



## Assessing New Media Literacies in Social Work Education: The Development and Validation of a Comprehensive Assessment Instrument

Jimmy A. Young

To cite this article: Jimmy A. Young (2015) Assessing New Media Literacies in Social Work Education: The Development and Validation of a Comprehensive Assessment Instrument, Journal of Technology in Human Services, 33:1, 72-86, DOI: [10.1080/15228835.2014.998577](https://doi.org/10.1080/15228835.2014.998577)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15228835.2014.998577>



Published online: 17 Feb 2015.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 172



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

## **Assessing New Media Literacies in Social Work Education: The Development and Validation of a Comprehensive Assessment Instrument**

JIMMY A. YOUNG

*University of Nebraska–Kearney, Kearney, Nebraska*

*The focus of this article is to replicate the validity and reliability of a newly developed assessment tool for self-reported media literacy levels by assessing the new media literacy levels of social work students and educators. The study is grounded in the New Media Literacies (NML) framework and the concept of participatory culture. Findings indicate a significant difference between the levels of new media literacy of students and educators. Students were also found to be more engaged with new media. The study demonstrates the need to incorporate new media literacies into the social work curriculum to increase the digital competencies of both educators and students. Implications for social work education and future research are suggested.*

**KEYWORDS** *assessment, education, social media, technology literacy*

In 2005, the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) and the Association of Social Work Boards (ASWB) identified Standards for Technology and Social Work Practice. The standards guide the ethical and competent delivery of social work services through electronically mediated activity. This activity is generally operationalized through the use of information and communication technologies or ICTs, which are defined as “technologies used to convey, manipulate and store data by electronic means” (Perron, Taylor, Glass, & Margerum-Leys, 2010, p. 67). The past decade has seen an increase in the literature on the use of ICTs in social work education and practice (Beaulaurier & Radisch, 2005; Coe & Elliot, 1999; Holmes, Hermann,

---

Received August 12, 2014; accepted November 7, 2014.

Address correspondence to Jimmy A. Young, Department of Social Work, University of Nebraska-Kearney, 2022 Founders Hall, Kearney, NE 68849-1270. E-mail: [youngja2@unk.edu](mailto:youngja2@unk.edu)

& Kozlowski, 2014; McNutt, 2008; McNutt & Menon, 2008; Quinn & Fitch, 2014; Thyer, Artlet, Markward, & Dozier, 1998; Vernon, Vakalahi, Pierce, Pittman-Munke, & Adkins, 2009; Wolfson, Marsom, & Magnuson, 2005). However, some have argued that ICTs are not being addressed in the social work classroom in a manner that can prepare students for professional practice (Ayala, 2009; Parrot & Madoc-Jones, 2008; Perron et al., 2010; Quinn & Fitch, 2014; York, 2008). Perron et al. (2010) assert, “competencies with ICT and ICT literacy should be required learning outcomes in social work education and continuing education” (p. 69). Literacy with information communication technology is defined as knowing the major concepts and language associated with ICTs, whereas competency is defined as having the skills and knowledge to understand and use ICTs for a specific purpose (Perron et al., 2010).

The challenge with increasing knowledge and skills related to information communication technologies begins with understanding how to assess one’s level of competency with digital technologies or one’s level of media literacy. Media literacy has been referred to as “the ability to access, analyze, evaluate, and communicate messages in a wide variety of forms” (Hobbs, 1998, p. 16). Media literacy is generally concerned with learning and teaching skills to critically analyze and create messages in a variety of print or digital forms (Hobbs, 1998). For the purpose of this study, ICTs are referred to as New Media and New media defined represents what ICTs are but extends the definition to include more of the interactive nature of today’s technological environment such as social media and other digital technologies (Potter, 2013). “This new media environment is characterized by the four inter-related features of technological convergence, interactivity, information saturation, and a shift in marketing” (Potter, 2013, p. 233). A key component of this environment is the expansion of participatory cultures that are coalescing around diverse interests, whether they are political, religious, economic, or purely personal (Potter, 2013). The new media environment has changed the way individuals interact with one another and is having a dramatic impact on education (Hedberg, 2011; Jenkins, Clinton, Purushotma, Robison, & Weigel, 2009; Losh & Jenkins, 2012; Rheingold, 2012, 2013). New media has altered the meaning of literacy to require new habits of mind, new ways of processing culture and interacting with the world (Jenkins et al., 2009). Utilizing the definition of new media allows a reconceptualization of media literacy or new media literacies for the 21st century.

The purpose of this study is to replicate the validity and reliability of a newly developed assessment tool for self-reported media literacy levels (Literat, 2014), and to assess the new media literacy levels of social work students and educators. The study is grounded in the New Media Literacies (NML) framework and the concept of participatory culture as identified by Jenkins et al. (2009). The NML framework and participatory culture resonates with the ecological perspective of the social work profession because it envisions people as active participants in the environment, or the new digital

environment. “The emphasis is not just on how people respond to media messages, but also on how they engage proactively in a media world where production, participation, social group formation, and high levels of nonprofessional expertise are prevalent” (Gee, 2010, p. 36). The concept of participatory culture and the NML framework are further described as follows.

## PARTICIPATORY CULTURE AND NMLs

The new media landscape has amplified the effects of what Henry Jenkins describes as Participatory Culture. “Participatory culture is a culture with relatively low barriers to artistic expression and civic engagement, strong support for creating and sharing creations, and some type of informal mentorship whereby experienced participants pass along knowledge to novices” (Jenkins et al., 2009, p. 3). Participatory culture includes the opportunity for freedom of expression by remixing digital content to share messages in online communities such as Facebook or YouTube. Participatory culture provides the opportunity to work in teams and use collaborative problem solving to develop new knowledge such as through Wikipedia; and participatory culture shapes the flow of media content through blogging, videos, and podcasts (Jenkins et al., 2009). To be clear, participatory culture is not simply Web 2.0 or social media. Jenkins would argue that participatory culture existed before the Internet but that social media tools have expanded the opportunities of participatory culture (TEDxTalks, 2010).

The participatory aspects of social media build on the foundation of traditional research skills, technical skills, and critical analysis taught in the classroom by identifying a framework for NMLs (Jenkins et al., 2009). The NML framework includes:

**Play:** the capacity to experiment with one’s surroundings as a form of problem solving. **Performance:** the ability to adopt alternative identities for the purpose of improvisation and discovery. **Simulation:** the ability to interpret and construct dynamic models of real-world processes. **Appropriation:** the ability to meaningfully sample and remix media content. **Multitasking:** the ability to scan one’s environment and shift focus as needed to salient details. **Distributed Cognition:** the ability to interact meaningfully with tools that expand mental capacities. **Collective Intelligence:** the ability to pool knowledge and compare notes with others toward a common goal. **Judgment:** the ability to evaluate the reliability and credibility of different information sources. **Transmedia Navigation:** the ability to follow the flow of stories and information across multiple modalities. **Networking:** the ability to search for, synthesize, and disseminate information. **Negotiation:** the ability to travel across diverse communities, discerning and respecting multiple perspectives, and grasping and following alternative norms. **Visualization:** the ability to translate information into visual models and understand the

information visual models are communicating as a key method for coping with large data sets and being able to make sense of the complexity of our environment. (Jenkins et al., 2009, p. 4)

It is important to note that the NMLs are not meant to supplant traditional literacy skills. Students need to have the traditional literacy skills to be able to expand their knowledge of how to search for information, critically evaluate the credibility of information, synthesize and make sense of information to help construct arguments, make appropriate decisions, and/or move towards action. The difference with NMLs is that they should also be seen as social skills or methods of interaction within larger communities, and not simply an individualized skill set to be used for personal reasons (Jenkins et al., 2009). This is important when thinking about how students are becoming more culturally aware or culturally competent practitioners. Consumers today present with challenges associated to their digital lives such as challenges with cyber-bullying and Internet safety or the influence of social media on behaviors (Gustavsson & MacEachron, 2013; Vaterlaus, Patten, Roche, & Young, 2015). Students need to be ready to understand those challenges as well as being able to use creative and innovative techniques that harness the power of new media. In doing so they can model appropriate use of technology, educate consumers, and engage them in more meaningful ways such as with the use of virtual ecomaps (Gustavsson & MacEachron, 2013). Recognizing and infusing NMLs into the social work curriculum can help prepare students to respond to these new developments, use critical thinking skills, creativity, and engage in research-informed practice and practice informed research. Students are already using many of the NMLs identified previously, but without fully recognizing it. Highlighting NMLs as both technical and social skills may help to increase technological or digital competencies among students as well as increasing understanding of participatory culture and its effects on the digital environment as well as that of the consumer.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The use of new media, including social media and digital technologies such as mobile devices, has flourished across higher education. Social work educators are using Twitter and other social media to engage students through innovative assignments (Hitchcock & Battista, 2013; Young, 2014). Others have used social media in conjunction with Learning Management Systems to improve social work education in remote areas (Kilpeläinen, Pääkkönen, & Sankala, 2011). Additionally, universities and various classes are adopting smart classrooms and incorporating the use of devices such as iPads to augment student learning (Baldrige, McAdams, Reed, & Moran, 2013; Young, 2014). For a historical review of instructional technology in social work education, see Shorkey and Uebel (2014).

A defining point in the literature revolves around the notion of developing the skills and knowledge to use information communication technologies, or new media, in education to help students learn and be prepared for the changing nature of social work practice (Hitchcock & Battista, 2013; McNutt, 2008; McNutt & Menon, 2008; Moore, 2005; Mukherjee & Clark, 2012; Parrot & Madoc-Jones, 2008; Perron et al., 2010; Quinn & Fitch, 2014). It is important to understand how and where to use new media to promote learning and sound pedagogy rather than try to replace proper teaching methods with new technological tools (Parrot & Madoc-Jones, 2008; Perron et al., 2010; Young, 2014). Despite this point, little evidence exists that assesses the skills and knowledge of social work students and educators with new media such as Facebook, Twitter, mobile devices, and digital technologies.

Several authors have written about millennial students and their abilities with technology often assuming that because they are young or because they consume digital content that they know or understand new media better than their older counterparts (Hedberg, 2011; Prensky, 2001a, 2001b). This assumption is disingenuous and may even be detrimental to the learning process (Koutropoulos, 2011). Just as we would not traditionally assume that someone is literate if they can read but not write, we should not assume that someone possesses media literacy if they can consume but cannot express themselves (Jenkins, 2006, p. 170). This also holds true for using new media in the educational process as students have indicated satisfaction for using new media such as iPads or Twitter, but struggle when applying it to their learning (Helsper & Eynon, 2010; Ransdell, Kent, Gaillard-Kenney, & Long, 2011; Young, 2014).

## METHODOLOGY

The main objective of this study is to replicate the validity and reliability of a newly developed instrument for self-reported media literacy levels (Lerat, 2014). The research questions consist of whether the subscales of the survey instrument map well onto the NML framework (Jenkins et al., 2009), and to assess the level of digital participation of social work students and educators as determined by their level of media literacy. Specifically, the hypothesis for the study is that higher levels of NML will predict a higher degree of engagement with new media.

### Survey Design

This study utilized a cross-sectional survey design that was approved by the Institutional Review Board. Cross-sectional studies have improved internal validity with the advances of multivariate statistics and are beneficial for studies seeking larger samples (Rubin & Babbie, 2005). The survey instrument

was graciously provided by Ioana Literat (2014) and adapted for this study. Changes were made to distinguish social work students from social work educators, but the sections on media use habits and NMLs were not changed in order to add reliability and validity to the psychometric properties of the instrument. Demographic questions sought information related to gender, age, social work student or educator, level of education or faculty position, and ethnicity. The next section asked for information regarding digital participation such as access to the Internet, number of hours spent on the Internet or consuming media messages, playing games, number of hours engaged on social media sites, in addition to number of hours engaged reading books or newspapers that are not online. The third section is the most important and aims to assess participants' NML skills by presenting them with a randomized series of 60 statements about their personality, social, and cultural modes of engagement, online and offline peer interaction, learning styles, and media consumption and creation patterns (Literat, 2014, p. 17). The statements were conceptually built from the NML framework identified by Jenkins et al. (2009). It is important to note that the statements include both technology related and nontechnology related behaviors in accordance with the view that NML skills are social and cultural competencies (Jenkins et al., 2009; Literat, 2014). The questions were assessed on the same 5-point Likert scale (1 [*Strongly Disagree*], 5 [*Strongly Agree*]) used in Literat's (2014) study.

## Sample

The sampling frame for this study included social work educators and students who participate in the use of social media as well as those who do not. Participants were recruited nationally using social media websites and e-mail list serves. The sample size for this study consisted of social work students (N = 161) and social work educators (N = 150) for a total size of N = 311. The gender distribution of the sample contained 72 males, 238 females, and 1 individual who chose not to identify. In regards to ethnicity, 78.8% of the participants were White, 8% were African American, 3.9% were Hispanic, and 3.5% were Asian. The average age of participants was 35.9 (SD = 15.8). A distribution of participants' education and faculty status by student and educator is provided in Table 1.

## Data Collection

The study followed the same design as Literat (2014) by making the survey instrument available as a fun personality quiz where participants received a personalized media literacy score at the end of the survey based on their responses, which helped to increase participation. Qualtrics web-based survey software was used to create the questionnaire and a link was shared via social media such as Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn, and Blogs as well as

**TABLE 1** Distribution of Education and Faculty Status

	Students	Educators
Education		
Current BSW Student	107 (34.4%)	
Current MSW Student	41 (13.2%)	
Current PhD/DSW	10 (3.2%)	
Other	3 (1.0%)	
Faculty status		
Lecturer		36 (11.6%)
Field Director		6 (1.9%)
Assistant Professor		45 (14.5%)
Associate Professor		33 (10.6%)
Professor		30 (9.6%)
Total N responding = 311	161 (51.8%)	150 (48.2%)

the Association for Baccalaureate Program Directors (BPD) and Masters in Social Work (MSW-L) e-mail Listservs. A true response rate could not be calculated because of the data collection method and the uncertainty regarding the number of views the survey link received via social media. However, Qualtrics does provide a survey completion rate, which was 67.5%. In total, 175 participants responded to the survey via e-mail and 136 responded via social media.

### Data Analysis

The data were exported into SPSS version 22 for prescreening and analysis. Prescreening data involves examining the data set for errors, missing data, outliers, linearity, and ensuring that the data fit the assumptions of the statistical procedures (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Prescreening the data helps to increase the validity of the study and an assessment of the data and linearity suggest there are no major concerns. Descriptive statistics were used to help illustrate the sample and multivariate statistics were used to address the research questions. Specifically, Factor Analysis was employed to determine whether the subscales of the survey instrument map well onto Jenkins' 12 NMLs, and the multivariate analysis was completed just as was done in the original study (Literat, 2014).

### Results

The primary research question of this study follows that of Literat (2014) to determine whether this instrument measures NML by breaking down the components that were similar to the NML's skills identified by Jenkins et al. (2009). Collectively, the scale maintains high reliability through testing of internal consistency with Cronbach's alpha of .917, where the literature suggests an alpha of .70 or higher (Carmines & Zeller, 1979; Tabachnick, & Fidell, 2007; Vogt, 1999). A principal components factor analysis with Varimax rotation

was performed using SPSS. The value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of the sampling adequacy of the correlation matrix for factor analysis was 0.850, which is strong.

Criteria for retaining factors included (a) an Eigen value greater than one, (b) total variance explained, and (c) a factor threshold of 0.50. The factor analysis yielded 16 factors with Eigen values above 1.00, which explained 61.5% of the variance. The subscales that loaded together in the model and mapped onto the NML's skills were: negotiation, networking, multitasking, judgment, appropriation, performance, simulation, transmedia navigation, and collective intelligence. The reliability of these subscales was found to be satisfactory (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .866$ ).

Literat (2014) discovered 10 out of the 12 NML's skills, and the current study discovered nine of the 12 NML's skills that were identified as competencies of media literacy. Although this is less than the original study it is still encouraging because all 60 items in the scale were randomized so that each of the questions that made up the 12 subscales never appeared together. The NML's skills that did not distinctly emerge from the factor analysis were distributed cognition, visualization, and play. Rather than the questions for these subscales loading together on distinct factor components, the items were spread out over different subscales.

### Media Use and NMLs

The hypothesis for this study is that higher levels of NMLs will predict a higher degree of engagement with new media. Nine new variables were created as composite subscales from the identified components in the factor analysis by calculating the aggregate mean of their constituent items. Multivariate analysis of variance was used to test the hypothesis and determine the variations in NML's skills among students and educators. Social Work students and educators were used as the dependent variables and the nine NML's skills were used as independent variables.

The multivariate difference in degree of engagement with media was not significant using Wilks' Lambda  $F(3, 235) = 4.83, p = 0.058$ . The univariate differences between students and educators were significant only in the area

**TABLE 2** Difference Between Students & Educators Number of Hours Engaged with Media

Media type	Status	Mean	Std. deviation	N <sup>a</sup>
Hours spent on the Internet in a week	Student	28.10	20.45	134
	Educator	29.06	15.71	105
Hours spent playing games online in a week <sup>b</sup>	Student	7.46	10.33	134
	Educator	3.89	4.77	105
Hours spent reading books or newspapers (not online)	Student	11.05	10.33	134
	Educator	12.32	10.45	105

<sup>a</sup>Total N Responding = 239. <sup>b</sup>Relationship is significant at the 0.05 level.

**TABLE 3** Difference Between Students and Educators New Media Literacy Levels

New media literacy	Status	Mean	Std. deviation
Negotiation	Student	3.83	.577
	Educator	3.82	.664
Networking <sup>a</sup>	Student	3.66	.602
	Educator	3.51	.867
Multitasking <sup>a</sup>	Student	3.69	.623
	Educator	3.59	.737
Judgment	Student	4.06	.463
	Educator	4.31	.443
Appropriation	Student	3.19	.636
	Educator	2.88	.716
Performance	Student	2.96	.598
	Educator	2.92	.558
Simulation <sup>a</sup>	Student	3.60	.496
	Educator	3.47	.637
Transmedia Navigation <sup>a</sup>	Student	3.69	.552
	Educator	3.60	.650
Collective Intelligence	Student	3.86	.439
	Educator	4.06	.487
Total Responding	Student (N = 161)		
	Educator (N = 150)		

<sup>a</sup>Relationship is significant at 0.05 level.

of number of hours spent playing games online ( $F(1, 237) = 10.78, p = 0.001$ ), where students indicated they spent more hours engaged with this type of media. Table 2 provides the mean for students and educators in the three areas that measure engagement with the media.

The multivariate difference in media literacy levels was in fact significant ( $F(9, 301) = 10.03, p < 0.05$ ) across all levels of NML skills. Students scored higher than educators in seven of the nine areas as shown in Table 3. Univariate differences between students and educators were prominent in the areas of networking ( $F(1, 309) = 3.22, p < 0.05$ ), simulation ( $F(1, 309) = 4.00, p < 0.05$ ), transmedia navigation ( $F(1, 309) = 1.91, p < 0.05$ ), and multitasking ( $F(1, 309) = 1.45, p < 0.05$ ).

## DISCUSSION

The objective of this study was to replicate the validity and reliability of a newly developed survey instrument that measures NMLs (Literate, 2014), in accordance with the NML's framework developed by Jenkins et al. (2009). The results of the factor analysis indicate that most of the subscales map well onto the framework with 9 of the 12 NMLs being identified and maintaining adequate reliability. A promising finding for this instrument is that between the two studies seven similar subscales emerged from the factor analysis from different samples. The constructs of negotiation, networking, judgment,

multitasking, appropriation, performance, and transmedia navigation emerged from both studies. Examining the NML's skills that emerged for social work students and educators may explain the difference in the subscales that emerged for the current study versus those discovered by Literat (2014). Future research should focus on the questions related to the remaining items to increase the probability of those items loading together on a component in a factor analysis model. For instance, one participant stated that the questions in the instrument seemed to relate too much to pop culture or younger people. A qualitative research design may be needed to develop better questions for the instrument and the related NML's skills they seek to measure. This may help to increase the construct validity of the instrument.

The hypothesis that there would be a difference between the NML's skills was supported as students scored higher in more areas than social work educators. This supports the view that increased engagement with new media requires competencies for full participation in the digital environment (Jenkins et al., 2009). Examining the number of hours engaged with media may also explain why students scored higher than educators in NMLs as students spend more time playing games online or on their phones. Despite the argument for distraction with this type of media, the NML's theoretical framework and concept of participatory culture illustrates how students are learning differently in a digital environment. They are using the skills of multitasking, judgment, play, appropriation, and performance to achieve some desired outcome and the reality is that there are tangible skills being learned in gaming and digital environments (Adachi & Willoughby, 2012; Dougherty & Andercheck, 2014; Gee, 2010; Granic, Lobel, & Engels, 2014; Jarvis, 2011; Jenkins et al., 2009). These skills are transferrable to practice in many diverse areas, such as in the use of social media in community organizing and digital activism, the voluntary sector, and clinical practice (Brady, Young, & McLeod, *in press*; Guo & Saxton, 2014; Mishna, Bogo, Root, & Fantus, 2014; Saxton & Wang, 2014; Young, 2014).

## Implications

This study represents one of the first attempts to measure NMLs of social work students and educators. The data gathered will be instrumental to further refine the assessment instrument to measure the NMLs identified in the Jenkins et al. (2009) framework. This study compliments the view of the ecological perspective within the social work profession where individuals are seen as part of an overall environment, an environment that impacts their day-to-day life. Including this expanded view of the digital environment in the ecological perspective is critical for social work practice as consumers are now immersed in technology (Mishna et al., 2014). Assessing the level of NMLs in education can help to further increase these skills and incorporate innovative methods for addressing digital competencies in social work education. A particularly strong finding is the fact that the study supported a connection between engagement with

digital media and NMLs, where higher NMLs were predicted based on the amount of time engaged with digital media. Clearly more research is needed to confirm this finding by implementing a strong and rigorous research design. Perhaps utilizing a pretest and posttest design to assess the level of NMLs over time would be able to support this finding.

The literature argues for increased competency in regards to digital technology and ICTs. What is missing in the discussion is the point of participatory culture and how individuals are learning tangible skills by engaging with digital media to increase their own NMLs. Although the findings in this study support this idea, it needs to be reiterated that media literacy does not increase simply through consumption of new media by engaging with Facebook or watching YouTube videos. Rather, NML aids in understanding how to conduct oneself in the online environment and how to use newly developed skills. Thoughtful consideration of how NMLs are both social and technical skills can help practitioners understand the impact of the digital environment on their consumers. This knowledge may be useful in social work education as the use of technology, specifically social media, continues to increase in social work practice (Holmes et al., 2014; Mishna et al., 2014). Furthermore, these digital interactions often impact real-life events whether it is in education through the use of social media and iPads (Hitchcock & Battista, 2013; Young, 2014) or in the helping process such as cyber communication or online therapy (Gustavsson & MacEachron, 2013; Mishna et al., 2014).

Limitations to this study include the content of the survey, length, and the recruitment strategy, which utilized social media and e-mail. This strategy implies an inherent bias towards individuals that may already have a higher level of new media literacy. The survey consisted of 80 questions that required about 20 min to complete. This amount of time is manageable but as noted in the discussion section, item questions need to be reevaluated to ensure they load on the appropriate factor. Furthermore, reducing the number of component items or questions would make completing the survey much more practicable and mitigate the number of incomplete responses. The content of the questions in the survey were designed primarily for assessment in educational contexts with younger participants (Literat, 2014). As one participant noted via social media to this author, the survey seemed to be geared towards a younger audience. Literat (2014) had a similar comment and thus I would follow her recommendation that distinct versions of the survey may need to be developed based on the characteristics of the target population.

## CONCLUSION

Social work education can further build upon NML's skills to impact the profession and prepare students for the challenges they face in an increasingly technological society. This study represents one of the first attempts to study

NMLs among social work students and educators as the area of NMLs continues to emerge. The NASW/ASWB (2005) Standards for Technology and Social Work Practice provide a great starting point for understanding how to use technology ethically and appropriately. In addition, the most recent draft of the 2015 Council on Social Work Education Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) includes a statement on using technology “ethically and appropriately to facilitate practice outcomes” (p. 3). However, these standards neglect to address technological competency (Quinn & Fitch, 2014). The NML framework may offer the ability to further understand the digital world and increase competencies regarding the use of technology and its impact on various systemic levels. Assessing the level of NMLs in social work education can help to develop methods for increasing the knowledge and skills of social work students to increase digital competencies as well as the ethical use of technology.

New media, such as Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, and other digital technologies are changing social work education and practice. Social workers respond to contexts that shape practice, use critical thinking skills augmented by creativity and curiosity, and engage in research-informed practice and practice informed research. These are skills that complement the concept of participatory culture and NMLs, and this study provides a starting point to discuss the place of NMLs in social work education. Human relationships, behavior, and interactions are increasingly mediated through technology and research continues to emerge regarding this topic area. Future research should also focus on NMLs and social work practice, which may also help to inform how to include the topic of NMLs in social work education.

Finally, a common misunderstanding of technology is the focus on what the tools do and do not allow. The conversation on digital technology and learning needs to include a focus on the participatory aspects of this new digital culture and how increasing knowledge around NMLs can address the challenges we face as social work educators and the challenge of our students entering the profession. Expanding our view of new media, digital technology, and understanding participatory culture will help social work students to build upon the skills they bring to the classroom. Evaluating the level of NMLs provides a baseline from which to begin moving forward as social work educators have the exciting opportunity to empower students to build upon those skills by incorporating NMLs in a way that will expand knowledge, create opportunities for collaboration, and prepare students for ethical and appropriate social work practice in a new and diverse society.

## REFERENCES

- Adachi, P. J. C., & Willoughby, T. (2012). Do video games promote positive youth development? *Journal of Adolescent Research, 28*(2), 155–165. doi:10.1177/0743558412464522

- Ayala, J. S. (2009). Blended learning as a new approach to social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education, 45*(2), 277–288.
- Baldrige, S., McAdams, A., Reed, A., & Moran, A. (2013). Mobile classrooms: Using mobile devices to enhance BSW education. *Journal of Baccalaureate Social Work, 18*, 18–35.
- Beaulaurier, R. L., & Radisch, M. A. (2005). Responding to CSWE technology guidelines. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 25*(1/2), 129–150.
- Brady, S. R., Young, J. A., & McLeod, D. A. (in press). Utilizing digital advocacy in community organizing: Lessons learned from organizing in virtual spaces to promote worker rights and economic justice. *Journal of Community Practice*.
- Carmines, E. G., & Zeller, R. A. (1979). *Reliability and validity assessment*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Coe, J., & Elliott, D. (1999). An evaluation of teaching direct practice courses in a distance education program for rural settings. *Journal of Social Work Education, 35*(3), 353–365.
- Council on Social Work Education. (2015, October). *Draft 1 of the 2015 Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS)*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Dougherty, K. D., & Andercheck, B. (2014). Using Facebook to engage learners in a large introductory course. *Teaching Sociology, 42*(2), 95–104. doi:10.1177/0092055x14521022
- Gee, J. P. (2010). *New digital media and learning as an emerging area and “worked examples” as one way forward*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Granic, I., Lobel, A., & Engels, R. (2014). The benefits of playing video games. *American Psychologist, 69*(1), 66–78. doi:10.1037/a0034857
- Guo, C., & Saxton, G. D. (2014). Tweeting social change: How social media are changing nonprofit advocacy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 43*(1), 57–79. doi:10.1177/0899764012471585.
- Gustavsson, N. S., & MacEachron, A. E. (2013). The virtual ecomap: A diagrammatic tool for assessing the digital world of clients. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services, 94*(4), 243–250. doi:10.1606/1044-3894.4316
- Hedberg, J. G. (2011). Towards a disruptive pedagogy: Changing classroom practice with technologies and digital content. *Educational Media International, 48*(1), 1–16.
- Helsper, E. J., & Eynon, R. (2010). Digital natives: Where is the evidence? *British Educational Research Journal, 36*(3), 503–520. doi:10.1080/01411920902989227
- Hitchcock, L. I., & Battista, A. (2013). Social media for professional practice: Integrating twitter with social work pedagogy. *The Journal of Baccalaureate Social Work, 18*(special issue), 33–45.
- Hobbs, R. (1998). The seven great debates in the media literacy movement. *Journal of Communications, 48*(1), 16–32.
- Holmes, C., Hermann, K., & Kozlowski, K. (2014). Integrating Web 2.0 technologies in educational and clinical settings: An isomorphic perspective. *Journal of Technology in Human Services, 32*(1/2), 65–80. doi:10.1080/15228835.2013.860363
- Jarvis, J. (2011). *Public parts: How sharing in the digital age improves the way we work and live*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

- Jenkins, H., Clinton, K., Purushotma, R., Robison, A. J., & Weigel, M. (2009). Confronting the challenges of participatory culture: Media education for the 21st century [white paper]. Retrieved from [http://digitalllearning.macfound.org/atf/cf/%7B7E45C7E0-A3E0-4B89-AC9C-E807E1B0AE4E%7D/JENKINS\\_WHITE\\_PAPER.PDF](http://digitalllearning.macfound.org/atf/cf/%7B7E45C7E0-A3E0-4B89-AC9C-E807E1B0AE4E%7D/JENKINS_WHITE_PAPER.PDF)
- Kilpeläinen, A., Pyykkönen, K., & Sankala, J. (2011). The use of social media to improve social work education in remote areas. *The Journal of Technology in Human Services, 29*(1), 1–12. doi:10.1080/15228835.2011.572609
- Koutropoulos, A. (2011). Digital natives: Ten years after. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 7*(4).
- Literat, I. (2014). Measuring new media literacies: Towards the development of a comprehensive assessment tool. *Journal of Media Literacy Education, 6*(1), 15–27.
- Losh, E., & Jenkins, H. (2012). Can public education coexist with participatory culture? *Knowledge Quest, 41*(1), 16–21.
- McNutt, J. G. (2008). Web 2.0 tools for policy research and advocacy. *Journal of Policy Practice, 7*(1), 81–85. doi:10.1080/15588740801909994
- McNutt, J. G., & Menon, G. M. (2008). The rise of cyberactivism: Implications for the future of advocacy in the human services. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services, 89*(1), 33–38. doi:10.1606/1044-3894.3706
- Mishna, F., Bogo, M., Root, J., & Fantus, S. (2014). Here to stay: Cyber communication as a complement in social work practice. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services, 95*(3), 179–168. doi:10.1606/1044-3894.2014.95.23
- Moore, B. (2005). Key issues in web-based education in the human services: A review of the literature. *Journal of Technology in Human Services, 23*(1/2), 11–28. doi:10.1300/J017v017n01\_02
- Mukherjee, D., & Clark, J. (2012). Students' participation in social networking sites: Implications for social work education. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 32*(2), 161–173.
- National Association of Social Workers. (2005). *NASW and ASWB standards for technology and social work practice*. Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- Parrott, L., & Madoc-Jones, I. (2008). Reclaiming information and communication technologies for empowering social work practice. *Journal of Social Work, 8*(2), 181–197. doi:10.1177/1468017307084739
- Perron, B. E., Taylor, H. O., Glass, J. E., & Margerum-Leys, J. (2010). Information and communication technologies in social work. *Advances in Social Work, 11*(1), 67–81.
- Potter, W. J. (2013). The expanding role for media literacy in the age of participatory cultures. In A. Delwhiche & J. J. Henderson (Eds.), *The participatory cultures handbook* (pp. 232–243). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Prensky, M. (2001a). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon, 9*(5).
- Prensky, M. (2001b). Digital natives, digital immigrants: Do they really think different? *On the Horizon, 9*(6), 1–6.
- Quinn, A., & Fitch, D. (2014). A conceptual framework for contextualizing information technology competencies. *Journal of Technology in Human Services, 32*(1/2), 133–148. doi:10.1080/15228835.2013.860367

- Ransdell, S., Kent, B., Gaillard-Kenney, S., & Long, J. (2011). Digital immigrants fare better than digital natives due to social reliance. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 42(6), 931–938. doi:10.1111/j.1467–8535.2010.01137.x
- Rheingold, H. (2012). *Net smart: How to thrive online*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rheingold, H. (2013). Participative pedagogy for a literacy of literacies. In A. Delwhiche & J. J. Henderson (Eds.), *The participatory cultures handbook* (pp. 232–243). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (2005). *Research methods for social work* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thompson Learning, Inc.
- Saxton, G. D., & Wang, L. (2014). The social network effect: The determinants of giving through social media. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(5), 850–868. doi:10.1177/0899764013485159
- Shorkey, C. T., & Uebel, M. (2014). History and development of instructional technology and media in social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 50(2), 247–261.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- TEDxTalks. (2010, April 13). *TEDxNYED - Henry Jenkins - 03/06/10* [Video podcast]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AFCLKa0XRlw>
- Thyer, B., Artlet, T., Markward, M., & Dozier, C. (1998). Evaluating distance learning in social work education: A replication study. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 34(2), 291–296.
- Vaterlaus, J. M., Patten, E. V., Roche, C., & Young, J. A. (2015). #Gettinghealthy: The perceived influence of social media on young adult health behaviors. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 45(1), 151–157. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2014.12.013
- Vernon, R., Vakalahi, H., Pierce, D., Pittman-Munke, P., & Adkins, L. F. (2009). Distance education programs in social work: Current and emerging trends. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 45(2), 263–276.
- Vogt, W. P. (1999). *Dictionary of statistics & methodology: A nontechnical guide for the social sciences* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wolfson, G., Marsom, G., & Magnuson, C. (2005). Changing the nature of the discourse: Teaching field seminars online. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 41(2), 355–361.
- York, R. (2008). Comparing three modes of instruction in a graduate social work program. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 44(2), 157–172.
- Young, J. (2014). iPolicy: Exploring and evaluating the use of iPads in a social welfare policy course. *Journal of Technology in Human Services*, 32(1/2), 39–53.