

O  
*by S Q*

---

**Submission date:** 30-Aug-2021 03:57PM (UTC+0700)

**Submission ID:** 1638158047

**File name:** criminal\_justice\_1.edited.docx (14.76K)

**Word count:** 544

**Character count:** 2989

**Criminal Justice Discussion**

Name

University

Course

Professor

Date

### **Criminal Justice Discussion**

The rise of the internet and social media use in the world has resulted in substantial workplace issues. Employees have a right to freedom of speech and thus can express it through social media sites such as Facebook. However, employers also have guidelines and policies that control employees' use of social networking and sites; the first amendment protections online also protect the workers using social media. In this situation, the employer can discipline the officer for posting negative comments concerning the department's COVID 19 policies on his personal Facebook page. Francis & Wagner (2018) stated that the employer could offer a protective suspension to the employee to perform internal investigations of an issue and anticipate disciplinary actions. Therefore, since the police officer had posted negative comments about the department's coronavirus policies, the employer will have to suspend the officer for more investigations to realize their motive. Also, the suspension is to certify that the department's interest is not damaged.

Law enforcement officers need to understand their rights and be protected while at work. Nevertheless, it is also vital for them to recognize the limits of their freedom of speech. For instance, police officers know the first amendment protects them; however, it does not give them the authority to speak out anything they want because the only information on public concern is protected (Aitchson, 2020). On the other hand, those that outweigh the employer's interest are restricted. One of the ways to ensure the employee is following the employer's social media use policies is to educate them on the work expectations and limits. These technologies continue to change, and therefore, the employer will need to update the policies and train them frequently.

One aspect in the reading that is of particular interest is the first amendment of the United States constitution. The amendment states that "the congress cannot make any law relating to the

creation of religion, or barring the unrestricted practice therefrom; or shifting the talking liberty or that of the media or the freedom of individuals nonviolently to gather as well as request the administration for a compensation of complaints" (Hudson, 2017). The point is salient because social media posts can threaten the employer, and employees can also be suspended or fired because of their posts. The first amendment protects people against the administration invading their rights to freedom of expression and speech; therefore, the private employers and other employees at will can be fired despite not being illegal. This aspect is essential for all employees to grasp because they will recognize the benefits of realizing what is lawful and unlawful on social media and the employer's social media rules. In turn, this will help strengthen the relationship between the concerned parties since every one of them knows what is expected from them.

Why should freedom of speech be restricted on social networks?

### References

- Aitchison, Will (2020). *The Rights of Law Enforcement Officers* (8th edition). Labor Relations Information System. ISBN: 978-1-880607-33-6
- Francis, D., & Wagner, K. (2018). Social media policies in the workplace—unjustifiable constitutional limitation?. *Without Prejudice*, 18(4), 44-45.
- Hudson Jr, D. L. (2017). In the age of social media, expand the reach of the First Amendment. *Hum. Rts.*, 43, 84.

0

---

ORIGINALITY REPORT

---

0%

SIMILARITY INDEX

0%

INTERNET SOURCES

0%

PUBLICATIONS

0%

STUDENT PAPERS

---

PRIMARY SOURCES

---

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On