

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

“Doctors can’t be doctors all of the time”: a qualitative study of how general practitioners and medical students negotiate public- professional and private-personal realms using social media

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-047991
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	16-Dec-2020
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Marshal, Megan; Health Research Institute, University of Limerick School of Medicine</p> <p>Niranjan, Vikram; Health Research Institute, University of Limerick School of Medicine</p> <p>Spain, Eimear; Health Research Institute, University of Limerick School of Medicine</p> <p>MacDonagh, Joe; Technical University Dublin, School of Business and Humanities</p> <p>O'Doherty, Jane; Health Research Institute, University of Limerick School of Medicine</p> <p>O'Connor, Raymond; Health Research Institute, University of Limerick School of Medicine, Graduate Entry Medical School</p> <p>O'Regan, Andrew; University of Limerick Faculty of Education and Health Sciences, Health Research Institute, University of Limerick School of Medicine</p>
Keywords:	PRIMARY CARE, MEDICAL EDUCATION & TRAINING, MEDICAL ETHICS

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

Title page

“Doctors can’t be doctors all of the time”: a qualitative study of how general practitioners and medical students negotiate public-professional and private-personal realms using social media

M Marshall¹, V Niranjana¹, E Spain¹, J MacDonagh², J O’Doherty¹, R O’Connor¹, *A O’Regan¹

*corresponding author Dr Andrew O’Regan, address: School of Medicine, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland; email- andrew.oregan@ul.ie; phone – 00353-646634111

¹ Health Research Institute University of Limerick School of Medicine, Limerick, Ireland

² School of Business & Humanities, Technological University Dublin, Ireland

Key words – General Practice, Social media, online professionalism, medical education

Manuscript word count – 3,963

Abstract

Objective- The objective of this study was to explore the experiences and perspectives of general practitioners and medical students use of and behaviour on social media and, specifically, to understand how they negotiate threats to professional and personal life on social media.

Design- A two phase qualitative design was employed, consisting of semi-structured interviews and follow-up vignettes, where participants were asked to respond to vignettes that involved unprofessional behaviour to varying degrees. Data were analysed using template analysis.

1
2
3
4 **Setting and Participants-** Participants were general practitioner tutors and third year medical students
5 who had just completed placement on the University of Limerick longitudinal integrated clerkship.
6 Five students and three general practitioners affiliated with a medical school were invited to
7 participate in one-to-one interviews.
8
9

10 **Results** – three overarching themes, each containing subthemes were reported. ‘The world has got
11 smaller’ shows how platforms provide useful resources and illustrates the potential risks of social
12 media. ‘Online persona’ considers changing relationships to which advances in social media have
13 contributed. ‘Towards standards and safety’ conveys how to protect patients, doctors and the
14 profession.
15
16
17
18

19 **Conclusion** - Guidance is required for students and medical practitioners on how to establish
20 reasonable boundaries between their personal and professional presence on social media and in their
21 right to a private life in which ineffective use of social media does not negatively affect career
22 prospects.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Strengths and Weaknesses of the Study**

30
31 This study has provided new insights into boundary setting and safe negotiation on social media
32 platforms for medical students and physicians
33
34

35 The analysis addresses a knowledge gap rationalising the differences in attitude between students and
36 tutors to online professional behaviour
37
38

39 The purposive sampling method facilitated a balance of students and GP-tutors, European and North
40 American students and male and female participants
41
42

43 The study was limited to one cohort of medical students in a single medical school
44
45

46 **Introduction**

47
48
49 Medical professional bodies in Europe and the USA have issued position statements and guidelines
50 for their members advising on how best to utilise social media [1, 2]]. The term social media, itself, is
51 difficult to define but a commonly accepted description as that of a set of online applications, including
52 blogging and networking sites, that facilitate users to express themselves and interact with each other
53 [3]. Social media has become an effective communication tool for public health [4], helping patients
54 with chronic illness to self-care [5], and more recently, as a means get information to populations in
55 ‘real-time’ during the COVID-19 pandemic [6].
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 While social media can improve communication in some instances, the associated environment is
4 fraught with the danger of suboptimal communication [7]. A comprehensive review warned that, for
5 health professionals and patients, social media can negatively impact on mental health,
6 confidentiality, privacy and quality of information available [8]. The concept of 'online
7 professionalism', rooted in the traditional values of medicine, has evolved in the past decade in
8 response to the challenges of the constantly changing social media sphere [9].
9

10
11
12
13
14 Physicians being disciplined by regulatory bodies for unprofessional online behaviour [10] is a cause
15 for concern for students, physicians and medical educators. An international study of doctors and
16 medical students reported widespread use of social media, and almost one fifth of students admitted
17 to sharing clinical images inappropriately [11]. Similarly, surveys of medical students in Australia [12],
18 England [13] and the USA [14] reported that inappropriate and unprofessional social media posting
19 was common. This raises the question of whether there is an effect for age in the use of social media
20 and whether younger medical professionals and those currently in training need to be educated in the
21 ethical and professional implications of using social media both in their clinical practice and in their
22 personal lives and particularly where these two areas may overlap. Ethical concerns also concern the
23 public-professional and private-personal spheres.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Researchers examining the impact of social media on medical professionals called for an intergenerational dialogue [15], as physicians and students may be unsure of the full medical, professional, and personal reputational consequences of the new social media age [16, 17]. While a small number of qualitative studies have been conducted with physicians [18] and medical students [19], there are few qualitative studies examining the views of medical students and those of their clinical supervisors on this topic. This study aimed to address the knowledge gap by investigating the understanding and attitudes of general practitioners (GPs) and medical students to their use of and behaviour on social media.

Methodology

Study design

The study adhered to the COREQ [Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research] principles for reporting qualitative research (supplementary material 1) [20]. Ethical approval was granted by the University of Limerick Education and Health Science Faculty Ethics Committee [2017_05_17_EHS].

1
2
3 Each participant was contacted twice. The first step was an in-depth, semi-structured interview that
4 was based on a topic guide designed by the research team. The second was a follow-up phone call,
5 during which, the participant was asked to respond to three separate vignettes which required them
6 to consider the ethical dilemmas and professional practice challenges of using social media personally
7 and professionally. The vignettes were chosen as a complementary method because of their ability
8 to yield rich data [21] and to offer new insights [22].
9
10
11
12

13 **Setting and Participants**

14
15
16 Participants were GP tutors and third year medical students who had just completed placement on
17 the University of Limerick longitudinal integrated clerkship [23]. Purposive, non-probabilistic,
18 sampling was used to ensure that a balance was achieved between students from Europe and North
19 America and that both male and females were selected to be as representative as possible of the
20 student population. Participants were recruited by an email. The sample size was based on the
21 principle of data saturation, whereby a minimum number of interviews was selected for a first round
22 of interviews for initial analysis and a minimum number also for subsequent interviews that would be
23 checked for no new themes emerging; the stopping criterion [24]. Based on previous qualitative
24 research with medical students [25], we set the initial minimum number at five and specified a
25 minimum of three subsequent interviews. The characteristics of the participants are outlined in table
26 1.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Public and patient involvement**

36
37 No patients were involved in the study but the research question was derived from classroom
38 discussions with the medical students and interactions with GP-tutors, which reflected that this
39 research area is under-studied. Participants were not involved in the design of the study, recruitment
40 or conduct of the study. We plan to disseminate the study report as a brief and a full publication to all
41 the study participants.
42
43
44
45

46 {Insert table 1 here}
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **Data Collection instruments**

55
56 The interview guide was developed by an interdisciplinary team, and consisted of open and closed
57 ended questions. Vignettes were developed by two of the research team with the purpose of exploring
58 students' and clinicians' responses to examples of unprofessional behaviour online by healthcare
59
60

1
2
3 workers (supplementary material 2). They were piloted at an academic workshop for health care
4 educators.
5

6 7 **Interviews and vignettes**

8
9 Interviews were conducted by a trained female researcher (MM), who would have known some of the
10 participants and lasted between 15 and 30 minutes. Participants were subsequently invited to a brief
11 follow-up and a time at least one week later was arranged. These were conducted by telephone and
12 were digitally recorded, with explicit consent of those participating. Participants were shown or read
13 short vignettes about use of social media and their opinion were elicited.
14
15
16
17

18 19 **Data analysis**

20
21 The methodology utilised was template analysis. A coding template based on representative parts of
22 the data is developed, and, subsequently, is revised and refined [26]. It facilitates the use of a priori
23 themes which can later be modified or excluded as the data analysis evolves, as the researchers read
24 and re-read the data. The identification of templates is thus iterative in nature - some are established
25 initially as more important and then, after thorough reading and re-reading of the data transcripts,
26 may be seen as less important or more important. This helps to compare perspectives between
27 different categories of participants; in this case, GPs and medical students [27]. It is a practical method
28 that is well suited to a team involving multiple coders as it gives the freedom to the team to collaborate
29 on the direction and content of the coding [28]. The process involved over six meetings of the coders.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Coders discussed personal experiences with social media, professional boundaries, and attitudes
37 towards the scenarios in the vignettes. This “active-acknowledgement”, a recognised reflexivity
38 technique for overcoming researcher bias in qualitative studies, was maintained throughout the
39 analysis [29].
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 49 **Findings**

50 The analysis produced three overarching themes, each with subthemes that were often
51 interconnected and, in some cases, had overlapping ideas.
52
53
54
55

56 57 **1. The world has got smaller**

1
2
3 This theme refers to the practical, day-to-day applications of social media for medical students and
4 GPs. It has been divided into two subthemes: 'staying connected' and 'educational tool'.
5
6

7 **1.1 Staying connected**

8
9 Maintaining friendships and staying in touch with others was the primary stated use of social media
10 platforms. A North American student said how helpful Facebook was in keeping touch with family
11 throughout the world and with a network of friends from a previous course. However, one student
12 felt that the speed and ease of access may come at the cost of maintaining meaningful relationships.
13
14

15
16
17 *"perhaps they are superficial relationships, but you know I feel like if I didn't have 'Facebook',*
18 *particularly I would absolutely lose contact with these people."* [student]
19

20
21 There appeared to be an awareness of the link between social media misuse and being compromised
22 when interviewing for jobs or being publicly castigated for holding the 'wrong' view on a contentious
23 topic.
24

25
26
27 *"I am very conscious about putting up things like my date of birth, things about politics... of not giving*
28 *away too much about myself."* [student]
29

30
31 In this quote there is both the appreciation of confidential personal details such as "date of birth" but
32 also the sense that there are areas which are personal and private, such as "politics" and "giving away
33 too much about myself".
34
35

36 37 38 **1.2 'Educational tool'**

39
40 This subtheme describes how, on one hand, social media platforms have significantly enhanced
41 learning but, on the other hand, must be handled with care. For students, the educational component
42 is closely linked to the connectedness described in the previous subtheme. Concerns about social
43 media distracting from learning and in general were evident:
44
45
46

47
48
49 *"you can spend hours and hours just scrolling going from Twitter to Facebook to LinkedIn."* [general
50 practitioner]
51

52
53 *"99% of the time it is just for killing time."* [student]
54

55 Some experts post pictures and scenarios and invite students to suggest differential diagnoses, often
56 giving the correct answer and an explanation at a later point. While this was appreciated by one
57 student in the interview, in the follow-up vignette discussion he then questioned the professional
58 ethics of posting patient information in a publicly accessible forum, and the concepts of consent and
59
60

1
2
3 confidentiality were raised. When asked about professional concerns relating to the first vignette [on
4 online sharing of clinical educational material] all participants acknowledged the importance of
5 confidentiality.
6
7

8
9 *"I think you need to be careful about what you post. Personally, for myself, as a rule of thumb, I don't*
10 *think you should post anything about clinical... a clinical scenario or anything because that could get*
11 *you into trouble."* [student]
12
13

14 Most noticeable in this last statement is the tension between a very useful medical pedagogical tool,
15 which may benefit medical students, and the ethicality of referring to patient case studies.
16
17
18

21 **2. Online persona**

22
23 This theme analyses the process whereby learners at all stages of the medical continuum negotiate
24 an online image and attempt to balance personal and professional dimensions. There are three
25 subthemes: Crafting an image, societal expectations and boundaries are blurring.
26
27
28

29 **2.1 Crafting an image**

30
31 Participants agreed that care had to be taken with how a medical student/clinician presents
32 themselves online. Students and GPs were aware that various platforms serve very different
33 purposes. Both groups indicated a degree of embarrassment with self-promotion on social media. It
34 appears that all participants were conscious of how they would be perceived by the public. Several
35 felt it was important to be selective with what gets posted to craft a positive image:
36
37
38

39
40 *"you can hold an image of yourself... put up the photos where you look good are having a wonderful*
41 *time.... I suppose also, some people open their hearts a bit too much... it probably doesn't cast them in*
42 *the best light even if that is not their intention."* [student]
43
44

45
46 Another student explained this concept further, detailing how he restricted what he posted to paint
47 an almost superhuman version of himself.
48
49

50
51 *"the image you are trying to maintain could be what you identify with or what you want to identify*
52 *with, but you are not really that, so kind of detachment is potentially harmful particularly with young*
53 *people.... There is a culture of social media that is centred around vanity and around what you want to*
54 *identify with versus what you actually identify with."* [student]
55
56

57 This quote strongly points to the tensions and pressures in emotional self-regulation involved in
58 anyone using such impression management strategies. It also highlights the danger, when using social
59
60

1
2
3 media, of a cognitive dissonance between the image medical students and doctors wish to project and
4 the extent to which this image accurately reflects who they are.
5
6
7
8
9

10 **2.2 Societal expectations**

11 This theme considers how they think society might view them when using social media. An
12 experienced GP participant felt strongly that society expects something more from medical students
13 compared to other students as they were “future doctors”. This question as to whether society should
14 expect a higher standard for doctors permeated most of the interviews.
15
16
17
18

19 *“maybe somebody looking on would say... ‘I don’t care if my plumber has 20 pints at the weekend... or*
20 *I see them on ‘Facebook’ running... with no clothes on – but I don’t want to see a GP on Monday*
21 *morning who has been doing that’.” [general practitioner]*
22
23
24

25 The fear of reputation damaged was balanced with the realisation that we cannot all be perfect all the
26 time. One student described this succinctly but still advised the utmost caution when using social
27 media:
28
29

30 *“We are only human. I mean, God forbid, Watson and Crick who discovered DNA, I am sure they were*
31 *mad for their lush [alcohol] every once in a while, but who cares?” [student]*
32
33
34

35 Other students took an opposing view and expressed in both interview and follow-up vignette the
36 need to maintain professional conduct on and off duty.
37
38

39 *“They have a reputation to maintain and here they are not representing themselves in a professional*
40 *manner.” [student]*
41
42

43 In some instances, there was dissonance between the view expressed by a participant in the interview
44 and that of the same participant in the follow-up vignettes. One student, when asked about societal
45 expectations, cited the example of a picture shared on a social media platform of a doctor smoking a
46 cigarette, saying that it made no sense for that doctor then to be telling patients not to smoke. When
47 asked to comment on the vignette where a patient expressed concern about doctors who were
48 potentially going to operate on her and had appeared drunk on a social media platform, she
49 responded:
50
51
52
53

54 *“I would tell her that doctors can’t be doctors all of the time” [student]*
55
56
57
58
59

60 **2.3 Boundaries are blurring**

1
2
3 This subtheme refers to the changing dynamic between doctors and patients to which social media is
4 contributing. GP participants agreed that it was not unusual to have friends who might be taken on
5 as patients or to have social interaction in the community with existing patients. However, the
6 introduction of social media has the potential to destroy privacy and to blur the boundary between
7 personal and professional.
8
9

10
11
12 Friend requests on 'Facebook' were cited by many students and GPs as a potential source of
13 compromise with all viewing it as an inappropriate relationship, fraught with possibilities of doctors'
14 personal information being inappropriately viewed as well as the potential for medical advice being
15 requested online. The risk to patient safety brought about by casual contact and giving of advice in a
16 non-clinical and more relaxed social media environment was pointed out. One GP emphasised
17 maintaining a division between personal and professional life:
18
19
20
21

22
23 *"It is about keeping things separate. Your personal life and your professional life."* [general
24 practitioner]
25

26
27 All of these points, once again, to the need for individual doctors to decide where they are going to draw
28 their boundary lines with their patients online. This ties into the final theme of what exactly is proper
29 use of social media by doctors.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **3 Towards standards and safety**

38
39 This final theme illustrates the current uncertainty regarding what it means to be a medical
40 professional on social media. There are two subthemes – clarifying the standard and safe navigation.
41
42
43
44
45

46 **3.1 Clarifying the standard**

47
48 While the data shows that there is awareness among all participants of some ethical dimensions and
49 legal ramifications of poor conduct on social media, there was no clear consensus on what is
50 acceptable. One GP, while aware of the limitations of his own experience with social media, expressed
51 concern for medical students:
52
53
54

55
56 *"people who have spent all their waking hours for the last ten years stuck in a room swotting, most of*
57 *them don't have life experience and are not worldly-wise and therefore are very innocent... they are*
58
59
60

1
2
3 *just not aware of the huge implications this can have on their future so I think that needs to be spelled*
4 *out very clearly and explicitly.” [general practitioner]*
5
6

7 GPs and students appeared to disagree on whether clinical experiences could be shared online for
8 teaching and reflective purposes. The vignettes magnified this uncertainty and were useful in
9 presenting examples of where such social media dilemmas might occur. Most of the GPs believed that
10 there was insufficient guidance provided for them and for students. They agreed that a clear set of
11 guidelines was necessary that would uphold good professional conduct while protecting individuals
12 who, in their leisure time, were trying to unwind:
13
14
15
16

17
18 *“It is a stressful enough job. You would hate to think that people would be told that you can never let*
19 *your hair down, you can never do this or that. I think there has to be a balance somewhere.” [general*
20 *practitioner]*
21
22

23 This quote underlines the imperative of educating future and current physicians in the use of social
24 media to achieve a private social life.
25
26
27
28
29

30 **3.2 Safe Navigation**

31
32 This final subtheme connects the perceptions found throughout the data on how students and GPs
33 might successfully and safely navigate social media platforms, accessing education and connecting
34 with others, while at the same time keeping themselves plus their current and future patients safe.
35 GPs were very clear on what type of information should not be divulged on social media platforms:
36
37
38

39 *“Any info. that you think could harm you, your family or your patients.” [general practitioner]*
40
41

42 The follow-up vignettes revealed that for three of the students, there was a high level of awareness
43 of risks with sharing information on SMPs. They recognised the potential for litigation and damaged
44 career opportunities as consequences of inappropriate use of SMPs. However, a fourth student, did
45 not appear to have this level of awareness and was actively engaging in broadcasting her own clinical
46 experiences on SMPs seemingly without awareness of the dangers:
47
48
49

50
51 *“I have a [You Tube] channel that I just started, and I am just uploading some videos about my life...*
52 *about medicine”*
53

54
55 *[Interviewer] Do you think there are any risks with that?*
56

57 *“no, not really.” [student]*
58
59
60

1
2
3 There was no evidence among participants of any level of participation in formal education on
4 engaging social media, and for most, awareness seemed to come from life experience. One student
5 told how lessons learned about life as a younger girl influenced her behaviour on SMPs:
6
7

8
9 *“My dad used to always give us lectures about pictures which I totally understand so I do have certain*
10 *settings on ‘Facebook’ which only allows... not even all my friends to see my photos” [student]*
11

12
13 There was a notable lack of awareness of the existence of guidelines among both groups of
14 participants. All agreed that, in general, social media is a positive thing, but most urged caution and
15 showed awareness of risk.
16

17
18 *“I think overall, social media is great but just be careful with it. That is the long and the short of it.”*
19 *[general practitioner]*
20
21

22 23 24 25 **Discussion**

26
27
28
29
30 The analysis has provided new insights into the research question in terms of investigating the
31 understanding and attitudes of GPs and medical students to use of and behaviour on social media.
32 While all were agreed that it provides useful educational and networking benefits to the profession,
33 most expressed unease about boundary setting and staying safe on these platforms. GPs and medical
34 students appeared to agree that there was a line between professional and personal realms that
35 needed to be maintained, but for medical students in particular, defining where that boundary lies
36 was difficult to conclude. The students interviewed had all completed an 18-week placement in
37 general practice and it is possible that this placement influenced student attitudes and research has
38 reported that medical students’ professionalism increases with more clinical exposure [30].
39 Participants’ awareness of the potential effects of social media mishaps on their future career appears
40 to be well founded, with reports of post graduate training directors checking prospective candidates’
41 social media profiles prior to interview [31]. Evidence suggests that patients’ perceptions of their
42 physician’s professionalism can be influenced by the content of their social media accounts [32, 33].
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 The scenario that caused the most disagreement among participants related to a video of doctors
54 behaving unprofessionally during their time off, with some defending them and others saying it was
55 unacceptable to behave in a certain way at any time. The statement in our study that “doctors can’t
56 be doctors all of the time” is similar to a previously reported finding [34]. An important point in our
57 study is the discordance within participants between what they think and what they say, as illustrated
58
59
60

1
2
3 by the follow up interview seeking their reactions to scenarios, and similar findings have been reported
4 [35]. Establishing boundaries in a social media age is difficult for all citizens but especially for doctors
5 as they expected to practise to the highest level. The quote regarding Crick and Watson was very
6 apposite in this respect.
7
8
9

10 The theme of 'crafting an image' refers to the efforts of medical students and physicians to portray
11 themselves favourably on social media. This phenomenon has been described as an online "identity
12 crisis" for medical professionals [36]. Researchers have warned of the problem of conflating "self-
13 expression, self-promotion and self-communication" [37]. While concepts such as wellness and
14 efficiency are described in medical literature [38], the concern regarding projecting an unrealistic
15 image in a world where privacy is difficult to control, which was raised by participants in this study,
16 has not been addressed previously. Research has reported that taking time away from social media
17 can decrease stress levels [39]. Such a finding may in part be related to the pressure described in our
18 study of maintaining an 'online persona'.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 The concept of dual relationships, whereby professionals and the public interact formally at times and
27 informally at other times is brought to a greater level of acuity by social media where 'context
28 collapses'- a point emphasised in our data [40]. Formal education at medical school in digital
29 professional identity formation in medical school curricula is thus important as is subsequent
30 professional accreditation [41]. Interventions aimed at promoting professionalism on social media
31 are acceptable to students [42] and most students made and maintained positive changes to their
32 social media use [43]. Some of the participants in our study were aware of which social media
33 platforms to use for various purposes and how to use privacy settings to ensure safety. Education on
34 how to apply this knowledge has been successful in medical schools elsewhere [44]. Several of the
35 study participants called for medical council guidance on social media use but this in fact is already
36 available and reflects research findings in Britain pointing to the need to publicise these guidelines
37 effectively [45, 46]. This may indicate the need for regular communication between accreditation
38 bodies and both students and doctors as social media platforms change so rapidly.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Strengths and weaknesses**

52 The "two stage" nature of the study, involving in depth interviews followed up by a phone call soliciting
53 views on hypothetical scenarios, was a particular strength as it allowed participants to reflect on their
54 views. A useful cross-cultural element was the participation of GPs and medical students from Ireland
55 and North America. A weakness of the study was its location in a single medical school in Ireland.
56
57
58
59
60

Implications for further research and practice

Research is warranted to identify how best to teach safe practices for engaging with social media. It is also clear that medical school curricula must address how students need to use social media professionally and ethically from the earliest stages of their career. This should involve clear and dynamic guidelines for medical students and GPs to understand and implement ethical social media use in the medical profession due to the rapidly changing speed and scope of social media.

Conclusion

Students and GPs alike view social media as a positive resource for the medical profession. Guidance is required for students and medical practitioners on how to establish reasonable boundaries between their personal and professional presence on social media and in their right to a private life in which ineffective use of social media does not negatively affect career prospects.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to the students who inspired and contributed to the study as well as the GP tutors on the School of Medicine's ULEARN-GP network.

Contributors

MM (MB BCh BAO) was involved in the study design, data collection and analysis and helped to write the first draft; VN (PhD) was involved in the data analysis and write up, ES (PhD) was involved in study design, oversight, analysis and write-up; JMD (PhD) was involved in the data analysis and write up; ROC (MB BCh BAO, MMedSc) was involved in data analysis, write-up; JOD (MA) was involved in study design, data analysis and write-up; AOR (MB BCh BAO, MMedSc) was involved in all stages of the project. Each author contributed to all drafts of the paper, and read and approved the final manuscript.

Competing interests

We have read and understood BMJ policy on declaration of interests and declare that we have no competing interests.

1
2
3 **Ethics approval** University of Limerick Department of Education and Health Sciences Research
4
5 Ethics Committee; 2017_05_17_EHS
6

7 **Provenance and peer review** Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.
8

9 **Data sharing statement** No additional data are available.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **References**

- 20
21
22
23
24 1. Borgmann H, Cooperberg M, Murphy D, Loeb S, N'Dow J, Ribal MJ, et al. Online
25 professionalism—2018 update of European Association of Urology[@ Uroweb] recommendations on
26 the appropriate use of social media. *European urology*. 2018;74[5]:644-50.
27
28 2. Farnan JM, Snyder Sulmasy L, Worster BK, Chaudhry HJ, Rhyne JA, Arora VM. Online medical
29 professionalism: patient and public relationships: policy statement from the American College of
30 Physicians and the Federation of State Medical Boards. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2013; 158[8]:620-
31 7.
32
33 3. Treem JW, Dailey SL, Pierce CS, Biffi D. What we are talking about when we talk about social
34 media: A framework for study. *Sociology Compass*. 2016;10[9]:768-84.
35
36 4. McNeill A, Harris PR, Briggs P. Twitter influence on UK vaccination and antiviral uptake during
37 the 2009 H1N1 pandemic. *Frontiers in public health*. 2016;4:26.
38
39 5. Patel R, Chang T, Greysen SR, Chopra V. Social media use in chronic disease: a systematic
40 review and novel taxonomy. *The American journal of medicine*. 2015;128[12]:1335-50.
41
42 6. Ahani A, Nilashi M. Coronavirus outbreak and its impacts on global economy: the role of social
43 network sites. *Journal of Soft Computing and Decision Support Systems*. 2020;7[2]:19-22.
44
45 7. Smailhodzic E, Hooijsma W, Boonstra A, Langley DJ. Social media use in healthcare: a
46 systematic review of effects on patients and on their relationship with healthcare professionals. *BMC*
47 *health services research*. 2016;16[1]:442.
48
49 8. Giustini D, Ali SM, Fraser M, Boulos MNK. Effective uses of social media in public health and
50 medicine: a systematic review of systematic reviews. *Online Journal of Public Health Informatics*.
51 2018;10[2].
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 9. Kind T. Professional guidelines for social media use: a starting point. *AMA journal of ethics*.
4 2015;17[5]:441-7.
5
- 6 10. Chauhan B, George R, Coffin J. Social media and you: what every physician needs to know. *J*
7 *Med Pract Manage*. 2012;28[3]:206-9.
8
- 9 11. O'Sullivan E, Cutts E, Kavikondala S, Salcedo A, D'Souza K, Hernandez-Torre M, et al. Social
10 media in health science education: an international survey. *JMIR Medical Education*. 2017;3[1]:e1.
11
- 12 12. Barlow CJ, Morrison S, Stephens HO, Jenkins E, Bailey MJ, Pilcher D. Unprofessional behaviour
13 on social media by medical students. *Medical Journal of Australia*. 2015;203[11]:439-
14
- 15 13. Garner J, O'Sullivan H. Facebook and the professional behaviours of undergraduate medical
16 students. *The clinical teacher*. 2010;7[2]:112-5.
17
- 18 14. Kitsis EA, Milan FB, Cohen HW, Myers D, Herron P, McEvoy M, et al. Who's misbehaving?
19 Perceptions of unprofessional social media use by medical students and faculty. *BMC medical*
20 *education*. 2016;16[1]:1-7.
21
- 22 15. Mak-Van Der Vossen, M., Van Mook, W., Van Der Burgt, S., Kors, J., Ket, J. C., Croiset, G., &
23 Kusrkar, R. Descriptors for unprofessional behaviours of medical students: a systematic review and
24 categorisation. *BMC medical education*. 2017; 17[1], 164.
25
- 26 16. Gholami-Kordkheili F, Wild V, Strech D. The impact of social media on medical professionalism:
27 a systematic qualitative review of challenges and opportunities. *Journal of medical Internet research*.
28 2013;15[8]:e184.
29
- 30 17. O'Regan A, Smithson WH, Spain E. Social media and professional identity: pitfalls and
31 potential. *Medical teacher*. 2018;40[2]:112-6.
32
- 33 18. Campbell L, Evans Y, Pumper M, Moreno MA. Social media use by physicians: a qualitative
34 study of the new frontier of medicine. *BMC medical informatics and decision making*. 2016;16[1]:91.
35
- 36 19. Chretien KC, Goldman EF, Beckman L, Kind T. It's your own risk: medical students' perspectives
37 on online professionalism. *Academic Medicine*. 2010;85[10]:S68-S71.
38
- 39 20. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research[*COREQ*]:
40 a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International journal for quality in health care*.
41 2007;19[6]:349-57.
42
- 43 21. Wilson J, While AE. Methodological issues surrounding the use of vignettes in qualitative
44 research. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*. 1998;12[1]:79-86.
45
- 46 22. Wilks T. The use of vignettes in qualitative research into social work values. *Qualitative social*
47 *work*. 2004;3[1]:78-87.
48
- 49 23. O'Regan A, Hayes P, O'Connor R, Casey M, O'Dwyer P, Culhane A, et al. The University of
50 Limerick Education and Research Network for General Practice[*ULEARN-GP*]: practice characteristics
51 and general practitioner perspectives. *BMC family practice*. 2020;21[1]:1-11.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 24. Francis JJ, Johnston M, Robertson C, Glidewell L, Entwistle V, Eccles MP, et al. What is an
4 adequate sample size? Operationalising data saturation for theory-based interview studies.
5 Psychology and health. 2010;25[10]:1229-45.
6
7
8 25. Rashid-Doubell F, Mohamed S, Elmusharaf K, O'Neill C. A balancing act: a phenomenological
9 exploration of medical students' experiences of using mobile devices in the clinical setting. BMJ open.
10 2016;6[5].
11
12
13 26. Brooks J, McCluskey S, Turley E, King N. The utility of template analysis in qualitative
14 psychology research. Qualitative research in psychology. 2015;12[2]:202-22.
15
16
17 27. King N. 21—Using Templates in the Thematic Analysis ofText—. Essential guide to
18 qualitative methods in organizational research. 2004:256.
19
20 28. Brooks J, King N. Doing template analysis: evaluating an end of life care service. Sage research
21 methods cases. 2014.
22
23 29. Berger R. Now I see it, now I don't: Researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research.
24 Qualitative research. 2015;15[2]:219-34.
25
26 30. Zulkifli J, Noel B, Bennett D, O'Flynn S, O'Tuathaigh C. Medical students' perceptions of
27 professional misconduct: relationship with typology and year of programme. Journal of medical ethics.
28 2018;44[2]:133-7.
29
30
31 31. Hanzel T, Richards J, Schwitters P, Smith K, Wendland K, Martin J, et al. # DocsOnTwitter: how
32 physicians use social media to build social capital. Hospital topics. 2018;96[1]:9-17.
33
34 32. Maben-Feaster RE, Stansfield RB, Opiari A, Hammoud MM. Evaluating patient perspectives
35 of provider professionalism on Twitter in an academic obstetrics and gynecology clinic: Patient survey.
36 Journal of medical Internet research. 2018;20[3]:e78.
37
38 33. Fatollahi JJ, Colbert JA, Agarwal P, Lee JL, Lehmann EY, Yuan N, et al. The impact of physician
39 social media behavior on patient trust. AJOB Empirical Bioethics. 2020;11[2]:77-82.
40
41 34. Ross S, Lai K, Walton JM, Kirwan P, White JS. "I have the right to a private life": Medical
42 students' views about professionalism in a digital world. Medical teacher. 2013;35[10]:826-31.
43
44 35. Rocha PN, de Castro NAA. Opinions of students from a Brazilian medical school regarding
45 online professionalism. Journal of general internal medicine. 2014;29[5]:758-64.
46
47 36. DeCamp M, Koenig TW, Chisolm MS. Social media and physicians' online identity crisis. Jama.
48 2013;310[6]:581-2.
49
50 37. Van Dijck J. 'You have one identity': performing the self on Facebook and LinkedIn. Media,
51 culture & society. 2013;35[2]:199-215.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 38. Bohman B, Dyrbye L, Sinsky CA, Linzer M, Olson K, Babbott S, et al. Physician well-being: the
4 reciprocity of practice efficiency, culture of wellness, and personal resilience. *NEJM Catalyst*.
5 2017;3[4].
6
7
8 39. Turel O, Cavagnaro DR, Meshi D. Short abstinence from online social networking sites reduces
9 perceived stress, especially in excessive users. *Psychiatry research*. 2018;270:947-53.
10
11 40. Sugimoto C, Hank C, Bowman T, Pomerantz J. Friend or faculty: Social networking sites, dual
12 relationships, and context collapse in higher education. *First Monday*. 2015.
13
14 41. Jawed S, Mahboob U, Yasmeen R. Digital professional identity: Dear Internet! Who am I?
15 *Education for Health*. 2019;32[1]:33.
16
17 42. Bramstedt KA, Ierna BN, Woodcroft-Brown VK. Using SurveyMonkey® to teach safe social
18 media strategies to medical students in their clinical years. *Communication & medicine*.
19 2014;11[2]:117.
20
21 43. Gomes AW, Butera G, Chretien KC, Kind T. The development and impact of a social media and
22 professionalism course for medical students. *Teaching and learning in medicine*. 2017;29[3]:296-303.
23
24 44. Walton JM, White J, Ross S. What's on YOUR Facebook profile? Evaluation of an educational
25 intervention to promote appropriate use of privacy settings by medical students on social networking
26 sites. *Medical education online*. 2015;20[1]:28708.
27
28 45. Osman A, Wardle A, Caesar R. Online professionalism and Facebook—falling through the
29 generation gap. *Medical teacher*. 2012;34[8]:e549-e56.
30
31 46. Kang J, Djafari Marbini H, Patel P, Fawcett N, Leaver L. Survey of medical students' use of social
32 media. *The clinical teacher*. 2015;12[6]:373-7.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Participant Characteristics

GPs/ final year Medical Student	Gender[M/F]	Age Category[20-30],[30-40],[40+]	Style of Interview[face to face, phone, Skype]
Interview 1: GP	F	30-40	Phone
Interview 2: GP	M	30-40	Phone
Interview 3: Medical Student	M	20-30	Skype
Interview 4: Medical Student	M	20-30	Face-to-face
Interview 5: Medical Student	M	20-30	Face-to-face
Interview 6: Medical student	F	30-40	Face-to-face
Interview 7: GP	M	40+	Face-to-face
Interview 8: Medical student	F	20-30	Fact-to-face

COREQ (CONsolidated criteria for REporting Qualitative research) Checklist

A checklist of items that should be included in reports of qualitative research. You must report the page number in your manuscript where you consider each of the items listed in this checklist. If you have not included this information, either revise your manuscript accordingly before submitting or note N/A.

Topic	Item No.	Guide Questions/Description	Reported on Page No.
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
<i>Personal characteristics</i>			
Interviewer/facilitator	1	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	
Credentials	2	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	
Occupation	3	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	
Gender	4	Was the researcher male or female?	
Experience and training	5	What experience or training did the researcher have?	
<i>Relationship with participants</i>			
Relationship established	6	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	
Participant knowledge of the interviewer	7	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	
Interviewer characteristics	8	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	
Domain 2: Study design			
<i>Theoretical framework</i>			
Methodological orientation and Theory	9	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	
<i>Participant selection</i>			
Sampling	10	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	
Method of approach	11	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	
Sample size	12	How many participants were in the study?	
Non-participation	13	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	
<i>Setting</i>			
Setting of data collection	14	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	
Presence of non-participants	15	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	
Description of sample	16	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	
<i>Data collection</i>			
Interview guide	17	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	
Repeat interviews	18	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?	
Audio/visual recording	19	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	
Field notes	20	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	
Duration	21	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	
Data saturation	22	Was data saturation discussed?	
Transcripts returned	23	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or	

Topic	Item No.	Guide Questions/Description	Reported on Page No.
		correction?	
Domain 3: analysis and findings			
<i>Data analysis</i>			
Number of data coders	24	How many data coders coded the data?	
Description of the coding tree	25	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	
Derivation of themes	26	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	
Software	27	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	
Participant checking	28	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	
<i>Reporting</i>			
Quotations presented	29	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	
Data and findings consistent	30	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	
Clarity of major themes	31	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	
Clarity of minor themes	32	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	

Developed from: Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 2007. Volume 19, Number 6: pp. 349 – 357

Once you have completed this checklist, please save a copy and upload it as part of your submission. DO NOT include this checklist as part of the main manuscript document. It must be uploaded as a separate file.

1
2
3 *Interview Guide*
4
5

6 Interview Guide
7
8 1. Tell me about your experience of social media.
9
10 2. Do you share personal information online such as pictures, location and 11 employment status? If yes/no, why?
12
13 3. Do you use social media for personal or professional use?
14
15 4. What do you feel are the benefits of using social media apps?
16
17 5. What do you feel are the risks associated with the use of social media?
18
19 6. As a clinician/ future clinician how would you feel about patients contacting 20 you/following you on social media? 21 22

23
24
25
26
27 *Vignettes*
28
29

30 Follow up interviews: Vignettes
31
32
33 1. “Michelle Kelly is a student nurse. She recently posted a photo to twitter showing 34 the Accident and Emergency room of the hospital in which she is training on a 35 Saturday night. The caption for the photograph was “The crazies are really out 36 tonight...”. There were several patients in the photograph, although only one is 37 readily identifiable. You see from her feed that she is “friends” with a number of 38 former patients on facebook. In a series of posts with one former patient, John, they 39 discuss the upsetting nature of the injuries received by an unidentified patient, with 40 whom John shared a room”.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55 2. “As a senior house officer in a busy surgical outpatients clinic, you consult with a 56 young lady who is on the laparoscopy waiting list. She appears disconcerted and 57 tells you about a recent you tube video link that was shared with her by a friend. 58 59 60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The video involved a group of young men who appeared drunk and were taking turns jumping into a swimming pool after drinking a pint of alcohol. She recognised one of them as the surgical registrar who booked her for her upcoming laparoscopy. She has since found out that the others were also junior doctors in the hospital. She tells you that, although she has no problem with clinicians enjoying themselves, she would not be comfortable with such unprofessional type people having such involvement in her health”.

- How would you approach this problem with the patient?
- What ethical and professional issues arise here?

3. “While on placement in final year of physiotherapy, a friend sends you a screen shot of a blog that one of your classmates is running. The classmate is a very hard working student and has always shared resources with you. The blog is a day by day account of your classmate’s clinical encounters, highlighting learning points and tips for the final year examination. The screenshot is of a paragraph outlining in detail the history of a road traffic accident that led to a client presenting to her. The client’s name is not given but the gender, age, locality and date of accident is documented. The screenshot is followed by this comment from your friend: “no prizes for guessing who this guy is!”

- Would you act on this information? If so, how?
- What ethical and legal dilemmas arise while sharing experiences online?

BMJ Open

“Doctors can’t be doctors all of the time”: a qualitative study of how general practitioners and medical students negotiate public- professional and private-personal realms using social media

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-047991.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	08-Sep-2021
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Marshal, Megan; Health Research Institute, University of Limerick School of Medicine Niranjan, Vikram; Health Research Institute, University of Limerick School of Medicine Spain, Eimear; Health Research Institute, University of Limerick School of Medicine MacDonagh, Joe; Technical University Dublin, School of Business and Humanities O'Doherty, Jane; Health Research Institute, University of Limerick School of Medicine O'Connor, Raymond; Health Research Institute, University of Limerick School of Medicine, Graduate Entry Medical School O'Regan, Andrew; University of Limerick Faculty of Education and Health Sciences, Health Research Institute, University of Limerick School of Medicine</p>
Primary Subject Heading:	Medical education and training
Secondary Subject Heading:	Ethics
Keywords:	PRIMARY CARE, MEDICAL EDUCATION & TRAINING, MEDICAL ETHICS

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3 **Title page**
4
5
6
7
8

9 **“Doctors can’t be doctors all of the time”: a qualitative study of how general practitioners and**
10 **medical students negotiate public- professional and private-personal realms using social media**
11
12

13
14 M Marshal¹, V Niranjana², E Spain¹, J MacDonagh³, J O’Doherty¹, R O’Connor¹, *A O’Regan¹
15
16

17
18
19
20 *corresponding author Dr Andrew O’Regan, address: School of Medicine, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland; email- andrew.oregan@ul.ie
21

22
23 ¹ Health Research Institute University of Limerick School of Medicine, Limerick, Ireland
24

25
26 ²School of Public Health Physiotherapy and Sports Science, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland
27

28
29 ³ School of Business & Humanities, Technological University Dublin, Ireland
30
31

32
33
34 Key words – General Practice, Social media, online professionalism, medical education
35
36

37 Manuscript word count – 4923
38
39
40
41

42 **Abstract**
43
44

45 **Objective-** The objective of this study is to explore the experiences and perspectives of general
46 practitioners’ and medical students’ use of, and behaviour on, social media and to understand how
47 they negotiate threats to professional and personal life on social media.
48
49

50
51
52 **Design-** A two phase qualitative design was employed, consisting of semi-structured interviews and
53 follow-up vignettes, where participants were asked to respond to vignettes that involved varying
54 degrees of unprofessional behaviour. Data were analysed using template analysis.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Setting and Participants-** Participants were general practitioner tutors and third year medical students
4 who had just completed placement on the University of Limerick longitudinal integrated clerkship.
5
6
7 Five students and three general practitioners affiliated with the medical school were invited to
8
9 participate in one-to-one interviews.
10

11
12 **Results** – three overarching themes, each containing subthemes were reported. ‘Staying in contact
13 and up to date’ outlines how social media platforms provide useful resources and illustrates the
14 potential risks of social media. ‘Online persona’ considers how social media have contributed to
15 changing the nature of inter-personal relationships. ‘Towards standards and safety’ raises the matter
16 of how to protect patients, doctors and the medical profession.
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 **Conclusion** - Guidance is required for students and medical practitioners on how to establish
25 reasonable boundaries between their personal and professional presence on social media and in their
26 private life so that poorly judged use of social media does not negatively affect career prospects and
27 professional efficacy.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Strengths and Weaknesses of the Study**

- 41
- 42
- 43 • The sampling method facilitated balance of gender, age and nationality of participants.
- 44
- 45
- 46 • The conceptual lens, communities of learning, situated the data in terms of accepted theory
47 and evidence.
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51 • The use of vignettes provided rich data on participants’ experience of social media use and
52 behaviour.
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56 • The study was limited to one cohort of participants in a single medical school.
- 57
- 58
- 59 • The number of participants was relatively small (N=8).
- 60

Introduction

Social media is defined as “a group of internet-based applications that build on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0, and that allow the creation and exchange of user generated content” [1]. It has become an effective communication tool for public health to convey information to populations in ‘real-time’ during the COVID-19 pandemic [2]. While social media can improve communication in some instances, the associated environment is fraught with the danger of suboptimal communication [3]. A comprehensive review warned that, for health professionals and patients, social media can negatively impact on mental health, privacy and information quality [4]. The concept of ‘online professionalism’, rooted in the traditional values of medicine, has evolved in the past decade in response to the challenges of the constantly changing social media sphere [5].

Unprofessional online behaviour resulting in disciplinary action for medical students and doctors is concerning [6]; one international study reported that almost one fifth of the medical students surveyed admitted to sharing clinical images inappropriately [7]. Similarly, surveys of medical students in Australia [8], England [9] and the USA [10] reported that unprofessional social media posting was common. While regulatory guidelines are available, inappropriate behaviour on social media remains problematic [11], with the majority of residents in one study admitting to having posted inappropriate photographs of medical colleagues intoxicated on social media [12]. In this context, the findings of cross-sectional survey of the public are relevant; it reported that inappropriate use of social media by physicians, including images of intoxication, would cause patients to trust them less [13]. Such implications have been highlighted by medical ethicists [14].

The phenomenon is not restricted to doctors – over half of respondents in a survey of registered nurses said that they had witnessed inappropriate online behaviour among colleagues [15].

Furthermore, postgraduate programme directors frequently check the social media profiles of residency applicants for inappropriate behaviour [16].

1
2
3 Recent research surveys of medical students, residents and consultants, reported that almost one
4
5 third of students had posted inappropriate photographs of themselves on social media; the findings
6
7 among residents and consultants were significantly lower [17]. This raises the question of whether
8
9 there is an effect for age in the use of social media; a systematic review examining the impact of
10
11 social media on medical professionals encouraged intergenerational dialogue [18].
12
13

14
15 Physicians and students may be unsure of the full medical, professional, and personal reputational
16
17 consequences of the new social media age [19, 20]. Ethical concerns also include the public-
18
19 professional and private-personal spheres. Few qualitative studies examining the views of medical
20
21 students and those of their clinical supervisors on this topic exist. The aim of this study was to
22
23 explore general practitioners' (GPs) and medical students' perspectives on and experience of social
24
25 media. Specific objectives were to investigate how students and their GP-tutors utilise social media;
26
27 what challenges they encounter in keeping boundaries between professional and personal identities
28
29 and private and public realms; how they negotiate these challenges and conduct themselves
30
31 professionally when using online platforms.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Methodology**

40 41 **Study design**

42
43 The study adhered to the COREQ [Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research] principles
44
45 for reporting qualitative research (supplementary material 1) [21]. Ethical approval was granted by
46
47 the University of Limerick Education and Health Science Faculty Ethics Committee [2017_05_17_EHS].
48
49 Participants were contacted by email sent from a research administrator who was not involved in
50
51 course teaching and assessment, thus ensuring no power dynamic or coercion. This study utilised a
52
53 hybrid methodology whereby an in-depth, semi-structured interview based on a topic guide designed
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 by the research team was followed, for some participants, by a second interview structured using
4
5 short ethical dilemmas on social media described here as vignettes.
6
7

8 **Setting and Participants**

9

10
11 Participants were GP tutors and third year medical students who had just completed a longitudinal
12
13 integrated clerkship [22]. Five medical students and three GPs participated in the study. Purposive,
14
15 non-probabilistic, sampling was used to ensure that a balance was achieved between students from
16
17 Europe and North America and that both male and females were selected to be as representative as
18
19 possible of the student population. The characteristics of the participants are outlined in table 1. As
20
21 judgemental sampling involves the judgement of the researchers based, for example, on their
22
23 expertise and knowledge of previous research it was decided to base the sample size on a previous
24
25 qualitative study on medical student mobile phone usage [23]. The interview process worked through
26
27 the eight participants until no new themes were emerging. This is known as data saturation- the
28
29 'stopping criterion' [24] for the data collection being met as those being interviewed are repeating
30
31 themes mentioned by others or are not suggesting new themes.
32
33
34

35
36 {Insert table 1 here}

37 **Public and patient involvement**

38
39

40
41 No patients were involved in the study, but the research question was derived from classroom
42
43 discussions and interactions with medical students GP-tutors.
44
45
46

47 **Conceptual framework**

48
49

50
51 'Communities of practice' is a popular theory for conceptualising the development of medical
52
53 professional identity [25], whereby the medical profession is understood both as a "collegial
54
55 profession and community of practice" [25]. The theory states that successful identity formation
56
57 depends on a dynamic interplay between members of the medical community at different stages of
58
59 the medical continuum. To this end social media can supplement but not replace "meaningful contact
60

1
2
3 with members of the community”, which is considered in this framework to be the most important
4
5 factor in professional identity formation [25].
6
7

8 **Data Collection**

9

10
11 The interview guide was developed by an interdisciplinary team, and vignettes were developed by two
12
13 of the research team (ES, AOR) with the purpose of exploring students’ and clinicians’ responses to
14
15 examples of unprofessional behaviour online by healthcare workers (supplementary material 2).
16
17 These vignettes were designed so that doctors and medical students could give ethical and
18
19 professional perspectives not simply on themselves but also on those with whom they work and will
20
21 be working in their medical careers. Participants were asked to respond to three separate scenarios
22
23 which required them to consider the ethical dilemmas and professional practice challenges of using
24
25 social media personally and professionally. Where the themes explored in the vignettes were
26
27 addressed by the participants in their initial interview they were not interviewed again with the aid of
28
29 the vignettes.
30
31
32

33
34 Interviews were conducted by a trained female researcher (MM), who would have known some of the
35
36 participants and lasted between 15 and 30 minutes. These were conducted either by telephone, Skype
37
38 or in person and were digitally recorded, with the explicit consent of those participating. Where
39
40 participants were invited to a second interview, if their first interview had not addressed the themes
41
42 in the vignettes, they were shown or read short vignettes about use of social media and their opinions
43
44 were elicited.
45
46
47

48 **Data analysis**

49

50
51 The methodology utilised was template analysis. A coding template based on representative parts of
52
53 the data is developed, and, subsequently, is revised and refined [26]. It facilitates the use of a priori
54
55 themes which can later be modified or excluded as the data analysis evolves, as the researchers read
56
57 and re-read the data. The identification of templates is thus iterative in nature - some are established
58
59
60

1
2
3 initially as more important and then, after thorough reading and re-reading of the data transcripts,
4
5 may be seen as less important or more important. This helps to compare perspectives between
6
7 different categories of participant, in this case, GPs and medical students. It is a practical method that
8
9 is well suited to a team involving multiple coders as it gives the freedom to the team to collaborate on
10
11 the direction and content of the coding. The process involved over six meetings of the coders (AOR,
12
13 VN, JOD).
14
15

16
17 Initially, the coders read the full interview texts to familiarise themselves with the raw data.
18
19 Preliminary data coding was conducted independently with the use of a priori themes that the
20
21 researchers expected to appear in the data; only a priori themes related to the research question were
22
23 chosen. These included benefits of social media, personal and professional use, and potential pitfalls.
24
25 The initial codes and themes were used to define a coding template; this facilitated the researchers
26
27 to understand the relationship between the codes and themes, whilst maintaining flexibility so that
28
29 more codes and themes could be added as the hierarchical analysis developed. Coders discussed
30
31 personal experiences with social media and attitudes towards the scenarios in the vignettes, a process
32
33 known as “active-acknowledgement” for overcoming researcher bias [27]. Discrepancies were
34
35 resolved by personal reflection and ongoing dialogue between the data analysis team.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Findings**

44
45
46 The analysis produced three overarching themes, each with subthemes that were often
47
48 interconnected and, in some cases, had overlapping ideas.
49

50 51 **1. Staying in contact and up to date**

52
53
54 This theme refers to the practical, day-to-day applications of social media for medical students and
55
56 GPs. Social media has undoubted social and networking benefits, and these were highlighted by
57
58 participants, as well as the challenging nature of the information available- which can help participants
59
60

1
2
3 stay up to date, but which can waste time also. This theme has been divided into two subthemes:
4
5 'staying connected' and 'educational tool'.
6
7

8 **1.1 Staying connected**

9

10
11 Maintaining friendships and staying in touch with others was the primary stated use of social media
12
13 platforms. One student said how helpful Facebook was in keeping touch with family throughout the
14
15 world and with a network of friends from a previous course, while another felt that the speed and
16
17 ease of access may come at the cost of maintaining meaningful relationships.
18

19
20
21 *"perhaps they are superficial relationships, but you know I feel like if I didn't have 'Facebook',*
22
23 *particularly I would absolutely lose contact with these people."* [student, male]
24

25
26 Social media was perceived as very useful for staying in touch, but there appeared to be an awareness
27
28 of the link between social media abuse when interviewing for jobs or being publicly castigated for
29
30 holding the 'wrong' view on a contentious topic.
31

32
33
34 *"I am very conscious about putting up things like my date of birth, things about politics... of not giving*
35
36 *away too much about myself."* [student, female]
37

38
39 In this quote there is both the appreciation of confidential personal details such as "date of birth" but
40
41 also the sense that there are areas which are personal and private, such as political views. This raised
42
43 the idea that students and GPs alike were aware of the importance of boundary setting and so social
44
45 media must be approached carefully.
46
47
48
49
50

51 **1.2 'Educational tool'**

52

53
54 This subtheme describes how, on one hand, social media platforms have significantly enhanced
55
56 learning but, on the other, must be handled with care. Concerns about social media distracting from
57
58 learning were evident for GPs and students:
59
60

1
2
3 *“you can spend hours and hours just scrolling going from Twitter to Facebook to LinkedIn.” [general*
4
5 *practitioner, male]*

6
7
8 *“99% of the time it is just for killing time.” [student, male]*
9

10
11 Some medical experts post clinical pictures and scenarios and invite students to suggest differential
12 diagnoses, often giving the correct answer and an explanation at a later point. While this was
13 appreciated by one student in the interview, in the follow-up vignette discussion he then questioned
14 the professional ethics of posting patient information in a publicly accessible forum, and the concepts
15 of consent and confidentiality were raised. When asked about professional concerns relating to one
16 vignette (on online sharing of clinical educational material) all participants acknowledged the
17 importance of confidentiality.
18
19

20
21 *“I think you need to be careful about what you post. Personally, for myself, as a rule of thumb, I don’t*
22 *think you should post anything about clinical... a clinical scenario or anything because that could get*
23 *you into trouble.” [student, female]*
24
25

26
27 Most noticeable in this last statement is the tension between a very useful medical pedagogical tool,
28 which may benefit medical students, and the ethicality of referring to identifiable patient case studies.
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 **2. Online persona**

44
45 This theme analyses the process whereby learners at all stages of the medical continuum negotiate
46 an online image and attempt to balance personal and professional dimensions. There are three
47 subthemes: ‘crafting an image’, ‘societal expectations’ and ‘boundaries are blurring’.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 56 **2.1 Crafting an image**

57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Participants agreed that care had to be taken with how medical students/clinicians present
4 themselves online. Students and GPs were aware that various platforms serve very different
5 purposes. Both groups indicated a degree of embarrassment with self-promotion on social media. All
6 participants were conscious of how they would be perceived by the public. Several felt it was
7 important to be selective with what gets posted to craft a positive image:
8
9

10
11
12 *“you can hold an image of yourself... put up the photos where you look good are having a wonderful*
13 *time.... I suppose also, some people open their hearts a bit too much... it probably doesn't cast them in*
14 *the best light even if that is not their intention.” [student, male]*
15
16

17
18
19 Another student explained this concept further, detailing how he restricted what he posted to paint
20 an almost superhuman version of himself.
21
22

23
24
25 *“the image you are trying to maintain could be what you identify with or what you want to identify*
26 *with, but you are not really that, so kind of detachment is potentially harmful particularly with young*
27 *people.... There is a culture of social media that is centred around vanity and around what you want to*
28 *identify with versus what you actually identify with.” [student, male]*
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 This quote strongly points to the tensions and pressures in emotional self-regulation involved in using
38 such impression management strategies. It also highlights the danger, when using social media, of a
39 cognitive dissonance between the image medical students and doctors wish to project and the extent
40 to which this image accurately reflects who they are.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **2.2 Societal expectations**

51
52 This theme considers how participants think society might view them when using social media. An
53 experienced GP participant felt strongly that society expects something more from medical students
54 compared to other students as they are “future doctors”. This question as to whether society should
55 expect a higher standard for doctors permeated most of the interviews.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *“maybe somebody looking on would say... ‘I don’t care if my plumber has 20 pints at the weekend... or*
4 *I see them on ‘Facebook’ running... with no clothes on’ – but I don’t want to see a GP on Monday*
5 *morning who has been doing that.” [general practitioner, male]*
6
7
8
9

10 The fear of reputation damage was balanced with the realisation that we cannot all be perfect all the
11 time. One student described this succinctly but still advised the utmost caution when using social
12 media:
13
14
15
16

17
18 *“We are only human. I mean, God forbid, Watson and Crick who discovered DNA, I am sure they were*
19 *mad for their lush [alcohol] every once in a while, but who cares?” [student, male]*
20
21
22

23 Other students took an opposing view and expressed in both interview and follow-up vignette the
24 need to maintain professional conduct on and off duty.
25
26
27

28 *“They have a reputation to maintain and here they are not representing themselves in a professional*
29 *manner.” [student, male]*
30
31
32

33 In some instances, there was dissonance between the view expressed by a participant in the interview
34 and that of the same participant in the follow-up vignettes. One student, when asked about societal
35 expectations, cited the example of a picture shared on a social media platform of a doctor smoking a
36 cigarette, saying that it made no sense for that doctor then to be telling patients not to smoke. When
37 asked to comment on the vignette where a patient expressed concern about doctors who were
38 potentially going to operate on her and had appeared drunk on a social media platform, she
39 responded:
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 *“I would tell her that doctors can’t be doctors all of the time” [student, female]*
50
51
52

53 A very striking example of this is the extent to which doctors are now having to demarcate their public
54 and private life is the remark from one GP about how they had been told to circumvent their social
55 media behaviour at a wedding:
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *"I suppose you can try to make it as private as you can, but I don't know if people entirely understand*
4 *the rules of it, you know when pictures go up I don't think you're even able to take them down or that*
5 *kind of thing. I think people are kind of wary of that you know when pictures are being taken on a night*
6 *out or something you know people might say "don't put them on Facebook". I was at a wedding*
7 *recently of a doctor and there was a request on the invite not to put any pictures up on social media."*
8
9
10
11
12
13
14 *(general practitioner, female)*
15

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Aside from doctors not being allowed to have a personal life or having to be aware that parts of it may be captured inadvertently on social media such that they must take steps to prevent this, there is also the sense that the rules for social media usage are evolving but that this GP and others are not clear what those rules are and who is deciding upon them.

2.3 Boundaries are blurring

This subtheme refers to the changing dynamic between doctors and patients to which social media is contributing. GP participants agreed that it was not unusual to have friends who might be taken on as patients or to have social interaction in the community with existing patients. However, the introduction of social media has the potential to destroy privacy and to blur the boundary between personal and professional.

Friend requests on 'Facebook' were cited by many students and GPs as a potential source of compromise with all viewing it as an inappropriate relationship, fraught with possibilities of doctors' personal information being inappropriately viewed as well as the potential for medical advice being requested online. The risk to patient safety brought about by casual contact and giving of advice in a non-clinical and more relaxed social media environment was pointed out. One GP emphasised maintaining a division between personal and professional life:

1
2
3 *"It is about keeping things separate. Your personal life and your professional life." [general*
4 *practitioner, male]*
5
6
7

8 This points, once again, to the need for individual doctors to decide where they are going to draw their
9 boundary lines with their patients online. Many participants talked about withdrawing from social
10 media interaction or making it difficult for the public to find them. Given that we are all fallible one
11 GP highlighted the need for doctors to be careful about how they use social media:
12
13
14
15
16

17
18 *"I would try and avoid it. I think the importance of being a good doctor is to limit yourself. So, for*
19 *example you would, you can't be good 24-7. You can't be empathic 24-7. We are all human, we have*
20 *moods, we say the wrong thing, we do the wrong thing. I can only imagine someone Facebook*
21 *messaging me that they have a bit of indigestion or a bit of headache or something along those lines*
22 *and me not responding or me responding in an off-handed way in a less than professional manner and*
23 *then the inevitable happens, they have pneumonia, they have meningitis, they have cardiac issues or*
24 *something and of course they have contacted me and I have contacted them and it has been*
25 *unprofessional and that means that I am partly responsible for what happened. So, I am very wary of*
26 *patients using social media to contact me"* (general practitioner, male)
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 This ties into the final theme of what exactly is proper use of social media by doctors.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **3 Towards standards and safety**

49

50 This final theme illustrates the current uncertainty regarding what it means to be a medical
51 professional on social media. There are two subthemes – 'clarifying the standard' and 'safe
52 navigation'.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

3.1 Clarifying the standard

While the data shows that there is awareness among all participants of some ethical dimensions and legal ramifications of poor conduct on social media, there was no clear consensus on what is acceptable. One GP, while aware of the limitations of his own experience with social media, expressed concern for medical students:

“people who have spent all their waking hours for the last ten years stuck in a room swotting, most of them don’t have life experience and are not worldly-wise and therefore are very innocent... they are just not aware of the huge implications this can have on their future so I think that needs to be spelled out very clearly and explicitly.” [general practitioner, male]

GPs and students appeared to disagree on whether clinical experiences could be shared online for teaching and reflective purposes. The vignettes magnified this uncertainty and were useful in presenting examples of where such social media dilemmas might occur. Most of the GPs believed that there was insufficient guidance provided for them and for students. They agreed that a clear set of guidelines was necessary that would uphold good professional conduct while protecting individuals who, in their leisure time, were trying to unwind:

“It is a stressful enough job. You would hate to think that people would be told that you can never let your hair down, you can never do this or that. I think there has to be a balance somewhere.” [general practitioner, female]

This quote underlines the imperative of educating future and current physicians in the use of social media to achieve a private social life.

3.2 Safe Navigation

This final subtheme connects the perceptions found throughout the data on how students and GPs might successfully and safely navigate social media platforms, accessing education and connecting

1
2
3 with others, while at the same time keeping themselves plus their current and future patients safe.

4
5 GPs were very clear on what type of information should not be divulged on social media platforms:

6
7
8 *“Any info. that you think could harm you, your family or your patients.” [general practitioner, female]*

9
10
11 The follow-up vignettes revealed that for three of the students, there was a high level of awareness
12
13 of risks with sharing information online. They recognised the potential for litigation and damaged
14
15 career opportunities as consequences of inappropriate use of social media platforms. However, a
16
17 fourth student, did not appear to have this level of awareness and was actively engaging in
18
19 broadcasting her own clinical experiences seemingly without awareness of the dangers:

20
21
22
23 *“I have a [You Tube] channel that I just started, and I am just uploading some videos about my life...
24
25 about medicine”*

26
27
28 *[Interviewer] Do you think there are any risks with that?*

29
30
31 *“no, not really.” [student, female]*

32
33
34 There was no evidence among participants of any level of participation in formal education on
35
36 engaging social media, and for most, awareness seemed to come from life experience. One student
37
38 told how lessons learned about life as a younger girl influenced her behaviour on SMPs:

39
40
41 *“ My dad used to always give us lectures about pictures which I totally understand so I do have certain
42
43 settings on ‘Facebook’ which only allows... not even all my friends to see my photos” [student, female]*

44
45
46 There was a notable lack of awareness of the existence of guidelines among both groups of
47
48 participants. All agreed that, in general, social media can be positive thing, but most urged caution
49
50 and showed awareness of risk.

51
52
53
54 *“I think overall, social media is great but just be careful with it. That is the long and the short of it.”
55
56 [general practitioner, male]*

Discussion

The analysis has provided new insights into the research question exploring GPs and medical students experience of and perspectives on social media use and behaviour. While educational and networking benefits to the profession exist, most expressed unease about boundary setting and staying safe on these platforms. GPs and medical students appeared to agree that there was a line between professional and personal realms that needed to be maintained, but for medical students, defining where that boundary lies was difficult to conclude.

The scenario that caused the most disagreement among participants related to a video of doctors behaving unprofessionally during their time off, with some defending them and others saying it was unacceptable to behave in a certain way at any time. The statement in our study that “doctors can’t be doctors all of the time” is a dominant theme. An important point in our study is the discordance between what participants think and what they say, as illustrated by the follow up interview seeking their reactions to vignettes. Other research has reported similar inconsistencies, where respondents acknowledged that inappropriate social media use was common but were far more likely to interpret the behaviour as being inappropriate when it was reported among colleagues rather than themselves [17]. Establishing boundaries in a social media age is difficult for all citizens but especially for doctors as they expected to practise to the highest level. The quote regarding Crick and Watson was very apposite in this respect.

The theme of ‘crafting an image’ refers to the efforts of medical students and physicians to portray themselves favourably on social media. This phenomenon has been described as an online “identity crisis” for medical professionals [28]. Researchers have warned of the problem of conflating “self-expression, self-promotion and self-communication” [29]. Research with health care professionals on the subject of ‘digital identity’ formation identified the potential for conflict when professional, personal, public and private identities did not align [30]. The ‘communities of practice’ theory of identity formation addresses how personal and professional identities should be congruent. To this

1
2
3 end, role-modelling, mentoring, experiential learning, reflection, and support from medical educators
4
5 are important.
6
7

8 The concept of dual relationships, whereby professionals and the public interact formally at times
9
10 and informally at other times is brought to a greater level of acuity by social media where 'context
11
12 collapses'- a point emphasised in our data [31]. Formal education at medical school in digital
13
14 professional identity formation in medical school curricula is thus important as is subsequent
15
16 professional accreditation [32]. Some of the participants in our study were aware of which social
17
18 media platforms to use for various purposes and how to use privacy settings to ensure safety.
19

20
21
22 Scholars have called for systematic approaches to the instruction of e-professionalism so that it can
23
24 be incorporated into existing curricula [33].
25

26
27 The generational difference between the two groups of participants - students and general
28
29 practitioners, is another important consideration. The so-called 'generation Z' or millennials who have
30
31 grown up with social media are thought to be more aware of its use for personal branding and career
32
33 promotion [34]. This raises the matter of how these generations may have experienced social media
34
35 differently and how it may be an important effect- the 'cohort effect' as it is known in research on
36
37 depression, for example, where younger generations report greater incidence of depression [35].
38
39 Without negating the cohort effect theory, the participants' responses on social media were striking
40
41 in that they raised similar themes to the GPs, e.g. of the effect posting intemperate remarks or ill-
42
43 advised images would have on a medical practitioner's career. This suggests a 'trans-generational'
44
45 appreciation of the gravitas associated with medical practice which may be affected by the increasing
46
47 presence of social media in our personal and private lives.
48
49
50

51
52 Guidance from medical educators in the USA advised reflection on social media identity, and with
53
54 who and how they will interact [36]. The seriousness of inappropriate social media use is recognised
55
56 by training bodies [37], and early reports of pilot interventions designed to teach social media
57
58 professionalism have met with success [38].
59
60

Strengths and weaknesses

The “two stage” nature of the study, involving in depth interviews followed up by a phone call soliciting views on hypothetical scenarios, was a particular strength as it allowed participants to reflect on their views. A useful cross-cultural element was the participation of GPs and medical students from Ireland and North America. The use of a theoretical framework facilitated understanding of the data in terms of prior knowledge and theory, while allowing flexibility to incorporate new themes. Limitations of the study were its location in a single medical school in Ireland and the small sample size. The results may not be transferrable to other countries and may not be reflective of younger medical students and older clinicians. The interviewer was known to most of the participants which, on one hand, may exaggerate the propensity of participants to give socially desirable answers in the context of behaviour – a phenomenon known as social desirability bias [39]; on the other, it may produce richer data due to the easy establishment of rapport and trust [40].

Implications for further research and practice

Research is warranted to identify how best to teach safe practices for engaging with social media. Clear and dynamic guidelines for medical students and GPs are needed for ethical social media use in the medical profession due to the rapidly changing speed and scope of social media.

We have outlined operational guidance based on the study findings for professional practice:

- Medical educators should support students to use social media as a means of engaging in communities of practice with peers and senior colleagues.
- Existing medical curricula must incorporate social media policies and formal instruction on e-professionalism.

- Educators should acknowledge the tensions between personal and professional identities.
- Specific guidance is needed for students on what is appropriate to post and where and with whom it is appropriate to interact.
- We have identified a need for skills teaching on how identities are developed and the setting of boundaries and this may extend beyond social media use.

Conclusion

Students and GPs view social media as a positive resource for the medical profession. Guidance is required for students and medical practitioners on how to establish reasonable boundaries between their personal and professional presence on social media and in their right to a private life in which ineffective use of social media does not negatively affect career prospects.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to the students who inspired and contributed to the study as well as the GP tutors on the School of Medicine's ULEARN-GP network.

Contributors

MM was involved in the study design, data collection and analysis and helped to write the first draft; VN was involved in the data analysis and write up, ES was involved in study design, oversight, analysis and write-up; JMD was involved in the data analysis and write up; ROC was involved in data analysis, write-up; JOD was involved in study design, data analysis and write-up; AOR was involved in all stages of the project. Each author contributed to all drafts of the paper and read and approved the final manuscript.

Competing interests

1
2
3 We have read and understood BMJ policy on declaration of interests and declare that we have no
4
5 competing interests.
6
7

8 **Ethics approval** University of Limerick Department of Education and Health Sciences Research
9
10 Ethics Committee; 2017_05_17_EHS
11
12

13 **Provenance and peer review** Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.
14
15

16 **Data sharing statement** No additional data are available.
17
18

19 **Funding** – funding for publication was provided by the University of Limerick
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 **References**
58
59
60

1. Kaplan AM, Haenlein M. Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media. *Business horizons*. 2010 1;53(1):59-68.
2. McNeill A, Harris PR, Briggs P. Twitter influence on UK vaccination and antiviral uptake during the 2009 H1N1 pandemic. *Frontiers in public health*. 2016;4:26.
3. Ahani A, Nilashi M. Coronavirus outbreak and its impacts on global economy: the role of social network sites. *Journal of Soft Computing and Decision Support Systems*. 2020;7[2]:19-22.
4. Smailhodzic E, Hooijsma W, Boonstra A, Langley DJ. Social media use in healthcare: a systematic review of effects on patients and on their relationship with healthcare professionals. *BMC health services research*. 2016;16[1]:442.
4. Giustini D, Ali SM, Fraser M, Boulos MNK. Effective uses of social media in public health and medicine: a systematic review of systematic reviews. *Online Journal of Public Health Informatics*. 2018;10[2].
5. Kind T. Professional guidelines for social media use: a starting point. *AMA journal of ethics*. 2015;17[5]:441-7.
6. Chauhan B, George R, Coffin J. Social media and you: what every physician needs to know. *J Med Pract Manage*. 2012;28[3]:206-9.
7. O'Sullivan E, Cutts E, Kavikondala S, Salcedo A, D'Souza K, Hernandez-Torre M, et al. Social media in health science education: an international survey. *JMIR Medical Education*. 2017;3[1]:e1.
8. Barlow CJ, Morrison S, Stephens HO, Jenkins E, Bailey MJ, Pilcher D. Unprofessional behaviour on social media by medical students. *Medical Journal of Australia*. 2015;203[11]:439-.
9. Garner J, O'Sullivan H. Facebook and the professional behaviours of undergraduate medical students. *The clinical teacher*. 2010;7[2]:112-5.
10. Kitsis EA, Milan FB, Cohen HW, Myers D, Herron P, McEvoy M, et al. Who's misbehaving? Perceptions of unprofessional social media use by medical students and faculty. *BMC medical education*. 2016;16[1]:1-7.

- 1
2
3 11. Diller D, Yarris LM. A descriptive analysis of the use of Twitter by emergency medicine
4 residency programs. *Journal of graduate medical education*. 2018; 10(1):51-5.
5
6
- 7 12. Garg M, Pearson DA, Bond MC, Runyon M, Pillow MT, Hopson L, Cooney RR, Khadpe J, Nomura
8 JT, Inboriboon PC. Survey of individual and institutional risk associated with the use of social media.
9
10 *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2016; 17(3):344.
11
12
- 13 13. Fatollahi JJ, Colbert JA, Agarwal P, Lee JL, Lehmann EY, Yuan N, Lehmann LS, Chretien KC. The
14 impact of physician social media behavior on patient trust. *AJOB empirical bioethics*. 2020; 2;11(2):77-
15
16 82.
17
18
- 19 14. Snyder L. Online professionalism: social media, social contracts, trust, and medicine. *The*
20
21 *Journal of clinical ethics*. 2011; 22(2):173-5.
22
23
- 24 15. Wang Z, Wang S, Zhang Y, Jiang X. Social media usage and online professionalism among
25
26 registered nurses: a cross-sectional survey. *International journal of nursing studies*. 2019; 98:19-26.
27
28
- 29 16. Langenfeld SJ, Vargo DJ, Schenarts PJ. Balancing privacy and professionalism: a survey of
30
31 general surgery program directors on social media and surgical education. *Journal of surgical*
32
33 *education*. 2016 Nov 1;73(6):e28-32.
34
35
- 36 17. Pronk SA, Gorter SL, van Luijk SJ, Barnhoorn PC, Binkhorst B, van Mook WN. Perception of
37
38 social media behaviour among medical students, residents and medical specialists. *Perspectives on*
39
40 *Medical Education*. 2021; 7:1-7.
41
42
- 43 18. Mak-Van Der Vossen, M., Van Mook, W., Van Der Burgt, S., Kors, J., Ket, J. C., Croiset, G., &
44
45 Kusrkar, R. Descriptors for unprofessional behaviours of medical students: a systematic review and
46
47 categorisation. *BMC medical education*. 2017; 17[1], 164.
48
49
- 50 19. Gholami-Kordkheili F, Wild V, Strech D. The impact of social media on medical professionalism:
51
52 a systematic qualitative review of challenges and opportunities. *Journal of medical Internet research*.
53
54 2013;15[8]:e184.
55
56
- 57 20. O'Regan A, Smithson WH, Spain E. Social media and professional identity: pitfalls and
58
59 potential. *Medical teacher*. 2018;40[2]:112-6.
60

- 1
2
3 21. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research[COREQ]:
4 a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. International journal for quality in health care.
5
6 2007;19[6]:349-57.
7
- 8
9 22. O'Regan A, Hayes P, O'Connor R, Casey M, O'Dwyer P, Culhane A, et al. The University of
10 Limerick Education and Research Network for General Practice[ULEARN-GP]: practice characteristics
11 and general practitioner perspectives. BMC family practice. 2020;21[1]:1-11.
12
13
- 14 23. Rashid-Doubell F, Mohamed S, Elmusharaf K, O'Neill C. A balancing act: a phenomenological
15 exploration of medical students' experiences of using mobile devices in the clinical setting. BMJ open.
16 2016;6[5].
17
18
- 19 24. Francis JJ, Johnston M, Robertson C, Glidewell L, Entwistle V, Eccles MP, et al. What is an
20 adequate sample size? Operationalising data saturation for theory-based interview studies.
21 Psychology and health. 2010;25[10]:1229-45.
22
23
- 24 25. Cruess SR, Cruess RL, Steinert Y. Supporting the development of a professional identity:
25 general principles. Medical teacher. 2019 Jun 3;41(6):641-9.
26
27
- 28 26. Brooks J, McCluskey S, Turley E, King N. The utility of template analysis in qualitative
29 psychology research. Qualitative research in psychology. 2015;12[2]:202-22.
30
31
- 32 27. Berger R. Now I see it, now I don't: Researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research.
33 Qualitative research. 2015;15[2]:219-34.28. DeCamp M, Koenig TW, Chisolm MS. Social media
34 and physicians' online identity crisis. Jama. 2013;310[6]:581-2.
35
36
- 37 28. DeCamp M, Koenig TW, Chisolm MS. Social media and physicians' online identity crisis. Jama.
38 2013;310[6]:581-2.
39
40
- 41 29. Van Dijck J. 'You have one identity': performing the self on Facebook and LinkedIn. Media,
42 culture & society. 2013;35[2]:199-215.
43
44
- 45 30. Ruan B, Yilmaz Y, Lu D, Lee M, Chan TM. Defining the Digital Self: A Qualitative Study to Explore
46 the Digital Component of Professional Identity in the Health Professions. Journal of medical Internet
47 research. 2020;22(9):e21416.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 31. Sugimoto C, Hank C, Bowman T, Pomerantz J. Friend or faculty: Social networking sites, dual
4 relationships, and context collapse in higher education. *First Monday*. 2015.
5
6
- 7 32. Jawed S, Mahboob U, Yasmeen R. Digital professional identity: Dear Internet! Who am I?
8
9 *Education for Health*. 2019;32[1]:33.
10
11
- 12 33. Wissinger CL, Stiegler Z. Using the extended parallel process model to frame e-professionalism
13 instruction in healthcare education. *Teaching and learning in medicine*. 2019 May 27;31(3):335-41.
14
15
- 16 34. Vițelar A. Like me: Generation Z and the use of social media for personal branding.
17
18 *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy*. 2019;7(2):257-68.
19
20
- 21 35. MacDonagh, J. (2016). Depression and anxiety. In P. Greasley & A. Torn, (Eds.). *Psychology for*
22
23 *Nurses*. Cambridge: Polity.
24
25
- 26 36. Kind T, Patel PD, Lie DA. Opting in to online professionalism: social media and pediatrics.
27
28 *Pediatrics*. 2013 Nov 1;132(5):792-5.
29
30
- 31 37. Pillow MT, Hopson L, Bond M, Cabrera D, Patterson L, Pearson D, Sule H, Ankel F, Fernández-
32 Frackelton M, Hall RV, Kegg JA. Social media guidelines and best practices: recommendations from the
33 Council of Residency Directors Social Media Task Force. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*.
34
35 2014; 15(1):26.
36
37
- 38 38. Geyer E, Irish E, Hagzan A, Wiczulis A. Social Media and Online Professionalism Integrated into
39
40 Year 3 OB/GYN Clerkship#. *Medical Reference Services Quarterly*. 2020 Oct 1;39(4):359-69.
41
42
- 43 39. Nederhof AJ. Methods of coping with social desirability bias: A review. *European journal of*
44
45 *social psychology*. 1985; 15(3):263-80.
46
47
- 48 40. Devotta K, Woodhall-Melnik J, Pedersen C, Wendaferew A, Dowbor TP, Guilcher SJ, Hamilton-
49
50 Wright S, Ferentzy P, Hwang SW, Matheson FI. Enriching qualitative research by engaging peer
51
52 interviewers: A case study. *Qualitative research*. 2016; 16(6):661-80.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Participant Characteristics

GPs/ final year	Gender[M/F]	Age Category	Style of
Medical Student		[20-30], [30-40], [40+]	Interview [face to face, phone, Skype]
Interview 1: GP	F	30-40	Phone
Interview 2: GP	M	30-40	Phone
Interview 3: Medical Student	M	20-30	Skype
Interview 4: Medical Student	M	20-30	Face-to-face
Interview 5: Medical Student	M	20-30	Face-to-face
Interview 6: Medical student	F	30-40	Face-to-face
Interview 7: GP	M	40+	Face-to-face
Interview 8: Medical student	F	20-30	Face-to-face

COREQ (COnsolidated criteria for REporting Qualitative research) Checklist

A checklist of items that should be included in reports of qualitative research. You must report the page number in your manuscript where you consider each of the items listed in this checklist. If you have not included this information, either revise your manuscript accordingly before submitting or note N/A.

Topic	Item No.	Guide Questions/Description	Reported on Page No.
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
<i>Personal characteristics</i>			
Interviewer/facilitator	1	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	
Credentials	2	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	
Occupation	3	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	
Gender	4	Was the researcher male or female?	
Experience and training	5	What experience or training did the researcher have?	
<i>Relationship with participants</i>			
Relationship established	6	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	
Participant knowledge of the interviewer	7	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	
Interviewer characteristics	8	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	
Domain 2: Study design			
<i>Theoretical framework</i>			
Methodological orientation and Theory	9	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	
<i>Participant selection</i>			
Sampling	10	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	
Method of approach	11	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	
Sample size	12	How many participants were in the study?	
Non-participation	13	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	
<i>Setting</i>			
Setting of data collection	14	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	
Presence of non-participants	15	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	
Description of sample	16	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	
<i>Data collection</i>			
Interview guide	17	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	
Repeat interviews	18	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?	
Audio/visual recording	19	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	
Field notes	20	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	
Duration	21	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	
Data saturation	22	Was data saturation discussed?	
Transcripts returned	23	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or	

Topic	Item No.	Guide Questions/Description	Reported on Page No.
		correction?	
Domain 3: analysis and findings			
<i>Data analysis</i>			
Number of data coders	24	How many data coders coded the data?	
Description of the coding tree	25	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	
Derivation of themes	26	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	
Software	27	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	
Participant checking	28	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	
<i>Reporting</i>			
Quotations presented	29	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	
Data and findings consistent	30	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	
Clarity of major themes	31	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	
Clarity of minor themes	32	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	

Developed from: Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 2007. Volume 19, Number 6: pp. 349 – 357

Once you have completed this checklist, please save a copy and upload it as part of your submission. DO NOT include this checklist as part of the main manuscript document. It must be uploaded as a separate file.

1
2
3 *Interview Guide*
4
5

6 Interview Guide
7
8 1. Tell me about your experience of social media.
9
10 2. Do you share personal information online such as pictures, location and
11 employment status? If yes/no, why?
12
13 3. Do you use social media for personal or professional use?
14
15 4. What do you feel are the benefits of using social media apps?
16
17 5. What do you feel are the risks associated with the use of social media?
18
19 6. As a clinician/ future clinician how would you feel about patients contacting
20 you/following you on social media?
21
22

23
24
25
26
27 *Vignettes*
28
29

30 Follow up interviews: Vignettes
31
32
33 1. “Michelle Kelly is a student nurse. She recently posted a photo to twitter showing
34 the Accident and Emergency room of the hospital in which she is training on a
35 Saturday night. The caption for the photograph was “The crazies are really out
36 tonight...”. There were several patients in the photograph, although only one is
37 readily identifiable. You see from her feed that she is “friends” with a number of
38 former patients on facebook. In a series of posts with one former patient, John, they
39 discuss the upsetting nature of the injuries received by an unidentified patient, with
40 whom John shared a room”.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55 2. “As a senior house officer in a busy surgical outpatients clinic, you consult with a
56 young lady who is on the laparoscopy waiting list. She appears disconcerted and
57 tells you about a recent you tube video link that was shared with her by a friend.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The video involved a group of young men who appeared drunk and were taking turns jumping into a swimming pool after drinking a pint of alcohol. She recognised one of them as the surgical registrar who booked her for her upcoming laparoscopy. She has since found out that the others were also junior doctors in the hospital. She tells you that, although she has no problem with clinicians enjoying themselves, she would not be comfortable with such unprofessional type people having such involvement in her health”.

- How would you approach this problem with the patient?
- What ethical and professional issues arise here?

3. “While on placement in final year of physiotherapy, a friend sends you a screen shot of a blog that one of your classmates is running. The classmate is a very hard working student and has always shared resources with you. The blog is a day by day account of your classmate’s clinical encounters, highlighting learning points and tips for the final year examination. The screenshot is of a paragraph outlining in detail the history of a road traffic accident that led to a client presenting to her. The client’s name is not given but the gender, age, locality and date of accident is documented. The screenshot is followed by this comment from your friend: “no prizes for guessing who this guy is!”

- Would you act on this information? If so, how?
- What ethical and legal dilemmas arise while sharing experiences online?

BMJ Open

“Doctors can’t be doctors all of the time”: a qualitative study of how general practitioners and medical students negotiate public- professional and private-personal realms using social media

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-047991.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	27-Sep-2021
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Marshal, Megan; Health Research Institute, University of Limerick School of Medicine Niranjan, Vikram; Health Research Institute, University of Limerick School of Medicine Spain, Eimear; Health Research Institute, University of Limerick School of Medicine MacDonagh, Joe; Technical University Dublin, School of Business and Humanities O'Doherty, Jane; Health Research Institute, University of Limerick School of Medicine O'Connor, Raymond; Health Research Institute, University of Limerick School of Medicine, Graduate Entry Medical School O'Regan, Andrew; University of Limerick Faculty of Education and Health Sciences, Health Research Institute, University of Limerick School of Medicine</p>
Primary Subject Heading:	Medical education and training
Secondary Subject Heading:	Ethics
Keywords:	PRIMARY CARE, MEDICAL EDUCATION & TRAINING, MEDICAL ETHICS

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3 **Title page**
4
5
6
7
8

9 **“Doctors can’t be doctors all of the time”: a qualitative study of how general practitioners and**
10 **medical students negotiate public- professional and private-personal realms using social media**
11
12

13
14 M Marshal¹, V Niranjana², E Spain¹, J MacDonagh³, J O’Doherty¹, R O’Connor¹, *A O’Regan¹
15
16

17
18
19
20 *corresponding author Dr Andrew O’Regan, address: School of Medicine, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland; email- andrew.oregan@ul.ie
21
22

23 ¹Health Research Institute University of Limerick School of Medicine, Limerick, Ireland
24

25 ²School of Public Health Physiotherapy and Sports Science, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland
26
27

28 ³School of Business & Humanities, Technological University Dublin, Ireland
29
30
31
32
33

34 Key words – General Practice, Social media, online professionalism, medical education
35
36

37 Manuscript word count – 5071
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Abstract**
44

45 **Objective-** The objective of this study is to explore the experiences and perspectives of general
46 practitioners’ and medical students’ use of, and behaviour on, social media and to understand how
47 they negotiate threats to professional and personal life on social media.
48
49

50
51
52 **Design-** A two phase qualitative design was employed, consisting of semi-structured interviews and
53 follow-up vignettes, where participants were asked to respond to vignettes that involved varying
54 degrees of unprofessional behaviour. Data were analysed using template analysis.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Setting and Participants-** Participants were general practitioner tutors and third year medical students
4 who had just completed placement on the University of Limerick longitudinal integrated clerkship.
5
6
7 Five students and three general practitioners affiliated with the medical school were invited to
8
9 participate in one-to-one interviews.
10

11
12 **Results** – three overarching themes, each containing subthemes were reported. ‘Staying in contact
13 and up to date’ outlines how social media platforms provide useful resources and illustrates the
14 potential risks of social media. ‘Online persona’ considers how social media have contributed to
15 changing the nature of inter-personal relationships. ‘Towards standards and safety’ raises the matter
16 of how to protect patients, doctors and the medical profession.
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 **Conclusion** - Guidance is required for students and medical practitioners on how to establish
25 reasonable boundaries between their personal and professional presence on social media and in their
26 private life so that poorly judged use of social media does not negatively affect career prospects and
27 professional efficacy.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Strengths and Weaknesses of the Study**

- 41
- 42
- 43 • The sampling method facilitated balance of gender, age and nationality of participants.
- 44
- 45
- 46 • The conceptual lens, communities of learning, situated the data in terms of accepted theory
47 and evidence.
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51 • The use of vignettes provided rich data on participants’ experience of social media use and
52 behaviour.
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56 • The study was limited to one cohort of participants in a single medical school.
- 57
- 58
- 59 • The number of participants was relatively small (N=8).
- 60

Introduction

Social media is defined as “a group of internet-based applications that build on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0, and that allow the creation and exchange of user generated content” [1]. It has become an effective communication tool for public health to convey information to populations in ‘real-time’ during the COVID-19 pandemic [2]. While social media can improve communication in some instances, the associated environment is fraught with the danger of suboptimal communication [3]. A comprehensive review warned that, for health professionals and patients, social media can negatively impact on mental health, privacy and information quality [4]. The concept of ‘online professionalism’, rooted in the traditional values of medicine, has evolved in the past decade in response to the challenges of the constantly changing social media sphere [5].

Unprofessional online behaviour resulting in disciplinary action for medical students and doctors is concerning [6]; one international study reported that almost one fifth of the medical students surveyed admitted to sharing clinical images inappropriately [7]. Similarly, surveys of medical students in Australia [8], England [9] and the USA [10] reported that unprofessional social media posting was common. While regulatory guidelines are available, inappropriate behaviour on social media remains problematic [11], with the majority of residents in one study admitting to having posted inappropriate photographs of medical colleagues intoxicated on social media [12]. In this context, the findings of cross-sectional survey of the public are relevant; it reported that inappropriate use of social media by physicians, including images of intoxication, would cause patients to trust them less [13]. Such implications have been highlighted by medical ethicists [14]. The phenomenon is not restricted to doctors – over half of respondents in a survey of registered nurses said that they had witnessed inappropriate online behaviour among colleagues [15]. Furthermore, postgraduate programme directors frequently check the social media profiles of residency applicants for inappropriate behaviour [16].

1
2
3 Recent research surveys of medical students, residents and consultants, reported that almost one
4
5 third of students had posted inappropriate photographs of themselves on social media; the findings
6
7 among residents and consultants were significantly lower [17]. This raises the question of whether
8
9 there is an effect for age in the use of social media; a systematic review examining the impact of
10
11 social media on medical professionals encouraged intergenerational dialogue [18].
12
13

14
15 Physicians and students may be unsure of the full medical, professional, and personal reputational
16
17 consequences of the new social media age [19, 20]. Ethical concerns also include the public-
18
19 professional and private-personal spheres. Few qualitative studies examining the views of medical
20
21 students and those of their clinical supervisors on this topic exist. The aim of this study was to
22
23 explore general practitioners' (GPs) and medical students' perspectives on and experience of social
24
25 media. Specific objectives were to investigate how students and their GP-tutors utilise social media;
26
27 what challenges they encounter in keeping boundaries between professional and personal identities
28
29 and private and public realms; how they negotiate these challenges and conduct themselves
30
31 professionally when using online platforms.
32
33

34 35 36 **Conceptual framework**

37
38 'Communities of practice' is a popular theory for conceptualising the development of medical
39
40 professional identity [21], whereby the medical profession is understood both as a "collegial
41
42 profession and community of practice" [21]. The theory states that successful identity formation
43
44 depends on a dynamic interplay between members of the medical community at different stages of
45
46 the medical continuum. To this end social media can supplement but not replace "meaningful contact
47
48 with members of the community", which is considered in this framework to be the most important
49
50 factor in professional identity formation [21].
51
52
53

54
55 A qualitative epistemic approach leads to a methodology which teases out the subjective experience
56
57 of a research participant, and that is why interviews and responding to short vignettes were selected
58
59 for this study. Given we are not trying to make an invariant real word truth claim, such as with large
60

1
2
3 sample size quantitative studies, we chose a conceptual-methodological approach that investigated
4
5 the depth and breadth of how medical doctors and students experience social media in their
6
7 personal and professional lives. Thus, the theoretical contribution of our paper is to say that social
8
9 media is not merely a communication tool but is a fluid medium in which people posit varying
10
11 identities and often negotiate these with themselves, their colleagues, patients and with those in the
12
13 social media sphere, and that it is particularly difficult for doctors as they expect so much from
14
15 themselves and have so much expected from them by others.
16
17

18 19 **Methodology**

20 21 **Study design**

22
23
24
25 The study adhered to the COREQ [Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research] principles
26
27 for reporting qualitative research (supplementary material 1) [22]. Ethical approval was granted by
28
29 the University of Limerick Education and Health Science Faculty Ethics Committee [2017_05_17_EHS].
30
31 Participants were contacted by email sent from a research administrator who was not involved in
32
33 course teaching and assessment, thus ensuring no power dynamic or coercion. This study utilised a
34
35 hybrid methodology whereby an in-depth, semi-structured interview based on a topic guide designed
36
37 by the research team was followed, for some participants, by a second interview structured using
38
39 short ethical dilemmas on social media described here as vignettes.
40
41
42
43

44 45 **Setting and Participants**

46
47 Participants were GP tutors and third year medical students who had just completed a longitudinal
48
49 integrated clerkship [23]. Five medical students and three GPs participated in the study. Purposive,
50
51 non-probabilistic, sampling was used to ensure that a balance was achieved between students from
52
53 Europe and North America and that both male and females were selected to be as representative as
54
55 possible of the student population. The characteristics of the participants are outlined in table 1. As
56
57 judgemental sampling involves the judgement of the researchers based, for example, on their
58
59
60

1
2
3 expertise and knowledge of previous research it was decided to base the sample size on a previous
4 qualitative study on medical student mobile phone usage [24]. The interview process worked through
5 the eight participants until no new themes were emerging. This is known as data saturation- the
6 'stopping criterion' [25] for the data collection being met as those being interviewed are repeating
7 themes mentioned by others or are not suggesting new themes.
8
9

10 {Insert table 1 here}

11 **Public and patient involvement**

12 No patients were involved in the study, but the research question was derived from classroom
13 discussions and interactions with medical students GP-tutors.
14

15 **Data Collection**

16 The interview guide was developed by an interdisciplinary team, and vignettes were developed by two
17 of the research team (ES, AOR) with the purpose of exploring students' and clinicians' responses to
18 examples of unprofessional behaviour online by healthcare workers (supplementary material 2).
19 These vignettes were designed so that doctors and medical students could give ethical and
20 professional perspectives not simply on themselves but also on those with whom they work and will
21 be working in their medical careers. Participants were asked to respond to three separate scenarios
22 which required them to consider the ethical dilemmas and professional practice challenges of using
23 social media personally and professionally. Where the themes explored in the vignettes were
24 addressed by the participants in their initial interview they were not interviewed again with the aid of
25 the vignettes.
26

27 Interviews were conducted by a trained female researcher (MM), who would have known some of the
28 participants and lasted between 15 and 30 minutes. These were conducted either by telephone, Skype
29 or in person and were digitally recorded, with the explicit consent of those participating. Where
30 participants were invited to a second interview, if their first interview had not addressed the themes
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in the vignettes, they were shown or read short vignettes about use of social media and their opinions
4
5 were elicited.
6
7

8 **Data analysis** 9

10
11 The methodology utilised was template analysis. A coding template based on representative parts of
12
13 the data is developed, and, subsequently, is revised and refined [26]. It facilitates the use of a priori
14
15 themes which can later be modified or excluded as the data analysis evolves, as the researchers read
16
17 and re-read the data. The identification of templates is thus iterative in nature - some are established
18
19 initially as more important and then, after thorough reading and re-reading of the data transcripts,
20
21 may be seen as less important or more important. This helps to compare perspectives between
22
23 different categories of participant, in this case, GPs and medical students. It is a practical method that
24
25 is well suited to a team involving multiple coders as it gives the freedom to the team to collaborate on
26
27 the direction and content of the coding. The process involved over six meetings of the coders (AOR,
28
29 VN, JOD).
30
31
32

33
34 Initially, the coders read the full interview texts to familiarise themselves with the raw data.
35
36 Preliminary data coding was conducted independently with the use of a priori themes that the
37
38 researchers expected to appear in the data; only a priori themes related to the research question were
39
40 chosen. These included benefits of social media, personal and professional use, and potential pitfalls.
41
42 The initial codes and themes were used to define a coding template; this facilitated the researchers
43
44 to understand the relationship between the codes and themes, whilst maintaining flexibility so that
45
46 more codes and themes could be added as the hierarchical analysis developed. Coders discussed
47
48 personal experiences with social media and attitudes towards the scenarios in the vignettes, a process
49
50 known as “active-acknowledgement” for overcoming researcher bias [27]. Discrepancies were
51
52 resolved by personal reflection and ongoing dialogue between the data analysis team.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Findings

The analysis produced three overarching themes, each with subthemes that were often interconnected and, in some cases, had overlapping ideas.

1. Staying in contact and up to date

This theme refers to the practical, day-to-day applications of social media for medical students and GPs. Social media has undoubted social and networking benefits, and these were highlighted by participants, as well as the challenging nature of the information available- which can help participants stay up to date, but which can waste time also. This theme has been divided into two subthemes: 'staying connected' and 'educational tool'.

1.1 Staying connected

Maintaining friendships and staying in touch with others was the primary stated use of social media platforms. One student said how helpful Facebook was in keeping touch with family throughout the world and with a network of friends from a previous course, while another felt that the speed and ease of access may come at the cost of maintaining meaningful relationships.

"perhaps they are superficial relationships, but you know I feel like if I didn't have 'Facebook', particularly I would absolutely lose contact with these people." [student, male]

Social media was perceived as very useful for staying in touch, but there appeared to be an awareness of the link between social media abuse when interviewing for jobs or being publicly castigated for holding the 'wrong' view on a contentious topic.

"I am very conscious about putting up things like my date of birth, things about politics... of not giving away too much about myself." [student, female]

In this quote there is both the appreciation of confidential personal details such as "date of birth" but also the sense that there are areas which are personal and private, such as political views. This raised

1
2
3 the idea that students and GPs alike were aware of the importance of boundary setting and so social
4
5 media must be approached carefully.
6
7
8
9

10 11 **1.2 'Educational tool'**

12
13
14 This subtheme describes how, on one hand, social media platforms have significantly enhanced
15
16 learning but, on the other, must be handled with care. Concerns about social media distracting from
17
18 learning were evident for GPs and students:
19

20
21 *"you can spend hours and hours just scrolling going from Twitter to Facebook to LinkedIn."* [general
22
23 practitioner, male]
24

25
26 *"99% of the time it is just for killing time."* [student, male]
27
28

29
30 Some medical experts post clinical pictures and scenarios and invite students to suggest differential
31
32 diagnoses, often giving the correct answer and an explanation at a later point. While this was
33
34 appreciated by one student in the interview, in the follow-up vignette discussion he then questioned
35
36 the professional ethics of posting patient information in a publicly accessible forum, and the concepts
37
38 of consent and confidentiality were raised. When asked about professional concerns relating to one
39
40 vignette (on online sharing of clinical educational material) all participants acknowledged the
41
42 importance of confidentiality.
43
44

45
46 *"I think you need to be careful about what you post. Personally, for myself, as a rule of thumb, I don't*
47
48 *think you should post anything about clinical... a clinical scenario or anything because that could get*
49
50 *you into trouble."* [student, female]
51
52

53
54 Most noticeable in this last statement is the tension between a very useful medical pedagogical tool,
55
56 which may benefit medical students, and the ethicality of referring to identifiable patient case studies.
57
58
59
60

2. Online persona

This theme analyses the process whereby learners at all stages of the medical continuum negotiate an online image and attempt to balance personal and professional dimensions. There are three subthemes: 'crafting an image', 'societal expectations' and 'boundaries are blurring'.

2.1 Crafting an image

Participants agreed that care had to be taken with how medical students/clinicians present themselves online. Students and GPs were aware that various platforms serve very different purposes. Both groups indicated a degree of embarrassment with self-promotion on social media. All participants were conscious of how they would be perceived by the public. Several felt it was important to be selective with what gets posted to craft a positive image:

"you can hold an image of yourself... put up the photos where you look good are having a wonderful time.... I suppose also, some people open their hearts a bit too much... it probably doesn't cast them in the best light even if that is not their intention." [student, male]

Another student explained this concept further, detailing how he restricted what he posted to paint an almost superhuman version of himself.

"the image you are trying to maintain could be what you identify with or what you want to identify with, but you are not really that, so kind of detachment is potentially harmful particularly with young people.... There is a culture of social media that is centred around vanity and around what you want to identify with versus what you actually identify with." [student, male]

This quote strongly points to the tensions and pressures in emotional self-regulation involved in using such impression management strategies. It also highlights the danger, when using social media, of a cognitive dissonance between the image medical students and doctors wish to project and the extent to which this image accurately reflects who they are.

2.2 Societal expectations

This theme considers how participants think society might view them when using social media. An experienced GP participant felt strongly that society expects something more from medical students compared to other students as they are “future doctors”. This question as to whether society should expect a higher standard for doctors permeated most of the interviews.

“maybe somebody looking on would say... ‘I don’t care if my plumber has 20 pints at the weekend... or I see them on ‘Facebook’ running... with no clothes on’ – but I don’t want to see a GP on Monday morning who has been doing that.” [general practitioner, male]

The fear of reputation damage was balanced with the realisation that we cannot all be perfect all the time. One student described this succinctly but still advised the utmost caution when using social media:

“We are only human. I mean, God forbid, Watson and Crick who discovered DNA, I am sure they were mad for their lush [alcohol] every once in a while, but who cares?” [student, male]

Other students took an opposing view and expressed in both interview and follow-up vignette the need to maintain professional conduct on and off duty.

“They have a reputation to maintain and here they are not representing themselves in a professional manner.” [student, male]

In some instances, there was dissonance between the view expressed by a participant in the interview and that of the same participant in the follow-up vignettes. One student, when asked about societal expectations, cited the example of a picture shared on a social media platform of a doctor smoking a cigarette, saying that it made no sense for that doctor then to be telling patients not to smoke. When asked to comment on the vignette where a patient expressed concern about doctors who were

1
2
3 potentially going to operate on her and had appeared drunk on a social media platform, she
4
5 responded:

6
7
8 *"I would tell her that doctors can't be doctors all of the time" [student, female]*
9

10
11 A very striking example of this is the extent to which doctors are now having to demarcate their public
12
13 and private life is the remark from one GP about how they had been told to circumvent their social
14
15 media behaviour at a wedding:

16
17
18 *"I suppose you can try to make it as private as you can, but I don't know if people entirely understand*
19
20 *the rules of it, you know when pictures go up I don't think you're even able to take them down or that*
21
22 *kind of thing. I think people are kind of wary of that you know when pictures are being taken on a night*
23
24 *out or something you know people might say "don't put them on Facebook". I was at a wedding*
25
26 *recently of a doctor and there was a request on the invite not to put any pictures up on social media."*
27
28
29 *(general practitioner, female)*
30
31

32
33 Aside from doctors not being allowed to have a personal life or having to be aware that parts of it may
34
35 be captured inadvertently on social media such that they must take steps to prevent this, there is also
36
37 the sense that the rules for social media usage are evolving but that this GP and others are not clear
38
39 what those rules are and who is deciding upon them.
40
41
42
43
44

45 **2.3 Boundaries are blurring**

46
47

48
49 This subtheme refers to the changing dynamic between doctors and patients to which social media is
50
51 contributing. GP participants agreed that it was not unusual to have friends who might be taken on
52
53 as patients or to have social interaction in the community with existing patients. However, the
54
55 introduction of social media has the potential to destroy privacy and to blur the boundary between
56
57 personal and professional.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Friend requests on 'Facebook' were cited by many students and GPs as a potential source of
4
5 compromise with all viewing it as an inappropriate relationship, fraught with possibilities of doctors'
6
7 personal information being inappropriately viewed as well as the potential for medical advice being
8
9 requested online. The risk to patient safety brought about by casual contact and giving of advice in a
10
11 non-clinical and more relaxed social media environment was pointed out. One GP emphasised
12
13 maintaining a division between personal and professional life:
14
15

16
17 *"It is about keeping things separate. Your personal life and your professional life."* [general
18
19 practitioner, male]
20

21
22 This points, once again, to the need for individual doctors to decide where they are going to draw their
23
24 boundary lines with their patients online. Many participants talked about withdrawing from social
25
26 media interaction or making it difficult for the public to find them. Given that we are all fallible one
27
28 GP highlighted the need for doctors to be careful about how they use social media:
29
30

31
32 *"I would try and avoid it. I think the importance of being a good doctor is to limit yourself. So, for
33
34 example you would, you can't be good 24-7. You can't be empathic 24-7. We are all human, we have
35
36 moods, we say the wrong thing, we do the wrong thing. I can only imagine someone Facebook
37
38 messaging me that they have a bit of indigestion or a bit of headache or something along those lines
39
40 and me not responding or me responding in an off-handed way in a less than professional manner and
41
42 then the inevitable happens, they have pneumonia, they have meningitis, they have cardiac issues or
43
44 something and of course they have contacted me and I have contacted them and it has been
45
46 unprofessional and that means that I am partly responsible for what happened. So, I am very wary of
47
48 patients using social media to contact me"* (general practitioner, male)
49
50
51

52
53 This ties into the final theme of what exactly is proper use of social media by doctors.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

3 Towards standards and safety

This final theme illustrates the current uncertainty regarding what it means to be a medical professional on social media. There are two subthemes – ‘clarifying the standard’ and ‘safe navigation’.

3.1 Clarifying the standard

While the data shows that there is awareness among all participants of some ethical dimensions and legal ramifications of poor conduct on social media, there was no clear consensus on what is acceptable. One GP, while aware of the limitations of his own experience with social media, expressed concern for medical students:

“people who have spent all their waking hours for the last ten years stuck in a room swotting, most of them don’t have life experience and are not worldly-wise and therefore are very innocent... they are just not aware of the huge implications this can have on their future so I think that needs to be spelled out very clearly and explicitly.” [general practitioner, male]

GPs and students appeared to disagree on whether clinical experiences could be shared online for teaching and reflective purposes. The vignettes magnified this uncertainty and were useful in presenting examples of where such social media dilemmas might occur. Most of the GPs believed that there was insufficient guidance provided for them and for students. They agreed that a clear set of guidelines was necessary that would uphold good professional conduct while protecting individuals who, in their leisure time, were trying to unwind:

“It is a stressful enough job. You would hate to think that people would be told that you can never let your hair down, you can never do this or that. I think there has to be a balance somewhere.” [general practitioner, female]

1
2
3 This quote underlines the imperative of educating future and current physicians in the use of social
4 media to achieve a private social life.
5
6
7
8
9

10 11 **3.2 Safe Navigation** 12

13
14 This final subtheme connects the perceptions found throughout the data on how students and GPs
15 might successfully and safely navigate social media platforms, accessing education and connecting
16 with others, while at the same time keeping themselves plus their current and future patients safe.
17
18 GPs were very clear on what type of information should not be divulged on social media platforms:
19
20
21
22

23
24 *“Any info. that you think could harm you, your family or your patients.” [general practitioner, female]*
25

26
27 The follow-up vignettes revealed that for three of the students, there was a high level of awareness
28 of risks with sharing information online. They recognised the potential for litigation and damaged
29 career opportunities as consequences of inappropriate use of social media platforms. However, a
30 fourth student, did not appear to have this level of awareness and was actively engaging in
31 broadcasting her own clinical experiences seemingly without awareness of the dangers:
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 *“I have a [You Tube] channel that I just started, and I am just uploading some videos about my life...
39 about medicine”*
40
41

42
43 *[Interviewer] Do you think there are any risks with that?*
44

45
46 *“no, not really.” [student, female]*
47
48

49
50 There was no evidence among participants of any level of participation in formal education on
51 engaging social media, and for most, awareness seemed to come from life experience. One student
52 told how lessons learned about life as a younger girl influenced her behaviour on SMPs:
53
54
55

56
57 *“ My dad used to always give us lectures about pictures which I totally understand so I do have certain
58 settings on ‘Facebook’ which only allows... not even all my friends to see my photos” [student, female]*
59
60

1
2
3 There was a notable lack of awareness of the existence of guidelines among both groups of
4 participants. All agreed that, in general, social media can be positive thing, but most urged caution
5 and showed awareness of risk.
6
7
8
9

10 *"I think overall, social media is great but just be careful with it. That is the long and the short of it."*

11
12
13 *[general practitioner, male]*
14
15
16
17
18

19 Discussion

20
21
22 The analysis has provided new insights into the research question exploring GPs and medical students
23 experience of and perspectives on social media use and behaviour. While educational and networking
24 benefits to the profession exist, most expressed unease about boundary setting and staying safe on
25 these platforms. GPs and medical students appeared to agree that there was a line between
26 professional and personal realms that needed to be maintained, but for medical students, defining
27 where that boundary lies was difficult to conclude.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 The scenario that caused the most disagreement among participants related to a video of doctors
37 behaving unprofessionally during their time off, with some defending them and others saying it was
38 unacceptable to behave in a certain way at any time. The statement in our study that "doctors can't
39 be doctors all of the time" is a dominant theme. An important point in our study is the discordance
40 between what participants think and what they say, as illustrated by the follow up interview seeking
41 their reactions to vignettes. Other research has reported similar inconsistencies, where respondents
42 acknowledged that inappropriate social media use was common but were far more likely to
43 interpret the behaviour as being inappropriate when it was reported among colleagues rather than
44 themselves [17]. Establishing boundaries in a social media age is difficult for all citizens but
45 especially for doctors as they expected to practise to the highest level. The quote regarding Crick and
46 Watson was very apposite in this respect.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The theme of 'crafting an image' refers to the efforts of medical students and physicians to portray
4 themselves favourably on social media. This phenomenon has been described as an online "identity
5 crisis" for medical professionals [28]. Researchers have warned of the problem of conflating "self-
6 expression, self-promotion and self-communication" [29]. Research with health care professionals on
7 the subject of 'digital identity' formation identified the potential for conflict when professional,
8 personal, public and private identities did not align [30]. The 'communities of practice' theory of
9 identity formation addresses how personal and professional identities should be congruent. To this
10 end, role-modelling, mentoring, experiential learning, reflection, and support from medical educators
11 are important.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 The concept of dual relationships, whereby professionals and the public interact formally at times
25 and informally at other times is brought to a greater level of acuity by social media where 'context
26 collapses'- a point emphasised in our data [31]. Formal education at medical school in digital
27 professional identity formation in medical school curricula is thus important as is subsequent
28 professional accreditation [32]. Some of the participants in our study were aware of which social
29 media platforms to use for various purposes and how to use privacy settings to ensure safety.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Scholars have called for systematic approaches to the instruction of e-professionalism so that it can
38 be incorporated into existing curricula [33].
39
40
41
42

43 The generational difference between the two groups of participants - students and general
44 practitioners, is another important consideration. The so-called 'generation Z' or millennials who have
45 grown up with social media are thought to be more aware of its use for personal branding and career
46 promotion [34]. This raises the matter of how these generations may have experienced social media
47 differently and how it may be an important effect- the 'cohort effect' as it is known in research on
48 depression, for example, where younger generations report greater incidence of depression [35].
49 Without negating the cohort effect theory, the participants' responses on social media were striking
50 in that they raised similar themes to the GPs, e.g. of the effect posting intemperate remarks or ill-
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 advised images would have on a medical practitioner's career. This suggests a 'trans-generational'
4 appreciation of the gravitas associated with medical practice which may be affected by the increasing
5 presence of social media in our personal and private lives.
6
7
8

9
10 Guidance from medical educators in the USA advised reflection on social media identity, and with
11 who and how they will interact [36]. The seriousness of inappropriate social media use is recognised
12 by training bodies [37], and early reports of pilot interventions designed to teach social media
13 professionalism have met with success [38].
14
15
16
17
18

19 20 **Strengths and weaknesses** 21

22
23 The "two stage" nature of the study, involving in depth interviews followed up by a phone call
24 soliciting views on hypothetical scenarios, was a particular strength as it allowed participants to
25 reflect on their views. A useful cross-cultural element was the participation of GPs and medical
26 students from Ireland and North America. The use of a theoretical framework facilitated
27 understanding of the data in terms of prior knowledge and theory, while allowing flexibility to
28 incorporate new themes. Limitations of the study were its location in a single medical school in
29 Ireland and the small sample size. The results may not be transferrable to other countries and may
30 not be reflective of younger medical students and older clinicians. The interviewer was known to
31 most of the participants which, on one hand, may exaggerate the propensity of participants to give
32 socially desirable answers in the context of behaviour – a phenomenon known as social desirability
33 bias [39]; on the other, it may produce richer data due to the easy establishment of rapport and
34 trust [40].
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 **Implications for further research and practice** 58 59 60

1
2
3 Research is warranted to identify how best to teach safe practices for engaging with social media.
4
5 Clear and dynamic guidelines for medical students and GPs are needed for ethical social media use in
6
7 the medical profession due to the rapidly changing speed and scope of social media.
8
9

10 We have outlined operational guidance based on the study findings for professional practice:
11

- 12
13 • Medical educators should support students to use social media as a means of engaging in
14
15 communities of practice with peers and senior colleagues.
16
- 17
18 • Existing medical curricula must incorporate social media policies and formal instruction on e-
19
20 professionalism.
21
- 22
23 • Educators should acknowledge the tensions between personal and professional identities.
24
- 25
26 • Specific guidance is needed for students on what is appropriate to post and where and with
27
28 whom it is appropriate to interact.
29
- 30
31 • We have identified a need for skills teaching on how identities are developed and the setting
32
33 of boundaries and this may extend beyond social media use.
34
35
36
37

38 **Conclusion**

39
40 Students and GPs view social media as a positive resource for the medical profession. Guidance is
41
42 required for students and medical practitioners on how to establish reasonable boundaries between
43
44 their personal and professional presence on social media and in their right to a private life in which
45
46 ineffective use of social media does not negatively affect career prospects.
47
48
49
50
51

52 **Acknowledgements**

53
54
55 The authors are grateful to the students who inspired and contributed to the study as well as the GP
56
57 tutors on the School of Medicine's ULEARN-GP network.
58
59
60

Contributors

MM was involved in the study design, data collection and analysis and helped to write the first draft; VN was involved in the data analysis and write up, ES was involved in study design, oversight, analysis and write-up; JMD was involved in the data analysis and write up; ROC was involved in data analysis, write-up; JOD was involved in study design, data analysis and write-up; AOR was involved in all stages of the project. Each author contributed to all drafts of the paper and read and approved the final manuscript.

Competing interests

We have read and understood BMJ policy on declaration of interests and declare that we have no competing interests.

Ethics approval University of Limerick Department of Education and Health Sciences Research Ethics Committee; 2017_05_17_EHS

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data sharing statement No additional data are available.

Funding – funding for publication was provided by the University of Limerick

References

1. Kaplan AM, Haenlein M. Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media. *Business horizons*. 2010 1;53(1):59-68.
2. McNeill A, Harris PR, Briggs P. Twitter influence on UK vaccination and antiviral uptake during the 2009 H1N1 pandemic. *Frontiers in public health*. 2016;4:26.
3. Ahani A, Nilashi M. Coronavirus outbreak and its impacts on global economy: the role of social network sites. *Journal of Soft Computing and Decision Support Systems*. 2020;7[2]:19-22.
4. Smailhodzic E, Hooijsma W, Boonstra A, Langley DJ. Social media use in healthcare: a systematic review of effects on patients and on their relationship with healthcare professionals. *BMC health services research*. 2016;16[1]:442.
4. Giustini D, Ali SM, Fraser M, Boulos MNK. Effective uses of social media in public health and medicine: a systematic review of systematic reviews. *Online Journal of Public Health Informatics*. 2018;10[2].
5. Kind T. Professional guidelines for social media use: a starting point. *AMA journal of ethics*. 2015;17[5]:441-7.
6. Chauhan B, George R, Coffin J. Social media and you: what every physician needs to know. *J Med Pract Manage*. 2012;28[3]:206-9.
7. O'Sullivan E, Cutts E, Kavikondala S, Salcedo A, D'Souza K, Hernandez-Torre M, et al. Social media in health science education: an international survey. *JMIR Medical Education*. 2017;3[1]:e1.

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
 - 13
 - 14
 - 15
 - 16
 - 17
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
 - 22
 - 23
 - 24
 - 25
 - 26
 - 27
 - 28
 - 29
 - 30
 - 31
 - 32
 - 33
 - 34
 - 35
 - 36
 - 37
 - 38
 - 39
 - 40
 - 41
 - 42
 - 43
 - 44
 - 45
 - 46
 - 47
 - 48
 - 49
 - 50
 - 51
 - 52
 - 53
 - 54
 - 55
 - 56
 - 57
 - 58
 - 59
 - 60
8. Barlow CJ, Morrison S, Stephens HO, Jenkins E, Bailey MJ, Pilcher D. Unprofessional behaviour on social media by medical students. *Medical Journal of Australia*. 2015;203[11]:439-.
9. Garner J, O'Sullivan H. Facebook and the professional behaviours of undergraduate medical students. *The clinical teacher*. 2010;7[2]:112-5.
10. Kitsis EA, Milan FB, Cohen HW, Myers D, Herron P, McEvoy M, et al. Who's misbehaving? Perceptions of unprofessional social media use by medical students and faculty. *BMC medical education*. 2016;16[1]:1-7.
11. Diller D, Yarris LM. A descriptive analysis of the use of Twitter by emergency medicine residency programs. *Journal of graduate medical education*. 2018; 10(1):51-5.
12. Garg M, Pearson DA, Bond MC, Runyon M, Pillow MT, Hopson L, Cooney RR, Khadpe J, Nomura JT, Inboriboon PC. Survey of individual and institutional risk associated with the use of social media. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2016; 17(3):344.
13. Fatollahi JJ, Colbert JA, Agarwal P, Lee JL, Lehmann EY, Yuan N, Lehmann LS, Chretien KC. The impact of physician social media behavior on patient trust. *AJOB empirical bioethics*. 2020; 2;11(2):77-82.
14. Snyder L. Online professionalism: social media, social contracts, trust, and medicine. *The Journal of clinical ethics*. 2011; 22(2):173-5.
15. Wang Z, Wang S, Zhang Y, Jiang X. Social media usage and online professionalism among registered nurses: a cross-sectional survey. *International journal of nursing studies*. 2019; 98:19-26.
16. Langenfeld SJ, Vargo DJ, Schenarts PJ. Balancing privacy and professionalism: a survey of general surgery program directors on social media and surgical education. *Journal of surgical education*. 2016 Nov 1;73(6):e28-32.
17. Pronk SA, Gorter SL, van Luijk SJ, Barnhoorn PC, Binkhorst B, van Mook WN. Perception of social media behaviour among medical students, residents and medical specialists. *Perspectives on Medical Education*. 2021; 7:1-7.

- 1
2
3 18. Mak-Van Der Vossen, M., Van Mook, W., Van Der Burgt, S., Kors, J., Ket, J. C., Croiset, G., &
4
5 Kusrkar, R. Descriptors for unprofessional behaviours of medical students: a systematic review and
6
7 categorisation. *BMC medical education*. 2017; 17[1], 164.
8
9
10 19. Gholami-Kordkheili F, Wild V, Strech D. The impact of social media on medical professionalism:
11
12 a systematic qualitative review of challenges and opportunities. *Journal of medical Internet research*.
13
14 2013;15[8]:e184.
15
16 20. O'Regan A, Smithson WH, Spain E. Social media and professional identity: pitfalls and
17
18 potential. *Medical teacher*. 2018;40[2]:112-6.
19
20 21. Cruess SR, Cruess RL, Steinert Y. Supporting the development of a professional identity:
21
22 general principles. *Medical teacher*. 2019 Jun 3;41(6):641-9.
23
24 22. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research[*COREQ*]:
25
26 a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International journal for quality in health care*.
27
28 2007;19[6]:349-57.
29
30 31 23. O'Regan A, Hayes P, O'Connor R, Casey M, O'Dwyer P, Culhane A, et al. The University of
32
33 Limerick Education and Research Network for General Practice[*ULEARN-GP*]: practice characteristics
34
35 and general practitioner perspectives. *BMC family practice*. 2020;21[1]:1-11.
36
37 38 24. Rashid-Doubell F, Mohamed S, Elmusharaf K, O'Neill C. A balancing act: a phenomenological
39
40 exploration of medical students' experiences of using mobile devices in the clinical setting. *BMJ open*.
41
42 2016;6[5].
43
44 45 25. Francis JJ, Johnston M, Robertson C, Glidewell L, Entwistle V, Eccles MP, et al. What is an
46
47 adequate sample size? Operationalising data saturation for theory-based interview studies.
48
49 *Psychology and health*. 2010;25[10]:1229-45.
50
51 52 26. Brooks J, McCluskey S, Turley E, King N. The utility of template analysis in qualitative
53
54 psychology research. *Qualitative research in psychology*. 2015;12[2]:202-22.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 27. Berger R. Now I see it, now I don't: Researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research.
4 Qualitative research. 2015;15[2]:219-34.28. DeCamp M, Koenig TW, Chisolm MS. Social media
5 and physicians' online identity crisis. Jama. 2013;310[6]:581-2.
6
7
8
9
10 28. DeCamp M, Koenig TW, Chisolm MS. Social media and physicians' online identity crisis. Jama.
11 2013;310[6]:581-2.
12
13
14 29. Van Dijck J. 'You have one identity': performing the self on Facebook and LinkedIn. Media,
15 culture & society. 2013;35[2]:199-215.
16
17
18 30. Ruan B, Yilmaz Y, Lu D, Lee M, Chan TM. Defining the Digital Self: A Qualitative Study to Explore
19 the Digital Component of Professional Identity in the Health Professions. Journal of medical Internet
20 research. 2020;22(9):e21416.
21
22
23
24 31. Sugimoto C, Hank C, Bowman T, Pomerantz J. Friend or faculty: Social networking sites, dual
25 relationships, and context collapse in higher education. First Monday. 2015.
26
27
28 32. Jawed S, Mahboob U, Yasmeen R. Digital professional identity: Dear Internet! Who am I?
29 Education for Health. 2019;32[1]:33.
30
31
32
33 33. Wissinger CL, Stiegler Z. Using the extended parallel process model to frame e-professionalism
34 instruction in healthcare education. Teaching and learning in medicine. 2019 May 27;31(3):335-41.
35
36
37
38 34. Vițelar A. Like me: Generation Z and the use of social media for personal branding.
39 Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy. 2019;7(2):257-68.
40
41
42
43 35. MacDonagh, J. (2016). Depression and anxiety. In P. Greasley & A. Torn, (Eds.). *Psychology for*
44 *Nurses*. Cambridge: Polity.
45
46
47 36. Kind T, Patel PD, Lie DA. Opting in to online professionalism: social media and pediatrics.
48 Pediatrics. 2013 Nov 1;132(5):792-5.
49
50
51
52 37. Pillow MT, Hopson L, Bond M, Cabrera D, Patterson L, Pearson D, Sule H, Ankel F, Fernández-
53 Frackelton M, Hall RV, Kegg JA. Social media guidelines and best practices: recommendations from the
54 Council of Residency Directors Social Media Task Force. Western Journal of Emergency Medicine.
55 2014; 15(1):26.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 38. Geyer E, Irish E, Hagzan A, Wiczulis A. Social Media and Online Professionalism Integrated into
4 Year 3 OB/GYN Clerkship#. *Medical Reference Services Quarterly*. 2020 Oct 1;39(4):359-69.
5
6
7 39. Nederhof AJ. Methods of coping with social desirability bias: A review. *European journal of*
8 *social psychology*. 1985; 15(3):263-80.
9
10
11 40. Devotta K, Woodhall-Melnik J, Pedersen C, Wendaferew A, Dowbor TP, Guilcher SJ, Hamilton-
12 Wright S, Ferentzy P, Hwang SW, Matheson FI. Enriching qualitative research by engaging peer
13 interviewers: A case study. *Qualitative research*. 2016; 16(6):661-80.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 *Table 1: Participant Characteristics*

GPs/ final year	Gender[M/F]	Age Category	Style of
Medical Student		[20-30], [30-40], [40+]	Interview [face to face, phone, Skype]
Interview 1: GP	F	30-40	Phone
Interview 2: GP	M	30-40	Phone
Interview 3: Medical Student	M	20-30	Skype
Interview 4: Medical Student	M	20-30	Face-to-face
Interview 5: Medical Student	M	20-30	Face-to-face

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Interview 6: Medical student	F	30-40	Face-to-face
Interview 7: GP	M	40+	Face-to-face
Interview 8: Medical student	F	20-30	Face-to-face

For peer review only

COREQ (CONsolidated criteria for REporting Qualitative research) Checklist

A checklist of items that should be included in reports of qualitative research. You must report the page number in your manuscript where you consider each of the items listed in this checklist. If you have not included this information, either revise your manuscript accordingly before submitting or note N/A.

Topic	Item No.	Guide Questions/Description	Reported on Page No.
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
<i>Personal characteristics</i>			
Interviewer/facilitator	1	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	
Credentials	2	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	
Occupation	3	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	
Gender	4	Was the researcher male or female?	
Experience and training	5	What experience or training did the researcher have?	
<i>Relationship with participants</i>			
Relationship established	6	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	
Participant knowledge of the interviewer	7	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	
Interviewer characteristics	8	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	
Domain 2: Study design			
<i>Theoretical framework</i>			
Methodological orientation and Theory	9	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	
<i>Participant selection</i>			
Sampling	10	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	
Method of approach	11	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	
Sample size	12	How many participants were in the study?	
Non-participation	13	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	
<i>Setting</i>			
Setting of data collection	14	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	
Presence of non-participants	15	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	
Description of sample	16	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	
<i>Data collection</i>			
Interview guide	17	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	
Repeat interviews	18	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?	
Audio/visual recording	19	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	
Field notes	20	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	
Duration	21	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	
Data saturation	22	Was data saturation discussed?	
Transcripts returned	23	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or	

Topic	Item No.	Guide Questions/Description	Reported on Page No.
		correction?	
Domain 3: analysis and findings			
<i>Data analysis</i>			
Number of data coders	24	How many data coders coded the data?	
Description of the coding tree	25	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	
Derivation of themes	26	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	
Software	27	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	
Participant checking	28	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	
<i>Reporting</i>			
Quotations presented	29	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	
Data and findings consistent	30	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	
Clarity of major themes	31	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	
Clarity of minor themes	32	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	

Developed from: Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 2007. Volume 19, Number 6: pp. 349 – 357

Once you have completed this checklist, please save a copy and upload it as part of your submission. DO NOT include this checklist as part of the main manuscript document. It must be uploaded as a separate file.

1
2
3 *Interview Guide*
4
5

6 Interview Guide
7
8 1. Tell me about your experience of social media.
9
10 2. Do you share personal information online such as pictures, location and 11 employment status? If yes/no, why?
12
13 3. Do you use social media for personal or professional use?
14
15 4. What do you feel are the benefits of using social media apps?
16
17 5. What do you feel are the risks associated with the use of social media?
18
19 6. As a clinician/ future clinician how would you feel about patients contacting 20 you/following you on social media? 21
22

23
24
25
26
27 *Vignettes*
28
29

30 Follow up interviews: Vignettes
31
32
33 1. “Michelle Kelly is a student nurse. She recently posted a photo to twitter showing 34 the Accident and Emergency room of the hospital in which she is training on a 35 Saturday night. The caption for the photograph was “The crazies are really out 36 tonight...”. There were several patients in the photograph, although only one is 37 readily identifiable. You see from her feed that she is “friends” with a number of 38 former patients on facebook. In a series of posts with one former patient, John, they 39 discuss the upsetting nature of the injuries received by an unidentified patient, with 40 whom John shared a room”.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55 2. “As a senior house officer in a busy surgical outpatients clinic, you consult with a 56 young lady who is on the laparoscopy waiting list. She appears disconcerted and 57 tells you about a recent you tube video link that was shared with her by a friend. 58 59 60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The video involved a group of young men who appeared drunk and were taking turns jumping into a swimming pool after drinking a pint of alcohol. She recognised one of them as the surgical registrar who booked her for her upcoming laparoscopy. She has since found out that the others were also junior doctors in the hospital. She tells you that, although she has no problem with clinicians enjoying themselves, she would not be comfortable with such unprofessional type people having such involvement in her health”.

- How would you approach this problem with the patient?
- What ethical and professional issues arise here?

3. “While on placement in final year of physiotherapy, a friend sends you a screen shot of a blog that one of your classmates is running. The classmate is a very hard working student and has always shared resources with you. The blog is a day by day account of your classmate’s clinical encounters, highlighting learning points and tips for the final year examination. The screenshot is of a paragraph outlining in detail the history of a road traffic accident that led to a client presenting to her. The client’s name is not given but the gender, age, locality and date of accident is documented. The screenshot is followed by this comment from your friend: “no prizes for guessing who this guy is!”

- Would you act on this information? If so, how?
- What ethical and legal dilemmas arise while sharing experiences online?