the limitations and risks associated with such services (National Association of Social Workers website, n.d., expression 1.03).

Conflicts and dual relationships:

(a) Social workers should be alert to and avoid conflicts of interest that interfere with the exercise of professional discretion and impartial judgment. Social workers should inform clients when a real or potential conflict of interest arises and take reasonable steps to resolve the issue in a manner that makes the clients' interests primary and protects clients' interests to the greatest extent possible. In some cases, protecting clients' interests may require termination of the professional relationship with proper referral of the client (National Association of Social Workers website, n.d., expression 1.06).
(c) Social workers should not engage in dual or multiple relationships with clients or former clients in which there is a risk of exploitation or potential harm to the client. In instances when dual or multiple relationships are unavoidable, social workers should take steps to protect clients and are responsible for setting clear, appropriate, and culturally sensitive boundaries. (Dual or multiple relationships occur when social workers relate to clients in more than one relationship, whether professional, social, or business. Dual or multiple relationships can occur simultaneously or consecutively.) (National Association of Social Workers website, n.d., expression 1.06).

National Association of Social Workers website. (n.d.).

www.socialworkers.org
APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT
INFORMED CONSENT

The study in which you are being asked to participate is designed to explore social work students' attitudes about the use of social networking sites and possible ethical implications of such use. The study is being conducted by Christina Dillon, an MSW student at California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) under the supervision of Professor Janet Chang at CSUSB. The study has been approved by the School of Social Work Sub-Committee of the CSUSB Institutional Review Board.

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to understand the attitudes of graduate social work students about the use of social media in social work and the possible ethical implications of such use.

Description: If you take part in this study, you will be asked to fill out a brief questionnaire that asks about your attitudes about the use of social media in social work.

Participation: Participation is totally voluntary, and you are free to skip any questions you do not want to answer.

Confidentiality: The information you give will remain confidential and anonymous and no record will be made or kept of your name or any identifying information. The anonymous data from these questionnaires will only be seen by the researcher; the results will be conveyed to others in group form only.

Duration: Filling out a questionnaire should take no more than 15 minutes.

Risks: There are no foreseeable risks to taking part in the study and no personal benefits involved.

Benefits: Your opinions will help social workers and administrators to better understand the use of social media in social work and the unique ethical challenges it can present.

Contact: If you have any questions or concerns about this study, you can contact Dr. Chang at (909)537-5184.

Results: The results will be available after December 2012 at the Pfau Library at California State University San Bernardino.

By marking below, you agree that you have been fully informed about this questionnaire and are volunteering to take part.

Place a check mark here                      Date
APPENDIX C

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT
Debriefing Statement

Thank you for participating in this study conducted by Christina Dillon, MSW student at California State University, San Bernardino and for not discussing the contents of the questionnaire with other students. The questionnaire you have just completed was designed to explore social work students' attitudes about the use of social networking sites and the possible ethical implications of such use. It is hoped that the results of this study will help social workers and administrators better understand the unique ethical challenges that social media use in social work can present.

If you have any questions about the study, please feel free to contact my faculty supervisor, Dr. Janet Chang at (909)537-5184. If you would like to obtain a copy of the group results of this study, please contact the Pfau Library at California State University San Bernardino in December 2012.

Thank you again for your participation in this research project.
APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE
Survey Questionnaire
A Study Examining Graduate Social Work Students’ Attitudes about the Use of Social Networking and Possible Ethical Implications

PART I: BACKGROUND

In this section, you will be asked a series of demographic questions. Please write or circle your answers. All of your answers will remain confidential.

A1. Are you a Title IVE or non-Title IVE graduate social work student at California State University San Bernardino?
   1. Title IVE
   2. Non-title IVE

A2. What is your gender?
   1. Male
   2. Female

A3. Current Age: ____________________________ years old

A4. What is your ethnicity?
   1. African American
   2. Asian/Pacific Islander
   3. Hispanic
   4. Native-American
   5. White
   6. Other (Please specify) ____________________________

A5. What is your highest level of education?
   1. Bachelor Degree
   2. Master Degree

A6. Are you currently employed in child welfare?
   1. Yes
   2. No [Please skip to A10]
A7. Which county do you work for? ____________________________

A8. What is your job title? ____________________________

A9. Amount of experience in child welfare: _________ months/years

A10. Do you currently have an internship in child welfare?

1. Yes
2. No [Please skip to A13]

A11. In which county are you interning?

1. San Bernardino County
2. Riverside County
3. Other: ____________________________

A12. Amount of internship experience in child welfare: ___ months/years

A13. As a graduate student, are you in the full-time or part-time program and what year?

1. Full-time, 1st year
2. Full time, 2nd year
3. Part-time, 1st year
4. Part-time, 2nd year
5. Part-time, 3rd year

A14. Do you use social media, i.e. Facebook, Twitter, MySpace, YouTube, Google+, blogs, online message boards, etc.? Please circle all of the answers that apply.

1. Facebook
2. Twitter
3. MySpace
4. YouTube
5. Google+
6. Blogs
7. Online message boards
8. I do not use social media [Please skip to A16]
A15. If you selected any of the answers above from #1 through #7, which one do you primarily use?

1. Facebook
2. Twitter
3. MySpace
4. YouTube
5. Google+
6. Blogs
7. Online message boards

A16. If you do not currently use social networking sites (SNS), how likely are you to start using them in the future? [If you currently use social networking sites, please skip to A17]

1. Very likely [Please skip to B1]
2. Somewhat likely [Please skip to B1]
3. Not very likely [Please skip to B1]
4. Not at all likely [Please skip to B1]

A17. How often do you use social networking sites (SNS)?

1. None of the time
2. Several times a day
3. Once a day
4. A few times a week
5. Once a week
6. Once a month
7. A few times a year

A18. For what purpose (reason) do you use social networking sites (SNS)?

1. Personal
2. Professional
3. Both
4. Other (Please specify) ____________________________
A19. If you use social networking sites (SNS), how safe do you feel your personal information is, such as your full name, city of residence, names of the high school and colleges you’ve attended, any online resumes, current and former employers information and personal photos?

1. Very safe
2. Somewhat safe
3. Somewhat unsafe
4. Very unsafe
5. Don’t know

PART II: SAMPLE VIGNETTE’S

Please read the following scenarios carefully. After reading the scenarios, please answer the following questions.

B1. One day, a child welfare worker was sitting at her desk when a co-worker brought a methamphetamine exposed child into the office that the worker earlier detained from a drug lab found inside a local home. The child welfare worker decided to log-in to her Twitter (online blog) account on her phone and post about the co-workers new client. What do you think about this worker’s actions?

1. Very ethical
2. Somewhat ethical
3. Somewhat unethical
4. Completely unethical
5. Don’t know

Please explain why:__________________________________________

B2. An employee who has worked in child welfare for three years decided to complete a Google/Facebook search on one of her Child Protective Service
(CPS) clients to gather more information. What do you think about this worker’s actions?

1. Very ethical
2. Somewhat ethical
3. Somewhat unethical
4. Completely unethical
5. Don’t know

Please explain why:

B3. On his lunch break, a social worker decides to log-in into his Facebook account. He immediately sees that he has a friend request from a former client. The social worker decides to accept the friend request because the person is no longer a client of the agency and the social worker genuinely likes the client. What do you think about this worker’s actions?

1. Very ethical
2. Somewhat ethical
3. Somewhat unethical
4. Completely unethical
5. Don’t know

Please explain why:

B4. A young social worker with her MSW (Masters of Social Work) degree, blogs about her experiences. One day, she is particularly annoyed with clients and declares, “Why do all these people complain, without actually doing something about changing themselves? Why am I focusing on this? It’s because I’m angry! No offense, but today I don’t care about anything, social issues included. It’s all unimportant right now...” What do you think of this MSW’s actions?
1. Very ethical
2. Somewhat ethical
3. Somewhat unethical
4. Completely unethical
5. Don’t know

Please explain why:

B5. A long-time employed social worker has a disclaimer on his online blog that reads, “To protect my client’s privacy, I have changed the names, locations and other identifying information.” The social worker then proceeds to reveal personal details about his clients. What do you think of this worker’s actions?

1. Very ethical
2. Somewhat ethical
3. Somewhat unethical
4. Completely unethical
5. Don’t know

Please explain why:

B6. A newly employed social worker with Child Protective Services (CPS) had a very upsetting work day. He was unable to debrief or process his day with his supervisor or co-workers. The social worker went home and was still feeling very angry and exasperated. He decided to log-on to his Facebook account and write the following posting, “I hate working for Child Protective Services (CPS), and all of these clients drive me crazy! Today I had to tell a druggie mom how smoking meth while pregnant is a bad thing. Give me a break!” What do you think of this social worker’s actions?

1. Very ethical
2. Somewhat ethical
3. Somewhat unethical
4. Completely unethical
5. Don’t know

Please explain why: ____________________________________________

B7. An LCSW (Licensed Clinical Social Worker), regularly uses Twitter [an online microblogging service that allows users to send and read text-based posts of up to 140 characters, informally known as “tweets”] to communicate with clients in regards to setting appointments, providing crisis intervention and general therapy. What do you think of this social worker’s actions?

1. Very ethical
2. Somewhat ethical
3. Somewhat unethical
4. Completely unethical
5. Don’t know

Please explain why: ____________________________________________

B8. A therapist has a new female client that is the victim in a dangerous domestic violence relationship. This therapist is puzzled on how to proceed with the case. She seeks advice in regards to a suggested treatment plan and appropriate level of intervention from a fellow therapist on an online social work message board. What do you think of this social worker’s actions?

1. Very ethical
2. Somewhat ethical
3. Somewhat unethical
4. Completely unethical
5. Don’t know

Please explain why: ____________________________________________
THE END

Thank you for your participation, contribution to the field of social work and for not discussing the contents of this questionnaire with other students. Please put the completed questionnaire inside the attached envelope, seal it and take it over to the main office of the social work department (located on the fourth floor of the Social and Behavioral Sciences building) Monday through Friday between the hours of 9:00am and 5:00pm. When you go to the main office of the social work department, please ask the office staff for the social media questionnaire collection envelope, and then place your sealed questionnaire inside of it. If it is after hours, then please slide your sealed questionnaire under the locked office door. Please return your completed questionnaire within 7 days to the office. It is hoped that the results of this study will help social workers and administrators better understand the unique ethical challenges that social media use in social work can present.

Thanks again!

Developed by Christina Dillon
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