

I *Newer communication technologies are a regular part of students' lives. It is important to understand how and why students are using these technologies in order to best serve them and improve educational outcomes.*

An Introduction to Technologies Commonly Used by College Students

Reynol Junco, Gail A. Cole-Avent

Today's college students, the Net generation, have woven technology into their everyday repertoire of communication and connection tools. They use the Internet, e-mail, instant messaging, blogs, and social networking Web sites like Facebook and MySpace at higher rates than individuals from any other generation (Fox and Madden, 2005; Junco and Mastrodicasa, 2007; Lenhart and Madden, 2007; Rainie and Tancer, 2007). Student affairs professionals, however, use technology less and in different ways than their students do, lagging in their use of technology for newer forms of communication (Junco and Mastrodicasa, 2007). Indeed, there is an inverse relationship between age and going online, having high-speed access at home, using the Internet for academic research, text messaging, using social networking Web sites, instant messaging, reading and creating blogs, and downloading music and videos (Fox and Madden, 2005; Junco and Mastrodicasa, 2007). It is important for student affairs professionals to be familiar with the technology that students use, especially since newer technologies can be used in ways that increase student engagement and ultimately improve educational outcomes (Astin, 1999; Hu and Kuh, 2001; Nelson Laird and Kuh, 2005). In this chapter, we review the research on college student technology use, the more popular technology tools that today's college students use, and the importance of this information to student affairs professionals.

Today's college students are the most wired generation in history. They use the Internet at higher rates than the rest of the U.S. population, and their rates of use will continue to increase (Jones, 2002). Malaney (2004–2005)

assessed Internet use in two surveys over three years and found that Internet use overall increased significantly among students between 2000 and 2003. He found that in 2003, 97.9 percent of students owned their own computer and 95.3 percent had Internet access at home during their high school years. In a recent nationwide study, Junco (in preparation) found that 97.3 percent of college students owned a computer, 94.2 percent owned a cell phone, and 90.4 percent had high-speed Internet access in their residence.

College students expect faculty and student affairs staff to use newer technologies to connect to them, but institutions are ill prepared to respond to this change (Junco and Mastrodicasa, 2007; Duderstadt, Atkins, and Van Houweling, 2002). Of one thousand college-bound high school juniors, Noel-Levitz (2006) found that 72 percent have an interest in exchanging instant messages with an admissions counselor or student worker, 64 percent have an interest in reading a blog written by a faculty member, 63 percent have an interest in reading profiles of current students, and 63 percent have an interest in reading a blog written by a current student. Incoming students have used social networking Web sites to help them connect with others with similar interests before they arrive on campus. This early and immediate connection has allowed incoming students the ability to investigate their future roommates on Facebook, leading to record numbers of them asking to change roommates before the first day on campus (Farrell, 2006).

The 2007 *Horizon Report* (New Media Consortium, 2007), authored by the New Media Consortium's (NMC) Horizon project, identified current and future uses of technology in higher education. The report summarized information that it had collected and its advisory board had reviewed. Based on this information, it made predictions about the likelihood of the adoption of technologies in higher education. The 2007 report noted that social networking sites such as Facebook and MySpace and sites that allowed user-created content (such as blogs, Flickr, and YouTube) have been adopted, or will be widely adopted within the next year, by higher education professionals for teaching, learning, and creative expression. They also reported that cell phones and virtual worlds such as Second Life will be adopted by 2009. Unfortunately, few student affairs divisions take advantage of these technologies in their work with students and are missing an invaluable opportunity to engage their students in a way that meets them where they are.

Although the majority of college students are avid users of technology, differences across groups of students exist. As Table 1.1 summarizes, researchers have found that white students are more likely to use the Internet and live in a broadband household (Junco and Mastrodicasa, 2007; Junco, 2005; Kaiser Family Foundation, 2004; National Telecommunications and Information Administration, 2000; Oblinger and Oblinger, 2005; Sax, Ceja, and Teranishi, 2001). In addition, although computer use by males and females seems to have approached equal proportions (DeBell and Chapman, 2003; Jackson, Ervin, Gardner, and Schmitt, 2001; National

Table 1.1. Summary of Four Comprehensive Studies of Internet Use and Broadband Access

		<i>NTIA: A Nation Online^e</i>		<i>Pew Internet and American Life Project</i>	
Internet users	<i>Gender</i>				
	Women	59.2%	Women	66% ^c	
	Men	58.2	Men	68	
	<i>Ethnicity</i>				
	Latino	37.2	Latino	59 ^d	
	African American	45.6	African American	43	
	Asian American	63.1	White	67	
	White	65.1			
	<i>Age</i>				
	10–13	67.3	12–17	87 ^b	
	14–17	78.8	18–24	82	
	18–24	70.6	25–29	85	
	25–49	68.0	30–34	83	
	50 and over	44.8	35–39	80	
			40–44	76	
			45–49	73	
			50–54	68	
			55–59	68	
			60–64	55	
	<i>Family Income</i>				
Below \$15,000	31.2	Below \$30,000	44 ^d		
15,000–24,999	38.0	30,000–50,000	69		
25,000–34,999	48.9	50,000–75,000	81		
35,000–49,999	62.1	Over 75,000	89		
50,000–74,999	71.8				
Over 75,000	82.9				
<i>Educational Attainment</i>					
Less than high school	15.5	Less than high school	32 ^d		
High school	44.5	High school	52		
Some college	68.6	Some college	75		
Bachelor’s degree	84.9	College degree or higher	88		
Bachelor’s degree or higher	88.0				
Lives in broadband household	<i>Gender</i>				
	Women	21.8	Women	38 ^a	
	Men	23.9	Men	45	
	<i>Ethnicity</i>				
	Latino	12.6	Latino	41 ^a	
	African American	14.2	African American	31	
	Asian American	34.2	White	42	
	White	25.7			
	<i>Age</i>				
	10–13	25.8	12–17	49 ^b	
	14–17	28.3	18–24	40	

(continues on next page)

Table 1.1. (continued)

NTIA: A Nation Online ^e		Pew Internet and American Life Project	
		<i>Age</i>	
18–24	25.5	25–29	40
25–49	25.9	30–34	42
50 and over	15.9	35–39	36
		40–44	35
		45–49	36
		50–54	32
		55–59	27
		60–64	23
		<i>Family Income</i>	
Below \$15,000	7.5	Below \$30,000	21 ^a
15,000–24,999	9.3	30,000–50,000	43
25,000–34,999	13.4	50,000–75,000	48
35,000–49,999	19.0	Over 75,000	68
50,000–74,999	27.9		
Over 75,000	45.4		
		<i>Educational Attainment</i>	
Less than high school	5.9	Less than high school	17 ^a
High school	14.5	High school	31
Some college	23.7	Some college	47
Bachelor's degree	34.9	College degree or higher	62
Bachelor's degree or higher	38.0		

Source: *Connecting to the Net.Generation: What Higher Education Professionals Need to Know about Today's Students* (pp. 49–50), by R. Junco and J. Mastrodicasa, 2007, Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. Copyright 2007 by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. Reprinted with permission.

^aPew Internet and American Life Project, *Home Broadband Adoption 2006* (Horrigan, 2006). *N* = 4,001. Survey conducted in 2006.

^bPew Internet and American Life Project, *Generations Online* (Fox and Madden, 2005). *N* = 6,403 adults and 1,100 teens. Survey conducted in 2004–2005.

^cPew Internet and American Life Project, *How Women and Men Use the Internet* (Fallows, 2005). *N* = 6,403. Survey conducted in 2005.

^dPew Internet and American Life Project *A Decade of Adoption: How the Internet Has Woven Itself Into American Life* (Rainie and Horrigan, 2005). *N* = 2,200 adults. Survey conducted in 2004.

^eU.S. Department of Commerce National Telecommunications and Information Administration, *A Nation Online: Entering the Broadband Age* (2004). *N* = 134,000 persons ages three years and older. Survey conducted in 2003.

Telecommunications and Information Administration, 2000), there are differences in how men and women use technology. For instance, women use the Internet and Internet applications primarily for communication while men use it for conducting research and playing games (Cooper and Weaver, 2003; Jackson, Ervin, Gardner, and Schmitt, 2001; Joiner and others, 2005; Morgan and Cotten, 2003).

Table 1.1 also shows differences in how those who are younger, are from lower socioeconomic levels, and have less education use the Internet and have access to broadband at home. Younger adults, teenagers, and children are much more likely to use the Internet and to have broadband access than those who are over forty years old. In addition, there is an inverse relationship between income and education and Internet use and broadband access. In research on high school students, Brown, Higgins, and Hartley (2001), Milone and Salpeter (1996), Pisapia (1994), and Warschauer, Knobel, and Stone (2004) found that students in public schools in lower socioeconomic areas were more likely to use computers for academic practice and quizzing, while students in higher socioeconomic areas were more than three times as likely to be learning how to program computers. Those with lower household incomes have used the Internet less and have broadband access at home at lower rates than those with higher incomes. Furthermore, those with higher levels of education are more likely to use the Internet and to have broadband access. These trends have been reported by others (Kaiser Family Foundation, 2004; Sax, Ceja, and Teranishi, 2001).

Engaging Technologies That Students Use

College students use a wide range of technology tools for communication, connection, and engagement. They rarely differentiate between real-world and online communication. They often discuss how they were “talking to” a friend when they are actually referring to an online conversation. To them, online connections are merely an extension of their human ability to communicate (Junco, 2005). Interestingly, though, students are more likely to post information and pictures online (such as in blogs and their profiles) that they would not divulge to others in person (Junco, 2005). (The issue of privacy is addressed in Chapter Six.) The following sections address the technologies with the greatest potential to be used as tools to engage and educate students. These are also the most commonly used technologies by college students.

Social Networking Web Sites. Social networking Web sites allow users to connect to one another based on shared interests, activities, or characteristics. Users have the option of posting their personal information and pictures on a profile page (their personal home page), which displays a list of each user’s friends. Social networking Web sites also allow various modes of communication between users, for example, blogs, private messages, wall posts, pictures, and comments. The two most popular social networking Web sites for college students are Facebook and MySpace (comScore, 2007).

Facebook. Facebook, launched in 2004, is the social networking Web site of choice for college students (Facebook, 2007a). As of August 2007, it was the fourteenth most visited Web site in the United States (comScore, 2007). Currently, Facebook has over 100 million active users and holds an 85 percent market share of four year U.S. colleges and universities (Facebook, 2008). Over half of active users log in daily and typically spend

twenty minutes on the site (Facebook 2007). Even without privacy settings activated, users must be a network member to see a profile on that network (for instance, they must have an e-mail account at the same university). Facebook, like other social networking sites, allows users to post a profile with information about themselves and pictures.

Researchers have found that college students are heavy users of Facebook. Mastrodicasa and Kepic (2005) found that 85.5 percent of students at a large research university had accounts on Facebook. In a multicollge survey, over 68 percent of college students reported having a Facebook account and reported typically logging in twice per day (Junco and Mastrodicasa, 2007). (Chapter Two discusses how Facebook can be used to engage and involve students. Chapter Five looks at how students use Facebook to connect to each other and how they have used it to help them deal with psychological trauma, such as during the aftermath of crises.)

MySpace. MySpace is another familiar social networking Web site for college students. Its popularity has increased a great deal over the past few years, recently becoming the seventh most visited Web site in the United States (comScore, 2007). Only 12 percent of MySpace users log in from university domains versus 16 percent for Facebook (comScore, 2007). MySpace, launched in 2003 as an alternative to existing social networking Web sites (such as Friendster), attracted an audience of users in their twenties and thirties. Soon after, it became popular with younger users.

The basics of MySpace are similar to Facebook: users post profiles and invite others to be friends. Friends are displayed on profiles just as they are on Facebook. Through MySpace, users create their own networks by designating who can access their profile. One of the early differences between Facebook and MySpace was MySpace's focus on music performers. Unlike any other medium before it, MySpace allowed average fans to connect with their favorite national, local, or unsigned musical artists. Performers have capitalized on this exposure, and MySpace has launched the careers of various artists (such as Fall Out Boy, the Click Five, My Chemical Romance, Dashboard Confessional, Reliant K, and the All-American Rejects). In this regard, MySpace ushered in a new path for artists to rise to stardom.

Blogs. The use of weblogs, or blogs, increased dramatically between 2003 and 2004 (Rainie, 2005). The rise of blogs can be traced to late 1998 and early 1999 when the first blog hosting sites, such as LiveJournal and Blogger, started to appear. Writing a blog (called blogging) involves posting information in a sequential series of dated entries, much like a journal. College student bloggers write about a wide variety of topics, feeling comfortable with sharing details of their personal lives that members of other generations consider off-limits for broadcasting (Junco and Mastrodicasa, 2007). For instance, it is not uncommon for student bloggers to describe intimate details of their romantic relationships in their blogs.

College students use blogs more than those of other generations. The Pew Internet and American Life Project reported that teenagers aged fifteen

to seventeen own and read blogs at higher rates than adults (Lenhart and Madden, 2005). Mastrodicasa and Kepic (2005) found that 63 percent of college students read blogs. College student blog readership is substantially greater than that of teenagers (34 percent of teenage boys and 53 percent of teenage girls) and other adults (27 percent) surveyed in the Lenhart and Madden (2005) study. In their multicollge survey, Junco and Mastrodicasa (2007) found that 27.9 percent of college students reported owning blogs and 44.4 percent reported reading them for about an hour each week. One of the most popular blogging sites, LiveJournal, sees its highest proportion of traffic from university computers (Rainie, Kalehoff, and Hess, 2002). (Chapter Six reviews how blogs can be used to enhance educational outcomes.)

Other Web Sites That Allow Users to Create Content. In addition to blogs, other Web sites allow students to easily post content they have created. There are sites that allow students to post videos (YouTube, Google Video), pictures (Flickr, Picasaweb), and artwork (deviantART). Recently, two incidents involving campus police tasing students at the University of Florida (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iqAVvlyVbag>) and at the University of California, Los Angeles (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AyvrrqcxNIFs>) were recorded and posted on YouTube.com almost immediately after they occurred. YouTube is now seen as the preferred outlet for disseminating controversial videos such as these that might not have made it to popular media outlets. Before YouTube, if these videos existed at all, they would never have made it to the public.

Instant Messaging. Instant messaging (IM) is the act of communicating in real time (synchronously) through an online back-and-forth exchange. Sending and receiving instant messages is achieved by using specific software applications or more recently by using the instant messaging feature of sites like Facebook and MySpace. IM software displays a list of a user's online contacts. The IM user can click on a contact's name and enter text in a chat box. The user receiving the IM is notified of the message in a window that appears on his or her screen. The conversation that occurs over IM is usually referred to as "chatting" because of the synchronous nature of the communication. Indeed, students often describe "talking" to someone when they were actually engaged in an IM conversation (Junco and Mastrodicasa, 2007; Junco, 2005).

College students are more likely to use IM than are individuals from other generations. Shiu and Lenhart (2004) found that 62 percent of the Net generation used IM compared with 37 percent of Generation Xers, with use dropping substantially with older generations. Junco and Mastrodicasa (2007) found that 75.5 percent of college students used IM. Students in the Junco and Mastrodicasa (2007) study reported being logged on to IM services a median of thirty-five hours each week, with the largest proportion of users (15 percent) being logged on twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. IM users reported that they actively chat eighty minutes each day (this is a median). In the EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research Study of Undergraduate Students and Information Technology, Salaway, Caruso, and

Nelson (2007) found that 84.1 percent of students used IM. They reported that students preferred to use IM for their private lives and campus-provided e-mail account to communicate with representatives from their institutions.

Research has suggested that some students may receive positive psychosocial benefits from communicating online using tools such as IM, while others may not (Kraut et al., 2002). Campbell, Cumming, and Hughes (2006) found that regular chat users are less socially fearful and they reported that the Internet was psychologically beneficial to them more so than did the nonusers. In related research, Morgan and Cotten (2003) found that increased hours of IM use were associated with decreased depressive symptoms, while increased hours for shopping, research, or playing games were associated with increased symptoms. Shaw and Gant (2002) found that having students engage in online chats decreased their scores on instruments measuring depression and loneliness while increasing their scores on instruments measuring social support and self-esteem. (Chapter Four reviews the research on communication technology use and psychological well-being.)

Cell Phones. Cell phones have begun to replace the traditional landline for today's college students. Research shows that almost all college students own a cell phone. Mastrodicasa and Kepic (2005) found that 97.2 percent of students owned cell phones. Tucker, Brick, and Meekins (2007) found that 20.1 percent of eighteen to twenty-four year olds owned a cell phone and no landline. Junco and Mastrodicasa (2007) found that 94.1 percent of students owned a cell phone and that 42 percent owned a cell phone but no landline. In addition, Blumberg and Luke (2007) found that just over 25 percent of eighteen to twenty-four year olds lived in households with only cell phones. Salaway, Caruso, and Nelson (2007) found that 86.1 percent of students owned a simple cell phone, while 12 percent owned a smartphone (a cell phone with personal digital assistant, e-mail, Web browsing, and gaming features). Recent research (Junco, in preparation) shows that students reported using cell phones a median of five hours per week.

Most commercially available cell phones have text messaging functionality. Text messaging allows users to send and receive short messages. It is similar to e-mail in that the recipient receives the text message on the phone and may respond when she or he is able. Some phones include integrated keyboards, while others rely on the use of a keypad for alphanumeric entry for text messages (a process that is much slower than regular text entry). Because entering text messages on phones without keyboards takes a long time, a form of text messaging slang has evolved to make communication easier (see Junco and Mastrodicasa, 2007, for a guide to text message abbreviations). College students now prefer text message communications to e-mail. Indeed, Junco (in preparation) found that students send and receive a median of fifteen text messages per week.

The pace of technological advancements has allowed cell phones to become integrated personal computing devices. Apple's new iPhone integrates a cell phone, a music player, a personal digital assistant, and an Inter-

net tool in one device. These new developments have led groups such as the New Media Consortium (2007) to express excitement over the possible uses of cell phones in an educational setting. Recently service providers catering to colleges and universities have begun offering services such as real-time response collection (using cell phones to submit polling answers like the real-time response systems used in classrooms), emergency text alerts, and student tracking to replace escorts for nighttime safety. Already, 18.5 percent of students use their cell phones to IM (Junco and Mastrodicasa, 2007).

Virtual Worlds. Although we do not discuss virtual worlds in detail in this volume, they will, more than likely, be of great value to student affairs professionals within the coming decade (New Media Consortium, 2007). Virtual worlds are spaces that allow users to interact with each other within a three-dimensional environment. Second Life, developed by Linden Labs and available to the public since 2003 (Linden Lab, 2003), is one of the most popular virtual worlds. In 2004 the Campus: Second Life program was developed to support learning at the collegiate level by providing faculty and students with an environment that promotes real-time experimentation and collaboration (Linden Lab, 2004). To date, this tool has been adopted by more than three hundred community colleges, colleges, and universities for educational activities and leadership development (Sussman, 2007). The opportunities for enriching educational experiences in these settings are expansive, allowing anything from lectures, to art exhibits, to real-time science lab demonstrations.

Publications released by Linden Labs focus on Second Life as a classroom tool; however, it can be beneficial to student affairs as well. The Second Life environment provides a world of “limitless possibilities for creativity and self expression” (Linden Lab, 2007, p. 2), where students may explore identity, including body image, gender, and ethnicity through the development of their virtual self (called an avatar). They are also able to explore how they connect and interact with others. There are opportunities to explore a variety of interest groups and engage in conversations about numerous topics (Linden Lab, 2007). Some student affairs divisions have created events on Second Life in order to help market real-world campus events (such as on-campus movies, club activities, and student art shows). For instance, Columbia College in Chicago had a Second Life event to coincide with its real-world Manifest: Urban Arts Festival. Columbia students showcased their art online and in the real world. Similar to Facebook, instant messaging, and blogs, there are many possibilities for Second Life to contribute to division of student affairs goals, especially those of diversity awareness education and student involvement.

Technology Use by Student Affairs Professionals

It is important for student affairs professionals to understand how students are using technology in order to engage their students more fully. The use of technology can lead to increased student engagement (Hu and Kuh, 2001;

Nelson Laird and Kuh, 2005). (Chapter Seven discusses ways in which technology can assist in the attainment and retention of students.) Instead of using technology for enhancing educational and social outcomes, student affairs professionals have generally focused on reacting to inappropriate uses of technology (Dahne, 2006; Junco and Mastrodicasa, 2007; Read, 2006, 2007).

Understanding technology and addressing the call to incorporate it into programs and services is probably one of the more complicated trends that student affairs has encountered. With such complexities surrounding this topic and trying to maintain the profession's "high-touch" commitment, student affairs should consider how to approach this transition especially since today's students have a different definition of *high touch*: they expect immediate interaction and responses from student affairs professionals, but not necessarily by person-to-person interaction (Junco and Mastrodicasa, 2007). As a default, the remedy is to defer to the campus-based information technology specialists as the experts in this area. However, it is important for student affairs professionals to establish expertise through developing a technology mind-set (Love and Estanek, 2004), understanding the benefits of integrating technology into practice for effective and efficient services (Strong, 1993), and learning how to manage technology resources (Elling and Brown, 2001).

To support student affairs professionals in their development of a technology mind-set, there have been several threads in student affairs research and literature focusing on the students' perspective of technology, providing an overview and best practices for popular Internet-based applications and handheld devices, such as social networking sites and digital music players. Legal and ethical issues have also been addressed, including academic dishonesty by way of cybercheating, file sharing, free speech, harassment, intellectual property, and privacy (Hawke, 2001; Hollander, 1995; Petersen and Hodges, 1997; Shier, 2005). Although these areas have been helpful in providing a foundation for comprehending the current issues, it has not necessarily reduced the disconnection that many professionals have with adopting newer technologies. Technology is driving the future of student affairs, and professionals have reached the critical crossroad where they must decide if they are going to take an institutional leadership role through actively engaging with technology, understanding the impact of technology, recognizing its benefits and challenges, and participating in training to hone their skills or suffer the fate of not keeping up with student culture (Kleinglass, 2005). The task of advancing student affairs and technology is large, but once accomplished, it will contribute to future resources (Elling and Brown, 2001).

How can student affairs make the transition into a technologically fluent profession? Research on professionals' point of view about technology and its use has been scarce and mainly anecdotal. Even without that crucial research, there is still a clear difference between the technology proficiencies of college students and student affairs professionals. The services and programs provided for students continue to lag behind and do not accommodate their needs and proficiencies (Moneta, 2005).

Several resources may contribute toward student affairs' advancement toward becoming a technologically savvy profession. Moneta (2005) suggested partnering with campus-based information technology specialists. Centralized information technology units and educational technology departments should also be considered. Both areas employ experts who are knowledgeable about trends of technology use within higher education and may be able to assist in understanding how to apply it to specific programs and services promulgated by student affairs. Professional organizations (such as the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, American College Personnel Association, Association of College and University Housing Officers—International, and EDUCAUSE) should be considered beneficial resources, as many have established or have designated specialized communities or conferences for the purpose of addressing technology within higher education. Finally, engage students and colleagues. Students may be the most current resource available to help us understand how they are using technology. Colleagues can share their experiences and implementation strategies that work or did not work for them.

Integrating Technology into Student Affairs Practice

Agee and Zenelis (2002) listed ten factors for consideration when incorporating technology into higher education. We propose a revised version of their recommendations that focuses on the mission of student affairs:

- Technology initiatives should flow from and be a seamless part of the division's mission.
- Be open-minded when considering the adoption of newer technologies. Technology is a tool and has the potential for both productive and unproductive uses.
- When considering implementing new technologies, ask whether the technology has an educational goal. The educational goal may not be apparent at first, as we have discovered with the research on technology use and psychological well-being.
- Talk to students about how they are using technology and how they would like their institution to interact with them using technology.
- Assess your staff's professional development needs and your current technology infrastructure, and plan accordingly.
- Continually assess your technology efforts to determine whether the technology is value added in that it improves student developmental and educational outcomes.

Conclusion

College students are highly wired and interact with each other using technology in ways that astonish student affairs professionals. There are plenty of

opportunities for student affairs professionals to use technology to help students engage with their institution, enhance their learning, and improve their academic and psychosocial experiences. The chapters that follow explore specific ways that student affairs professionals can use emerging technologies in creative ways that will be beneficial for their students and their institutions.

Advancements in technology are progressing at a lightning pace (Ayers, 2004; Duderstadt, Atkins, and Van Houweling, 2002; Gumpert and Chun, 2005). College students adapt easily to changes in technology, a quality that is not always mirrored by student affairs professionals. To enhance the work conducted by student affairs professionals and help improve their connection to their students, it will be important for practitioners to understand the reasons students are using technology in addition to how students are using technology. This can be achieved only by taking steps toward professional development in technology competencies. The technologies addressed in this volume, although cutting edge, will be replaced by newer technologies quickly. Consider that in 2003, there was no such thing as Facebook, and now Facebook permeates campus environments. Although these technologies will become obsolete and replaced by newer technologies, it will be important for student affairs professionals to keep abreast of the latest developments in order to best serve students.

References

- Agee, A. S., and Zenelis, J. G. "Technology Across the Curriculum: Information Literacy and IT Fluency." In B. L. Hawkins, J. A. Rudy, and W. H. Wallace, Jr. (eds.), *Technology Everywhere: A Campus Agenda for Educating and Managing Workers in the Digital Age*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2002.
- Astin, A. W. "Student Involvement: A Developmental Theory for Higher Education." *Journal of College Student Development*, 1999, 40, 518–529.
- Ayers, E. L. "The Academic Culture and the IT Culture: Their Effect on Teaching and Scholarship." *EDUCAUSE Review*, 2004, 39, 48–62.
- Blumberg, S. J., and Luke, J. V. "Wireless Substitution: Early Release of Estimates Based on Data from the National Center for Health Statistics." National Center for Health Statistics, 2007. Retrieved June 5, 2007, from <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis.htm>.
- Brown, M., Higgins, K., and Hartley, K. "Teachers and Technology Equity." *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 2001, 33, 32–39.
- Campbell, A. J., Cumming, S. R., and Hughes, I. "Internet Use by the Socially Fearful: Addiction or Therapy?" *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*, 2006, 9(1), 69–81.
- comScore. "comScore Media Metrix: Top 50 Properties." Reston, Va.: comScore, Aug. 2007.
- Cooper, J., and Weaver, K. D. *Gender and Computers: Understanding the Digital Divide*. Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum, 2003.
- Dahne, M. "What's the Fuss over Facebook?" *Leadership Exchange*, 2006, 4(1), 24–25.
- DeBell, M., and Chapman, C. *Computer and Internet Use by Children and Adolescents in 2001*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, 2003.
- Duderstadt, J. J., Atkins, D. E., and Van Houweling, D. *Higher Education in the Digital Age: Technology Issues and Strategies for American Colleges and Universities*. Westport, Conn.: American Council on Education, 2002.

- Elling, T. W., and Brown, S. J. "Advancing Technology and Student Affairs Practice." In R. B. Winston Jr., D. G. Creamer, T. K. Miller, and Associates (eds.), *The Professional Student Affairs Administrator: Educator, Leader, and Manager*. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Facebook. "Press Room: Statistics." 2007. Retrieved Sept. 15, 2007, from <http://www.new.facebook.com/press/info.php?statistics>.
- Facebook. "Statistics." 2008. Retrieved Feb. 1, 2008, from <http://www.facebook.com/press/info.php?statistics>.
- Fallows, D. *How Women and Men Use the Internet*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2005.
- Farrell, E. F. "Judging Roommates by Their Facebook Cover." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 1, 2006, p. A53.
- Fox, S., and Madden, M. "Generations Online." 2005. Retrieved Sept. 25, 2006, from http://www.pewInternet.org/pdfs/PIP_Generations_Memo.pdf.
- Gumport, P. J., and Chun, M. "Technology and Higher Education: Opportunities and Challenges for the New Era." In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, and P. J. Gumport (eds.), *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.
- Hawke, C. S. *Computer and Internet Use on Campus*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2001.
- Hollander, P. A. "Legal Liabilities and Ethical Issues." In J. L. Baier and T. S. Strong (eds.), *Technology in Student Affairs*. Lanham, Md.: American College Personnel Association, 1995.
- Horrigan, J. B. *Home Broadband Adoption 2006*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2006.
- Hu, S., and Kuh, G. D. "Computing Experience and Good Practices in Undergraduate Education: Does the Degree of Campus 'Wiredness' Matter?" *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 2001, 9(49). Retrieved Sept. 20, 2007, from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v9n49.html>.
- Jackson, L. A., Ervin, K. S., Gardner, P. D., and Schmitt, N. "Gender and the Internet: Women Communicating and Men Searching." *Sex Roles*, 2001, 44(5/6), 363–379.
- Joiner, R., and others. "Gender, Internet Identification, and Internet Anxiety: Correlates of Internet Use." *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*, 2005, 8(4), 371–378.
- Jones, S. *The Internet Goes to College: How Students Are Living in the Future with Today's Technology*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2002.
- Junco, R. "Technology and Today's First-Year Students." In M. L. Upcraft, J. N. Gardner, and B. O. Barefoot (eds.), *Challenging and Supporting the First-Year Student: A Handbook for Improving the First Year of College*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.
- Junco, R. "College Student Technology Use and Its Relationship to Academic Success." Unpublished manuscript (in preparation).
- Junco, R., and Mastroicasa, J. *Connecting to the Net.Generation: What Higher Education Professionals Need to Know About Today's Students*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 2007.
- Kaiser Family Foundation. *Survey Snapshot: The Digital Divide*. Menlo Park, Calif.: Kaiser Family Foundation, 2004.
- Kleinglass, N. "Who Is Driving the Changing Landscape in Student Affairs?" In K. Kruger (Ed.), *Technology in Student Affairs: Supporting Student Learning and Services*. New Directions for Student Services, no. 112. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.
- Kraut, R., and others. "Internet Paradox Revisited." *Journal of Social Issues*, 2002, 58(1), 49–74.
- Lenhart, A., and Madden, M. *Teen Content Creators and Consumers*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2005.
- Lenhart, A., and Madden, M. "Social Networking Web sites and Teens: An Overview." Jan. 2007. Retrieved July 11, 2007, from http://www.pewinternet.org/pdfs/PIP_SNS_Data_Memo_Jan_2007.pdf.

- Linden Lab. "Second Life Opens Public Beta." Press release. 2003. Retrieved Oct. 16, 2007, from http://lindenlab.com/press/releases/03_04_28_2.
- Linden Lab. "Second Life Officially Opens Digital World to College Students for Exploration and Study of Design and Social Communities." 2004. Press release. Retrieved Oct. 16, 2007, from http://lindenlab.com/pressroom/releases/04_09_20.
- Linden Lab. 2007. "Second Life Product Fact Sheet." Retrieved Oct. 16, 2007, from <http://s3.amazonaws.com/static-secondlife-com/corporate/ProductFactSheet.pdf>.
- Love, P. G., and Estanek, S. M. *Rethinking Student Affairs Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004.
- Malaney, G. D. "Student Use of the Internet." *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 2004–2005, 33(1), 53–66.
- Mastrodicasa, J. M., and Kepic, G. "Parents Gone Wild." Paper presented at the national meeting of the National Academic Advising Association, Las Vegas, Nev., Oct. 2005.
- Milone, M. N., and Salpeter, J. "Technology and Equity Issues." *Technology and Learning*, 1996, 16(4), 38–47.
- Moneta, L. "Technology and Student Affairs: Redux." In K. Kruger (ed.), *Technology in Student Affairs: Supporting Student Learning and Services*. New Directions for Student Services, no. 112. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.
- Morgan, C., and Cotten, S. R. "The Relationship Between Internet Activities and Depressive Symptoms in a Sample of College Freshmen." *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*, 2003, 6(2), 133–142.
- National Telecommunications and Information Administration. *Falling Through the Net Toward Digital Inclusion: A Report on Americans' Access to Technology Tools*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic and Statistics Administration, 2000.
- Nelson Laird, T. F., and Kuh, G. D. "Student Experiences with Information Technology and Their Relationship to Other Aspects of Student Engagement." *Research in Higher Education*, 2005, 46(2), 211–233.
- New Media Consortium. *The Horizon Report*. 2007. Retrieved June 14, 2007, from <http://www.nmc.org/horizon/2007/report>.
- Noel-Levitz. "Engaging the 'Social Networking' Generation: How to Talk to Today's College Bound Juniors and Seniors. E-Expectations: Class of 2007." 2006. Retrieved June 15, 2007, from <https://www.noellevitz.com/NR/rdonlyres/425D56C3-9ACD-4A90-9782-F70ED7AC3CF2/0/EEExpectationsClassof2007.pdf>.
- Oblinger, D. G., and Oblinger, J. L. (eds.). *Educating the Net Generation*. Washington, D.C.: EDUCAUSE, 2005.
- Petersen, R. J., and Hodges, M. W. "Legal, Ethical, and Policy Issues." In C. M. Engstrom and K. W. Kruger (eds.), *Using Technology to Promote Student Learning: Opportunities for Today and Tomorrow*. New Directions for Student Services, no. 78. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997.
- Pisapia, J. *Technology: The Equity Issue*. Richmond, Va.: Metropolitan Educational Research Consortium, 1994.
- Rainie, L. "The State of Blogging." Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2005. Retrieved Sept. 26, 2007, from http://www.pewinternet.org/PPF/r/144/report_display.asp.
- Rainie, L., and Horrigan, J. *A Decade of Adoption: How the Internet Has Woven Itself into American Life*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2005.
- Rainie, L., Kalehoff, M., and Hess, D. "College Students and the Web." Sept. 2002. Data retrieved Sept. 16, 2007, from http://www.pewinternet.org/pdfs/PIP_College_Memo.pdf.
- Rainie, L., and Tancer, B. "Wikipedia Users." Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2007. Retrieved May 24, 2007, from http://www.pewInternet.org/pdfs/PIP_Wikipedia07.pdf.
- Read, B. "Think Before You Share." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Jan. 20, 2006, p. A38.

- Read, B. "A MySpace Photo Costs a Student a Teaching Certificate." *Chronicle of Higher Education's The Wired Campus*. Apr. 27, 2007. Retrieved Sept. 12, 2007, from <http://chronicle.com/wiredcampus/index.php?id=2029/>.
- Salaway, G., Caruso, J. B., and Nelson, M. R. *The ECAR Study of Undergraduate Students and Information Technology, 2007*. Boulder, Colo.: EDUCAUSE, 2007.
- Sax, L. J., Ceja, M., and Teranishi, R. T. "Technological Preparedness Among Entering Freshmen: The Role of Race, Class, and Gender." *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 2001, 24, 363–383.
- Shaw, L. H., and Gant, L. M. "In Defense of the Internet: The Relationship Between Internet Communication and Depression, Loneliness, Self-Esteem, and Perceived Social Support." *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*, 2002, 5(2), 157–171.
- Shier, M. T. "What We Know and the Difference It Makes." In K. Kruger (ed.), *Technology in Student Affairs: Supporting Student Learning and Services*. New Directions for Student Services, no. 112. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.
- Shiu, E., and Lenhart, A. *How Americans Use Instant Messaging*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2004.
- Strong, T. S. "The Technology and Information Explosion." In J. L. Baier and T. S. Strong (eds.), *Technology in Student Affairs*. Lanham, Md.: American College Personnel Association, 1993.
- Sussman, B. "Teachers, College Students Lead a Second Life." Aug. 2, 2007. *USAToday*. Retrieved Oct. 16, 2007, from http://www.usatoday.com/news/education/2007-08-01-second-life_N.htm.
- Tucker, C., Brick, J. M., and Meekins, B. "Household Telephone Service and Usage Patterns in 2004: Implication for Telephone Samples." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 2007, 71(1), 3–22.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. National Telecommunications and Information Administration. "A Nation Online: Entering the Broadband Age." 2004. Retrieved Jan. 30, 2008, from <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/reports/anol/NationOnlineBroadband04.htm>.
- Warschauer, M., Knobel, M., and Stone, L. "Technology and Equity in Schooling: Deconstructing the Digital Divide." *Educational Policy*, 2004, 18(4), 562–588.

REYNOL JUNCO is an associate professor in the Department of Academic Development and Counseling and director of disability services at Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania.

GAIL A. COLE-AVENT is the Assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs and University Ombudsperson at the University of Miami. In May 2008, she earned her PhD from the University of Georgia.

Copyright of *New Directions for Student Services* is the property of John Wiley & Sons, Inc. / Education and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.