Full Length Research Paper

Unethical behaviours preservice teachers encounter on social networks

Arzu DEVECI TOPAL[1*] and Aynur KOLBURAN GEÇER[2]

[1]Informatics Department, Kocaeli University, Kocaeli, Turkey.
[2]Department of Computer and Instructional Technologies Education, Kocaeli University, Kocaeli, Turkey.

The development of web 2.0 technology has resulted in an increase in internet sharing. The scope of this study is social networking, which is one of the web 2.0 tools most heavily used by internet users. In this paper, the unethical behaviours that preservice teachers encounter on social networks and the ways to deal with these problems are examined. A form consisting of open ended questions was given to preservice teachers. The form was developed by researchers who have studied the subject. By the end of the study, it was understood that 89% of the preservice teachers encountered inappropriate behaviours such as profanity, insults, sexually explicit photograph sharing, threats, unwanted video ads (advertisements) and verbal harassment. The results showed that teachers try to solve these issues by strengthening their privacy settings, reporting or blocking harassers, and that they also tend to share personal information only with friends and family. The preservice teachers stated that the most important unethical behaviours they came across on social networks were explicit content and personal information sharing. Teachers and preservice teachers ought to be informed about equality, respect to other opinions, human rights, personal privacy, media ethics and universal moralities with regard to online and social media content. Thus, it will be possible for them to inspire their students regarding the above mentioned values and contribute to the solution of the problems.

Key words: Social networks, preservice teachers, unethical behaviour.

INTRODUCTİON

With the development of internet technology, Web 2.0 applications have enabled users to easily develop personal websites and share their thoughts, videos and photographs (Wikipedia, Myspace, Facebook, Frendster, Flickr, Twitter, Friendfeed, Youtube etc.). Namely, they have enabled users to connect to various other users in different ways. Social networks are web based services that allow individuals to set up public or private profiles andshare their contact lists with others within a limited system. Social networks also allow other users to see and browse through listed contacts in the system (Büyükşener, 2009). The social network site is defined by Ellison and Boyd (2013) as "a networked communication platform in which participants have uniquely identifiable profiles that consist of user-supplied content, content provided by other users, and/or system-provided data;

can publicly articulate connections that can be viewed and traversed by others; and can consume, produce, and/or interact with streams of user generated content provided by their connections on the site". Social networking sites (SNS), one of the tools of Web 2.0, have infiltrated people's daily lives with amazing rapidity to become an important platform for computer-mediated communication (Lin and Lu, 2011). Nowadays social networks are used widely throughout the world and also within Turkey. Facebook has 1,310,000,000 active users globally and with 34 million active users in Turkey, it is ranked as number six among the most popular social networks worldwide (Quintly, 2014; TGNA (Turkish Grand National Assembly) Commission Report, 2012).

Twitter, another popular social network, has 645,750,000 users worldwide (Statistic Brain Research Institute, 2014). In Turkey, the number of Twitter users is over 5 million (TGNA Commission Report, 2012).

Social networking websites store user-related data in their database enabling individuals to connect with their friends, set up groups and share photographs, videos and opinions with people of common interests (Köktürk, 2013). In social networks users are allowed to decide on who can view their profiles; however, security settings are set up by default. Users can decide which other users may access their profiles as well as adjust privacy settings. This flexibility might be considered favourable when adult and informed users are taken into account but adults are not the only users on the internet. Research into social networks has shown that most users do not use security settings or they use very little even though they have the ability to administer the security settings of the information they share (Gross and Acquisti, 2005; Litt, 2013). Although the legal age limit to create an account on social networks is 13, many users who are under 13 are known to use these networks (Yavanoğlu et al., 2012). While social networks provide various sharing opportunities they also expose users to various risks and ethical problems, such as: identity theft, violent media, pornography, viruses, profanity, misinformation, fake profiles, hate speech and attacks on personal lives (Haddon et al., 2012). Considering the ages of the social network users, the aforementioned issues become particularly important for users who are under 13 years of age. The results of a study conducted by TGNA (2012) have shown that 48 % of children between the ages of 9-16 use social networks. One-third of the children who have a social network account who participated in the study in question are under 13 years of age. 85% of the children who use social networks have Facebook accounts. Even though more than half of the parents forbid their children to share their personal information online, 42% of the children choose the "Public" profile setting option which enables anyone to view their profiles. One-third of the children share their personal information only with friends. 19% of the children share their address details and 8% of them share their telephone numbers on social networking websites (TGNA, 2012).

In the United States, children and youths at the K-12 level were seen to have posted a large amount of their personal information to share on social networks (Washington Post, 2010).

Regarding the movements aimed at promoting the usage of social networks in the field of education, it is clearly seen that these networks are popularly used by many students and teachers for both social and educational purposes. When all these points are taken into account, the need to raise awareness in students about using social networks arises. Teachers play the most vital part in warning students about social networks. Raising awareness in teachers is crucial not only for their own benefit but also in terms of guiding their students and preventing risks and dangers that await students on social networks. In order to inform and raise awareness in teachers, touching on the risks and dangers on social networks in faculties of education may be the basis of future precautions that will be taken by teachers as well as recognizing the unethical behaviours and questioning the steps they take in terms of security measures.

Connectivism theory is the basis of the purpose of this study. Connectivism is a learning theory for the digital age and an approach that explains the process of learning about the meaning of information by establishing ties on networks (Siemens, 2005). The purpose of the study is to explore the perceptions of teachers about the risks and dangers while using social networks and help them realize the points to take into consideration regarding the measures that need to be taken with the security policies on social networks. With the help of the study, it will be possible to determine the frequency of use of social networks and preservice teachers' activities and the unethical behaviours they encounter on such networks. In the study is to examine the unethical behaviours that preservice teachers face on social networks. The study has two different subgoals based on the aims set. These are:

(1) To explore the views of preservice teachers on unethical behaviours they come across while using social networks,
(2) To point out the particular unethical behaviours that emerge with the use of social networks as a communication media.

METHOD

Research model

Being a qualitative study, the research was conducted within the 2013-2014 academic year using maximum variation samplings with the participation of the preservice teachers studying at Kocaeli University in the Faculty of Education. The preservice teachers were given a form consisting of open ended questions. The confidentiality of the information that the preservice teachers

provided for the research was of ultimate importance. The forms that students filled in were transcribed by the researchers. They were carefully examined and the codes and categories that established the framework of the research were explored and also functional definitions were assigned. As part of the defined codes, the practices carried out with the preservice teachers were re-examined and the nature and frequency of code applications were determined.

Study group

The students of the Faculty of Education were the core of the study. The participants of the study were second, third and fourth-year students from the departments of Psychological Counselling and Guidance, Computer and Instructional Technologies (CIT) and Classroom Teaching. Prior to receiving the forms, the preservice teachers were told about the purpose of the study and volunteers were sought. 120 preservice teachers answered the forms. 111 forms were analyzed after the elimination of the ones with missing information.

Data collection tool

The open ended form used in the research was created by the researchers who examined the previous studies in the literature on this topic (Balcı and Gölcü, 2013; Bilen et al., 2014; Büyükşener, 2009; Christofides et al., 2012; Çam, and İşbulan, 2012; Dilmaç, 2009; Genç et al., 2013; Gross and Acquisti, 2005; Grosseck et al., 2011; Hew, 2011; Lin and Lu, 2011; Özdemir and Akar, 2011; Yu et al., 2012). The expert opinions of three faculty members from the CIT field were sought and their responses helped the researchers to further develop and refine the form. In the form there were 6 items to determine the demographical information of the preservice teachers and 10 items regarding the unethical problems they faced on social networks. While the items about unethical issues were being developed, the questions were specifically designed to elicit detailed information from the preservice teachers. The preservice teachers were asked questions concerning their purposes in using social networks, their knowledge about the security and privacy settings, users they blocked on social networks, the social networks they used, the unethical behaviours they encountered on these networks and how they dealt with them, the most important problems they came across on social networks and whether it was appropriate for students and teachers to become friends on social networks. After the questionnaire had been developed, firstly the opinions of CIT experts were obtained. Experts gave feedback and offered the change of some of the questions in order to enhance the relevancy of the items in the form with the research questions. After the necessary changes had been made, 12 preservice teachers studying in the department of English Teaching in the Faculty of Education at Kocaeli University, who were exclusive of the study group, were given the form. According to the results of the pilot scheme, it was understood that the preservice teachers had difficulty in understanding and answering some of the open ended questions; thus the form was finalized pursuant to the necessary changes in the questions. The final version of the form consisted of two sections. The first section was composed of demographical information whereas the second section consisted of the opinions and suggestions of the preservice teachers about the unethical issues faced on social networks. This finalized form was given to volunteer students in the classroom environment by the authors.

Data analysis

No changes or corrections were made on the data obtained from the research. While the data was being analysed each form was given a numeric code from 1 to 111. At first the data were converted into text by the researchers using electronic spreadsheets and then it was sorted out by using content analysis, a qualitative research technique. The answers that preservice teachers gave to each question were classified and interpreted in terms of research purposes and then the frequency of the answers was determined. Since the categories were created by using qualitative research questions, items about each category were given using frequency and percentage rates. In this way, the researchers attempted to convert the qualitative data into quantitative data. The basic aim in converting qualitative data into quantitative data is to support reliability, decrease partiality and make comparisons among categories (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2005). Content analysis was conducted by two researchers and in comparing the results a consensus was reached at a rate of 80%. These results establish the reliability of the coding. Both researchers carried out content analysis separately and the agreements and disagreements from the emerging opinions were examined. Reliability analysis of the qualitative data was carried out by Miles and Huberman's (1994) formula:

Reconciliation Percent = Consensus / (Consensus + Dissidence) x 100

The cases under various categories were discussed and the researchers tried to reach an agreement. The correspondence coefficient between the two coders was estimated. The coefficient, one of the indicators of reliability, was obtained as .82 for this study.

FINDINGS

Within the scope of the research, the findings obtained were compared to the previous research outcomes and presented below in accordance with the purposes of the research.

The demographical information of the participants in the research is seen in Table 1. According to the table, 49 (44%) participants from the psychological counselling and guidance department, 32 (28.8%) participants from the CIT department, and 30 (27%) participants from the classroom teaching department took part in the research. 80 (72.1%) of the participants were female and 31 (27.9%) of them were male. 34 (30.6%) of the preservice teachers were second-year students, 51 (45.9%) of them were third-year students and 26 (23.4%) of them were fourth-year students. 14 (12.6%) of the preservice teachers used social networks for half an hour a day, 31 (27.9%) of them used the sites for 1 to 2 hours a day and 36 (32.4) of them used social networks for 5 hours a day or more .The length of time for which the preservice teachers were members of social networks were as follows: 4 (3.6%) of them 1-6 months, 2 (1.8%) of them 1 year, 40 (36%) of them 2-4 years, 62 (55.9%) of them 5-7 years and 3 (2.7%) of them were members for 8 years or more. It was understood that most preservice teachers were members of social networks for 2 to 7 years on

Table 1. Demographic features of preservice teachers.

Feature		F(n)	%
Department	Psychological counselling and guidance	49	44.1
	Computer and Instructional Technologies	32	28.8
	Classroom Teaching	30	27.0
Gender	Female	80	72.1
	Male	31	27.9
Grade	2nd	34	30.6
	3rd	51	45.9
	4th	26	23.4
Frequency of using social networks (daily)	Half an hour	14	12.6
	1-2 hours	31	27.9
	3-4 hours	30	27.0
	5 hours and over	36	32.4
Subscription period of social network (annually)	1-6 months	4	3.6
	1 year	2	1.8
	2-4 years	40	36.0
	5-7 years	62	55.9
	8 years and over	3	2.7

Table 1. Preservice teachers' purposes of using social networks.

The purposes of using social networks	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Connecting with friends	99	89
Finding old friends	64	57.6
Listening to / downloading music	42	37.8
Following sports teams /celebrities	34	30.6
Imitating the people around them (Curiosity)	21	18.9
Making new friends	9	8.1
Following agenda	9	8.1

average.

The preservice teachers were given various options in order to understand their purposes for using social networks and they were allowed to mark more than one option. By examining Table 2, it can be seen that the preservice teachers used social networks mostly for communicating with friends (n= 99,89%) and finding old friends (n= 64, 57.6). Also, listening to music (n= 42, 37,8%), following sports teams and celebrities (n=34, 30.6%) and imitating the people around them (n=21, 18.9%) were determined as the other common purposes.

Table 3 consists of the answers that the preservice teachers gave to the questions about security. 26,1% (n=29) of the preservice teachers shared their social network passwords with others whereas 73.9% (82) of them never shared their passwords with anyone and only 12,6% (n=14) of them stated that their passwords had been hacked. 93,7% (n=104) of the preservice teachers stated that they knew how to deactivate their accounts and 74,8% (n=83) of them indicated that they knew how to block users from viewing their profiles.

The privacy settings that the preservice teachers were aware of can be seen in Table 4. These are; timeline and tagging (n=94, 84,6%), photographs, albums, wall (n=100, 90,9%), friends list (n=94, 84,6%), about section (n=90, 81%), viewing friends list (n=85, 76,5%), connection settings (n=70, 63,6%) and ads (n=154, 48,6%). Most preservice teachers knew how to adjust the

Table 3. The information preservice teachers have regarding security settings.

Security questions	Yes/No	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Does anyone else beside you know your social network password?	Yes	29	26.1
	No	82	73.9
Has your password ever changed hands?	Yes	14	12.6
	No	97	87.4
Do you know how to deactivate your account?	Yes	104	93.7
	No	7	6.3
Do you know how to block someone who looks you up online?	Yes	83	74.8
	No	28	25.2

Table 4. Frequencies of the social network privacy settings, blocked persons and shared personal information, used social networking website.

Which of the social network privacy settings do you know?	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Timeline and tagging	101	90.9
Photograph-albums- wall	100	90.9
Friends list	94	84.6
About section	90	81.0
Viewing the friends list	85	76.5
Connection settings	70	63.6
Ads	54	48.6
Who do you block on social networks?		
No one	31	27.9
Friends	30	27
Relatives	21	18.9
Harassers	20	18
Strangers	19	17.1
Abusers	10	9
Who do you share your personal information with on social networks?		
Friends	64	57.6
Family	28	25.2
Everyone	19	17.1
Other	3	2.7
Name of Social Networking Website		
Facebook	99	89.1
Twitter	12	10.8
LinkedIn, instagram, whatsup	6	5,4

privacy settings; however, only half of them knew how to block ads.

As seen in Table 4, 27,9% (n=31) of the preservice teachers stated that they did not block anyone on social networks while 27% (n=30) of them said they blocked friends, 18,9% (n=21) of them stated they blocked

Table 5. Inappropriate behaviours preservice teachers encounter on social networks (profanity, sexually explicit messages, mockery etc.).

Inappropriate behaviours	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Obscene comments, insults	48	26,5
Mockery	25	13,8
Sharing sexually explicit photographs	24	13,3
Not encountering an ethical problem	20	11
Being harrassed by someone, threats	14	7,7
Receiving insults when the person's pokes and friend requests are turned down	10	5,5
Sexually explicit ads	7	3,9
Verbal abuse	6	3,3
Insults on personal values or people who are important for the user	6	3,3
Unwanted video ads	5	2,8
Receiving viruses	5	2,8
Being ridiculed by way of manipulated photographs, being tagged in inappropriate photographs	3	1,7
Personal information and photographs being invaded, accounts being hacked	2	1,1
Being tagged in sexually explicit photographs	2	1,1
Insults on national and religious values	2	1,1
Disinformation	2	1,1

relatives, 18% (n=20) of them said they blocked harassers, 17,1% (n=19) of them said they blocked strangers and 9% (n=10) of them stated they blocked people who used abusive language. All in all, it was understood that a majority of the preservice teachers used the blocking option as a security precaution. 57,6% (n=64) of the preservice teachers indicated that they shared personal information with friends on social networks, 25,2% (n=28) of them said they shared it with family members and 17,1% (n=19) of them stated that they shared personal information with everyone. The most frequently used social network websites among the preservice teachers were Facebook 89,1% (n=99), Twitter 10,8% (n=12) and LinkedIn, Instagram, Whatsapp 5,4% (F=6).

Inappropriate behaviours that preservice teachers encountered on social networks are given in Table 5. According to the table, 11% (n=20) of the preservice teachers stated that they did not encounter any unethical behaviours while 26,5% (n=48) of them said they came across abusive comments, 13,8% (n= 25) of them said they encountered mockery, 13,3% (n=24) of them stated they faced sexually explicit photograph sharing, 7,7% (F=14) of the teachers said they came across harassment and threats, 5,5% (n=10) of them stated that they encountered insults when another user's pokes and friend requests were turned down, 3,9% (n=7) of them said they faced sexually explicit ads and the remaining 18,2% of them stated that they came across harassment, insults, video ads, tags in sexually explicit photographs, hacked accounts, unauthorized message sending and misinformation.

According to the preservice teachers, the most important ethical problems on social networks appear to be sharing personal information with the percentage of 20,9 (n=14), sharing inappropriate content 16,4% (n=11) and pestering and mockery with the percentage of 9 (n=6) (Table 6). In addition to the aforementioned behaviours, preservice teachers consider photograph copying, unauthorized use of some information, networks storing all shared items in their database, the spreading of misinformation, fake accounts, profanity, networks being used for child abuse, disturbing ads and insults against national values all to be inappropriate behaviours on social networks.

42,6% (n=49) of the preservice teachers stated that they solved the problems by blocking people, 20,9% (n=4) of them solved it by making a complaint to the website, 15,7% (n=18) of them solved the problem by unfriending the offending user and 7% (n=8) of them solved it by strengthening their privacy settings (Table 7). While 62,2% (n=69) of the preservice teachers stated that it was acceptable for students and teachers to become friends on social networks as long as they maintained boundaries, 34,2% (n=38) of them indicated that it was inappropriate (Table 8).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The study was intended for the exploration of preservice teachers' perceptions about the risks and dangers that

Table 6. The most important unethical behaviours on social networks according to preservice.

Most important ethical issues	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Personal information sharing	14	20,9
Inappropriate content sharing	11	16,4
Pestering, mockery	6	9
Copiable photographs	4	5,8
Unauthorized use of certain information	4	5,8
All shared items stored in network database	3	4,5
Disinformation sharing	3	4,5
Fake accounts	3	4,5
Profanity	3	4,5
Network as a tool for child abuse	2	3
Inappropriate ads	2	3
Insults on national values	2	3
Small children exposed to inappropriate content	1	1,5
No privacy conditions	1	1,5
Addictive networks	1	1,5
Destroyed human relationships by concepts such as like / not like	1	1,5
Feelings being hurt	1	1,5
Virus spread	1	1,5
Attention seekers	1	1,5
Personal insults	1	1,5
Disturbance with the poke option	1	1,5
The follow option	1	1,5

Table 7. How did you deal with the problem / Do you know how to deal with the problem?

Ways to deal with the problem	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Blocking	49	42,6
Making a complaint to the website	24	20,9
Unfriending	18	15,7
Hardening privacy settings	8	7
Unfollowing the relevant page	3	2,6
Ignoring	3	2,6
Not clicking	2	1,7
Hiding the post	2	1,7
Not using a social network	2	1,7
Communicating with reliable people only	2	1,7
Unliking the page	1	0,9
Liking unproblematic pages	1	0,9

Table 8. Is it proper for students to become friends with their teachers on social networks?

		Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Is it acceptable for students to become friends with their teachers on social networks?	Acceptable	69	62.2
	Unacceptable	38	34.2
	Uncertain	4	3.6

might be encountered while using social networks and helping raise awareness in them regarding the points worthy of consideration and the precautions that need to be taken in regard to the security policies on these networks. In the study that was carried out, it was seen that when the frequency of preservice teachers' usage of social networks is examined, most of the participants used the networks for 1 hour or more daily.

In the research they conducted, Göker, Demir and Doğan (2010) found that 51,9% of the university students who visited Facebook, which is one of the social networks, spent less than an hour, and 39,3% of them spent 1-2 hours on the website per visit.

It was understood that a great majority of the preservice teachers had social network memberships for 2 to 7 years. According to Akyazı and Ünal (2013), most of the university students had social network member-ships for 3 years and over. Balcı and Gölcü (2013) pointed out in the study they conducted that 27,7% of the university students were "problematic" Facebook users and the more time users spent on the site the less time they spent with people in real life and they stopped interacting in society, gradually becoming addicted to social networks.

In the study they carried out with preservice teachers, Çam and İşbulan (2012) concluded that in comparison to females, male preservice teachers were more addicted and also compared to second- or third-year students, fourth-year students were more addicted to social networks. According to Yu et al (2012), an increase in Facebook usage causes users to become psychologically addicted to internet and they also tend to show more social withdrawal.

It was understood that the preservice teachers used social networks mostly to communicate with friends, to listen to music, to follow sports teams and celebrities, and because they imitate the people around them. Göker, Demir and Doğan(2010) with Balcı and Gölcü stated that students use Facebook for the purposes of improving friendships, entertainment, relaxation, receiving information about current events and people. Results consistent with these findings were seen in the literature (Bilen et al., 2014; Kert and Kert, 2010; Mazman, 2009).

While very few of the preservice teachers shared their social network passwords with others, most of them never shared their passwords with anyone and only 12,6% of the preservice teachers stated that their passwords had ever been hacked. Most of the preservice teachers stated that they knew how to deactivate their accounts and 74,8% of them said they knew how to block people from searching for them online. With reference to the emerging results, it can be said that in general preservice teachers are aware of the issue.

Very few of the preservice teachers stated that their passwords had been hacked. Sel (2013) conducted research about passwords and according to the results of

this research, 35% of the secondary school students who took part in the study stated that their passwords had been hacked. When compared to secondary school students, it can be determined that preservice teachers behave more conscientiously about privacy settings, in which age difference plays an important role.

The social network privacy settings that preservice teachers are aware of are as follows; timeline and tagging (90,9%), photographs-albums-wall (90,9%), friends list (84,6%), about section (81%), viewing friends list (76,5%), connection settings (63,6%) and ads (48,6%). Most preservice teachers know how to use privacy settings but only half of them know how to block ads. Since social networks use free advertisement platforms, these pages direct users to pornographic or other explicit content (Varol and Aydın, 2010).It has been suggested that publishing videos in the help pages of social networks instead of text would be more useful for users who need information. According to Hew (2011), students tend to share their personal information on Facebook more than any other social network. Also the research has shown that female students use privacy settings more than male students.

27,9% of the preservice teachers have stated that they do not block anyone on social networks whereas 27% of them block friends, 18% of them block relatives, 18% of them block harassers, 17,1% of them block strangers and 9% of them block those who use profane language. In general it is understood that preservice teachers use the blocking option as a security measure. Christofides, Muise and Desmarais (2012) have indicated that adolescents who have bad experiences on social networks tend to take more security measures. They have also stated that informing adolescents in their own peer group about privacy settings and security measures will be a more protective method.

57,6% of the preservice teachers stated that they shared personal information with friends on social networks, 25,2% of them with family members and 17,1% of them shared it with everyone. According to Sel (2013), 4,7% of the secondary school students said they did not want their teachers, 8,3% their relatives, 4,7% their father, 2,3% their sisters and 2,3% their neighbour's children to view the items they shared.

Facebook is the most popular social network among preservice teachers with a percentage of 89.1. Other popular networks are Twitter with a percentage of 10,8, LinkedIn, Instagram and Whatsapp with a percentage of 5,4. The literature also suggests that the most commonly used social network is Facebook (Baran and Ata, 2013; Christofides et al., 2012; Kert and Kert, 2010; Lin and Lu, 2011; Toprak et al., 2009; Vural and Bat, 2010).

11% of the preservice teachers said that they never encountered any unethical behaviours whereas 26,5% of them stated they came across abusive comments, 13,8% of them mockery, 13,3% of them sexually explicit

photographs, 5,5% of them insults when the persons pokes and friend requests were rejected, 3,9% of them sexually explicit ads and the remaining 18,2% of them said that they encountered verbal abuse, insults, video ads, being tagged in sexually explicit photographs, accounts being hacked and unauthorized messaging. These unethical behaviours might also be referred to as cyber bullying.

Dilmaç (2009) defined cyber bullying as "Using electronic data and communication technologies for the purpose of paving the way for threatening and ongoing deliberate abuse of an individual or group by sending vulgar texts and/or visuals with the help of technology." Dilmaç also observed that 55,3% of the university students partaking in the sample became victims of cyber bullying at least once. Özdemir and Akar (2011) showed that among social networks, high school students were exposed to cyber bullying mostly on Facebook. Also, some preservice teachers considered mockery, viruses, being tagged in inappropriate photographs and insults toward friends and social or religious values a problem. Christofides et al. (2012) concluded that 26,7% of the adolescents who took part in their study had bad experiences on Facebook. 52% of the adolescents experienced harrassment and bullying from their peers, 23% of them received messages or friend requests from strangers, 17% of them shared information and photographs with others which they later regretted, and 7% of them shared items that caused misunderstandings. As a result, the issues that students and preservice teachers have encountered are parallel.

The preservice teachers consider sharing personal information as the most important unethical behaviour on social networks, with a total percentage of 20,9. Sharing explicit content and pestering and mockery follow with the percentages of 16,4, and 9, respectively. They also regard photographs being able to be copied, unauthorized use of some information, all shared items being stored by the website, misinformation, fake accounts, profanity, the potential for child abuse, disturbing ads, and insulting national values as ethical problems.

42,6% of the preservice teachers indicated that they sorted the problem out by blocking people; 20,9% of them solved it by making a complaint to the website; 15,7% of them by unfriending; and 7% of them solved the issue by increasing their privacy settings. According to the research carried out by Sel (2013), 21% of the secondary school students who participated in the study stated that they became uncomfortable with the profanity on social networks and that they blocked people who used abusive language.

While 62,2% of the preservice teachers found it acceptable for students and teachers to become friends on social networks provided that they maintain boun-daries, 34,2% of them consider it inappropriate. More than half of the preservice teachers believe that the line between the student and the teacher should not be crossed regardless of the interaction platform. According to Grosseck et al. (2011), 39,7% of the students who took part in the study replied that teachers should accept their students' friend requests on Facebook whereas 31,3% of them stated that they were uncertain and 29% of them said teachers should not accept friend requests from their students.

Özpınar et al. (2010) concluded that the reasons for displaying unethical behaviours on social networks were caused by the environmental and social circle factors, as well as the sense of anonymity created by users who post under pseudonyms and fake profiles..

According to certain studies, university students did not receive proper education on ethics and without more training in online ethics the idea could not go beyond theory and was therefore ineffective (Genç and Fidan, 2013). However, other studies suggested the education that university students received on ethics was sufficient (Özpınar et al., 2010).

Within education faculties, it is necessary to help preservice teachers develop and improve strategies to deal with ethical problems encountered in social networks; this is important not only for the teachers' own welfare but on behalf of the students they will one day be educating.

Fake profiles and unethical behaviours that specifically target women and children can cause serious psychological disorders in users. Young children, in particular, can be deceived and physically harmed. After the family, teachers have the greatest responsibility to prevent students from falling victim to misinformation, make them aware of their personal rights, and foster sensitivity to universal moralities. Teachers and preservice teachers ought to be informed about equality, respect to other opinions, human rights, personal privacy, media ethics and universal moralities with regard to online and social media content. Thus, it will be possible for them to inspire their students regarding the above mentioned values and contribute to the solution of the problems. Some suggestions for manifesting this goal include public service announcements on television and online, posters displayed in public areas and in schools, and the introduction of ethics courses at all levels of education.

Ethics

In the study, the participants were informed about the purpose of the research. Then, verbal approval was obtained from the participants who volunteered and were included in the study. They have been reported their views only be used in a scientific investigation.

Students who participated in the study are disclosed with this study on ethical issues in social networks can

increase the awareness of teachers and can provide guidance for measures to be taken.

Demographic characteristics of the participants regarding gender and age are given in Table 1. Their names have not been determined in the study in terms of to focus on cases and the ethical principles of research. However, all records are stored by the researchers.

Conflict of Interests

The authors have not declared any conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

Akyazı E, Ünal AT (2013). Purpose, Adoption and Level of Loneliness Relation and the Use of Social Networks: A Study on Undergraduate Communication Students. Global Media J.Turk. Edition 6(3):1-24.

Balcı Ş, Gölcü A (2013). Facebook Addiction Among University Students in Turkey: "Selcuk University Example". J. Stud. Turkol. 34:255-278.

Baran B, Ata F (2013). University Students' Web 2.0 Technologies Usage, Skill Levels and Educational Usage. Educ. Sci. 38(169):192-208.

Bilen K, Ercan E, Gülmez T (2014). Intended Uses and Adoption Process of Social Networks; Kahramanmaras Sutcu Imam Unıversity Example. J. Res. Educ. Teach. 3(1):115-123.

Büyükşener E (2009). The Role of Social Networking in Turkey and Social Media Overview. inet-tr'09 XIV. Proceedings of Internet Conference in Turkey. Bilgi University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Çam E, İşbulan O (2012). A New Addiction for Teacher Candidates: Social Network. Turk. Online J. Educ. Technol. 11(3):14-19.

Christofides E, Muise A, Desmarais S (2012). Risky Disclosures on Facebook: The Effect of Having a Bad Experience on Online Behavior. J. Adolesc. Res. 27(6):714-731.

Dilmaç B (2009). Psychological Needs as a Predictor of Cyber Bullying: A Preliminary Report on College Students. Educational Sciences: Theory Practice, 9(3):1291-1325.

Ellison NB, Boyd D (2013). Sociality Through Social Network Sites. In Dutton, W. H. (Ed.), The Oxford Handbook of Internet Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press pp.151-172.

Genç Z, Kazez H, Fidan A (2013). A Study of University Students' Online Unethical Behaviors. Academic Computing, Antalya, Turkey.

Göker G, Demir M, Doğan A (2010). Socialization and Sharing in The Network Society: An Empirical Research On Facebook. E-J. New World Sci. Acad. 5(2):183-206.

Gross R, Acquisti (2005). Information Revelation and Privacy in Online Social Networks (The Facebook case), Proceedings of the 2005 ACM workshop on Privacy in the electronic society, pp.71-80.

Grosseck G, Bran R, Tiru L (2011). Dear Teacher, What Should I Write on My Wall? A Case Study on Academic Uses of Facebook. Proc. Soc. Behav. Sci. 15:1425–1430.

Haddon L, Livingstone S (2012). the EU Kids Online network, EU Kids Online: National perspectives. www.eukidsonline.net.

Hew KF (2011). Students' and Teachers' Use of Facebook. Computers in Human Behavior 27, 662–676.

Kert SB, Kert A (2010). The Usage Potential of Social Network Sites for Educational Purposes . Int. Online J. Educ. Sci. 2(2):486-507

Köktürk A (2013). Assessment of Universities According to Their Social Network Usage Performance: A Case Study of Twitter and Turkish Universities. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Başkent Unıversty, Ankara, Turkey.

Lin HY, Lu KP (2011). Why People Use Social Networking Sites: An Empirical Study Integrating Network Externalities and Motivation Theory. Comput. Hum. Behav. 27(3):1152-1161.

Litt E (2013). Understanding Social Network Site Users' Privacy Tool Use. Comput. Hum. Behav. 29:1649–1656.

Mazman SG (2009). Adoption Process of Social Network and Their Usage in Educational Context. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Hacettepe Universty, Ankara, Turkey.

Miles MB, Huberman AM (1994). Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook. (Second Edition). California: SAGE Publications.

Özdemir M, Akar F (2011). Examination of High School Students' Opinions on Cyberbullying in Terms of Various Variables. Educational Administration: Theory Pract. 17(4):605-626.

Özpınar A, Kazeskeroğlu E, Öz Ö (2010). Unethical Behavior and Causes in Access to Information, Sharing and in the Field of Information Technology. III. Network and Information Security Symposium, Ankara, Turkey.

Quintly (2013, June). Facebook Country Stats. http://www.quintly.com/facebook-country-statistics/turkey/?period=1month. Accessed date: 27.06.2013.

Sel H (2013). Access, Security and Privacy Dimensions of the Middle School Students' Use of Facebook Academic Computing, 23-25.

Siemens G (2005). Connectivism: A Learning Theory for The Digital Age. International Journal of Instructional Technology & Distance Learning. Retrieved from http://www.elearnspace.org/Articles/connectivism.htm.

Statistic Brain Research Institute, (2014). Twitter Statistics. http://www.statisticbrain.com/twitter-statistics/ Accessed date: 26.5.2014.

TGNA Commission Report, (2012). The Commission Report of Parliamentary Research was Established to Investigate the Social Impact About the Information Society Becoming The use of the Internet and ICT Industry Developments Especially in Children, Adolescents and the Family Structure. Ankara. http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/sirasayi/donem24/yil01/ ss381.pdf Accessed date: 21.05.2013

Toprak A, Yıldırım A, Aygül E, Binark M, Börekçi S, Çomu T (2009). Social Networking Facebook: I Seen Therefore I'm!". İstanbul: Kaldeon Publications, 1st edition, Turkey.

Varol A, Aydin O (2010). "Social Network Analysis: A Case Study in Turkey", 7th International Conference on Intellectual Capital, Knowledge Management & Organisational Learning, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, China, 11-12 November 2010, pp.471-479.

Vural ZBA, Bat M (2010). Social Media As a New Communication Environment: A Research on Ege University Faculty of Communication. J. Yaşar University 20(5):3348-3382.

Washington Post (2010). Internet: "Teens Bold Blogs Alarm School Area". internet address: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpdyn/content/article/2006/01/16/AR 2006011601489.html, 2010.

Yavanoğlu U, Sağıroğlu Ş, Çolak I (2012). Information Security Threats and Taking Privacy Precausions in Social Networks. J. Polytechnic 15(1):15-27.

Yıldırım A, Şimşek H (2005). Qualitative Research Methods in the Social Sciences. Ankara: Seçkin Publishing, Turkey.

Yu S, Hsu W, Yu M, Hsu H (2012) Is the use of Social Networking Sites Correlated with Internet Addiction? Facebook Use Among Taiwanese College Students. World Acad. Sci. Eng. Technol. 68:1659.