

UNCOVERING THE SOCIAL IMPACTS OF FACEBOOK ON A COLLEGE CAMPUS

by

MATTHEW ROBERT VANDEN BOOGART

B.A., University of Wisconsin – Madison, 2004

A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the

Requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology
College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Manhattan, Kansas

2006

Approved by:

Major Professor
Dr. S. Adrienne Leslie-Toogood

COPYRIGHT

UNCOVERING THE SOCIAL IMPACTS OF FACEBOOK ON A COLLEGE CAMPUS

MATTHEW ROBERT VANDEN BOOGART

2006

ABSTRACT

With the creation of Facebook in 2004, colleges and universities across the United States have been playing catch-up with students. This new technology carries much weight as a new medium for students to build social connections and grow as members of their institutions. However, this new technology also brings negative implications such as lowered GPAs with greater use.

Research was conducted at four major institutions across the country exploring how residence hall students use online communities and the impact it has on their physical world experience on campus. Most students use Facebook as a tool for staying connected to friends from high school, but there is a small population of students who are using it as a tool to make social connections they could not find in person.

This study explores the impacts Facebook has had on a college campus. University administrators are urged to use this data to take a proactive approach to using these technologies to enhance the overall campus experience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
LIST OF TABLES	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION	1
Background.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Statement of Purpose	2
Instrumentation	2
Research Question	3
Significance of Study.....	3
Delimitations.....	3
Definition of Terms.....	4
Confirmed Guest.....	4
Facebook.....	4
Flame War.....	4
Group	4
Party	4
Residence Hall	4
Wall.....	4
Weblog.....	4
Summary	4
CHAPTER TWO – REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	6
Physical World Communities	6
Online Communities	7
Preece’s Purpose, People, and Policies.....	10
Physical World Communities v. Online Communities.....	14
CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY	15
Research Question	15
Instrumentation	15
Pilot Study.....	16
Population and Sample	16

Procedures.....	17
Data Analysis Procedures	18
Limitations of the Study.....	19
Summary	19
CHAPTER FOUR – PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	20
Overview of Study	20
Institutional Response Rates.....	20
Respondent Demographics	21
Overview of Online Involvement	27
General Internet Use Results	28
Facebook Engagement.....	32
Non Facebook Engagement	39
Physical World Engagement.....	40
Research Question Analysis	46
Facebook Uses and Perceptions.....	46
Physical World Engagement and Perception.....	51
Online Community Impact on Social Connectedness	55
Summary.....	55
CHAPTER FIVE – DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	56
Summary of Study	56
Discussion of Online Community Involvement	56
Discussion of Research Question.....	57
Contributions to the Field	59
Recommendations for Future Research	59
Conclusion	60
REFERENCES.....	61
APPENDIX A – SURVEY INSTRUMENT	64
APPENDIX B – CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATIONS.....	82
APPENDIX C – INSTITUTIONAL PARTICIPATION INVITATION.....	84
APPENDIX D – ONLINE COMMUNITIES RESEARCH FACT SHEET	85

APPENDIX E – INSTITUTIONAL INVITATION EMAIL FOLLOW-UP	87
APPENDIX F – PARTICIPANT INVITATION EMAIL	88
APPENDIX G – PARTICIPANT REMINDER EMAIL	89
APPENDIX H – TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES INVITATION EMAIL	90
APPENDIX I – DEMOGRAPHICS BY INSTITUTION	91
APPENDIX J – ONLINE INVOLVEMENT BY INSTITUTION	96
APPENDIX K – GENERAL INTERNET USE BY INSTITUTION	97
APPENDIX L – FACEBOOK USE BY INSTITUTION	102
APPENDIX M – NON-FACEBOOK USE BY INSTITUTION	111
APPENDIX N – PHYSICAL WORLD INVOLVEMENT BY INSTITUTION	112

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Response Rates by Institution.....	21
Table 2: Year in School Demographic Response	22
Table 3: Gender Demographic Response	23
Table 4: Ethnicity Demographic Response.....	23
Table 5: Years in Residence Halls Demographic Response.....	24
Table 6: Number of Roommates Halls Demographic Response.....	24
Table 7: Residence Hall Type Demographic Response	25
Table 8: GPA Demographic Response	25
Table 9: Sexual Orientation Demographic Response	26
Table 10: Online Involvement Overview Response	27
Table 11: Use of Internet - Years.....	28
Table 12: Location of Internet Use.....	29
Table 13: Frequency of General Internet Activity Engagement	30
Table 14: Frequency of Internet Use.....	31
Table 15: Frequency of Facebook Daily Use	32
Table 16: Frequency of Facebook Wall Use.....	33
Table 17: Frequency of Misc. Facebook Activity Use	34
Table 18: Excitement Towards Joining Facebook.....	35
Table 19: Attitudes Towards Use of Facebook.....	36
Table 20: Attitudes Towards Connectedness on Facebook.....	37
Table 21: Attitudes Towards Addiction to Facebook.....	38
Table 22: Reasons not Involved on Facebook	39
Table 23: Attendance at Events/Activities.....	41

Table 24: Planning of Events/Activities	42
Table 25: Connectedness to Physical World	43
Table 26: Meeting New People at Physical World Events/Programs	44
Table 27: Student Organization Involvement	45
Table 28: Demographics * Facebook Daily Use Cross-tabulation	47
Table 29: Demographics * Facebook Connectedness Cross-tabulation	48
Table 30: Demographics * Facebook Difficult Social Connections Cross-tabulation	49
Table 31: Demographics * Facebook Addiction Cross-tabulation.....	50
Table 32: Demographics * Connectedness to Floor Cross-tabulation	51
Table 33: Demographics * Connectedness to Building Cross-tabulation.....	52
Table 34: Demographics * Connectedness to Campus Cross-tabulation	53
Table 35: Gender * Attendance at Events to Meet New People Cross-tabulation.....	54
Table 36: Facebook Daily Use * Connectedness to Campus Cross-tabulation	55
Table 37: Year in School by Institution	91
Table 38: Gender by Institution	92
Table 39: Ethnicity by Institution	92
Table 40: Years in Residence Halls by Institution.....	93
Table 41: Number of Roommates by Institution	93
Table 42: Residence Hall Type by Institution	94
Table 43: GPA by Institution.....	94
Table 44: Sexual Orientation by Institution.....	95
Table 45: Online Involvement Overview by Institution.....	96
Table 46: Internet Years of Experience by Institution.....	97
Table 47: Regular Internet Access Locations by Institution	97
Table 48: Frequency of Email Use by Institution	98

Table 49: Frequency of Instant Message Use by Institution.....	98
Table 50: Frequency of Finding Information by Institution	99
Table 51: Frequency of Making Purchases by Institution	99
Table 52: Frequency of Academic Research by Institution	100
Table 53: Frequency of Week Day Daily Internet Use by Institution.....	100
Table 54: Frequency of Weekend Daily Internet Use by Institution	101
Table 55: Frequency of Facebook Daily Use by Institution.....	102
Table 56: Mean Count of Facebook Statistics by Institution.....	102
Table 57: Frequency of Reading Personal Wall by Institution	103
Table 58: Frequency of Reading Friend’s Wall by Institution.....	103
Table 59: Frequency of Writing on Personal Wall by Institution.....	104
Table 60: Frequency of Writing on Friend’s Wall by Institution	104
Table 61: Frequency of Searching for New Friends by Institution.....	105
Table 62: Frequency of Updating Profile by Institution	105
Table 63: Frequency of Creating Groups by Institution.....	106
Table 64: Frequency of Creating Parties by Institution.....	106
Table 65: Excitement of Joining Facebook by Institution	107
Table 66: Use Facebook to Meet New People by Institution.....	107
Table 67: Use Facebook to Stay Connected to HS Friends by Institution.....	108
Table 68: Use Facebook to Keep Track of Friends by Institution	108
Table 69: Connectedness to Friends on Facebook by Institution.....	109
Table 70: Use Facebook to Make Non-In-Person Connections by Institution	109
Table 71: Addiction to Facebook by Institution.....	110
Table 72: Non-Facebook Usage by Institution	111
Table 73: Frequency of Participation in Floor Events by Institution	112

Table 74: Frequency of Participation in Building Events by Institution.....	112
Table 75: Frequency of Participation in Campus Events by Institution	113
Table 76: Frequency of Planning of Floor Events by Institution	113
Table 77: Frequency of Planning of Building Events by Institution.....	114
Table 78: Frequency of Planning of Campus Events by Institution	114
Table 79: Connectedness to Floor by Institution	115
Table 80: Connectedness to Building by Institution.....	115
Table 81: Connectedness to Campus by Institution	116
Table 82: Attend Floor Events to Meet New People by Institution.....	116
Table 83: Attend Building Events to Meet New People by Institution	117
Table 84: Attend Campus Events to Meet New People by Institution.....	117
Table 85: Involved in Hall Government by Institution	118
Table 86: Involved in Residence Hall Association or the National Residence Hall Honorary by Institution	118
Table 87: Involved in Campus Student Organization by Institution.....	119

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It was always a dream of mine to complete a thesis around something that I would truly enjoy researching; thankfully I found that topic. I couldn't celebrate the successes of this experience without thanking some people without whom I wouldn't be today.

Dr. Adrienne Leslie-Toogood has been a guiding force of reason and knowledge throughout this process. A helping hand was always lent as she helped steer me through focusing on a topic to helping communicate with the various institutions I've worked with throughout this process. Adrienne has been a great mentor and a great friend. I truly respect her and everything she does; as she shows a level of genuine care for all of her students.

I'd also like to thank Dr. Chuck Werring for being a voice of reason and a driving motivator to go out and make a positive difference in the world. Dr. Chuck has always been a great advisor and friend to me.

I would have never found a list of schools and a starting point in this research if it wasn't for Dr. Fred Newton. Fred is a brilliant man and I owe him much credit for the research side of this endeavor. I have great respect for the things he's taught me and will always regard him as an individual who sits on the cutting-edge of higher education.

Statistics were a blur to me until speaking with Dr. Steve Benton who helped me understand how to interpret the mounds of data collected with this project. I would like to thank him for his contributions to my understanding of the raw data and computation of it. I also would like to thank Dr. Christy Moran and Dr. Ken Hughey. Both of these professors have been a great asset to my education and development at K-State.

My family has been a great supporter of my adventure through graduate school. Though they might not fully understand what student affairs is or how Facebook works, I've appreciate

their support and dedication to my learning at K-State. If I was to dedicate this paper, it would be to them. My grandparents have been a motivating force in my education and I thank them for their continued support and genuine interest in understanding what it is I do. Thank you to Amy for being a supporter of my entire learning process. I have enjoyed learning with you and look forward to continuing to learn together.

For the laughs they've provided me throughout this, I have to thank Jen, Amanda, and Aggie, three individuals who've been my support on campus. Also I can't go without thanking my great mentors and friends Sarah Decke and Kevin Cook. Thank you for understanding that sometimes work must be pushed aside for the greater good of education. You both stand as role models to me and the work I do and have done. Thank you for the lessons learned and for the great friendship we'll continue to have. There's no starfish in my future yet thanks to them.

CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION

In the era of technology, the Internet has taken the world by storm. Every day the Internet sees an expansion of content brought to the homes and businesses of new and veteran surfers. In the past ten years, the Internet has taken off as a viable source of information and realm of social value. In the same field of vision, universities have been growing in the United States since the early 1800's, mirroring the same progress in information and social value. Residence halls have defined and progressed to become a gateway for students to gain new social perspectives, connect them to the university, and most pronounced, intertwine them into the greater university community.

Background

The role residence halls play in community formation has begun to shift in recent years. Residence halls will continue to play the vital role of community and social connection for students; however, the digital landscape has paved the way for alternative sources of connection. With the birth of blogging, Facebook, and other online venues, students are able to connect to other students (and society) without leaving the comfort of their rooms. The role residence halls play today in community development is an interesting question to address. Professionals are currently being faced with the predicament of what steps to take (or not to take) to address the growing use of online communities as a core source of social connection. The constant increase in growing technologies will “dramatically expand and intensify the domain of social connection” (Gergen, 2005). The recent explosion over these technologies is not about the technology itself; rather the vast access people have to it and what they are doing with it (Preece, 2001). As these technologies continue to grow, so will the role they play throughout society. Chapter two examines the literature associated with physical world and online communities.

Statement of the Problem

Little to no formal research has been conducted on the role online communities are playing on college campuses, let alone residence hall communities. Anecdotal research is coming out of recent student affairs conventions as professionals begin to dialogue about the recent technological trends. The fact remains that a major research study is yet to be conducted truly analyzing the impact that these technologies are having on college campuses. In efforts to detour the reactionist approach professionals have been known to take, this study aims to take a proactive look at how online communities are impacting the residence hall communities in the United States.

The evaluation of this question is complex and derives through understanding the activities students engage in online and in their physical world. In effort to quantify these two worlds, a web-based survey instrument was created to evaluate the level of engagement and frequency of activity in various capacities.

Statement of Purpose

This study sought to measure the level of effect students engaging in online communities has on their involvement and social connectedness to their physical world communities. Various institutions were examined to provide significant data and reliability towards the research being conducted.

Instrumentation

A web-based survey instrument was created for this study which examines several areas of a students' involvement: Internet use, Facebook use, reading weblogs, personal weblog authoring, online game play, and physical world involvement. A copy of this instrument can be

found in Appendix A, which consists of 143 different variables collected in 45 different question areas.

Research Question

The following research question guided this study:

What are the social impacts of online communities and their effect on the physical world communities of residence halls on a college/university campus?

It is my hypothesis that online communities have some level of affect on physical world communities. Students living in residence halls may play out portions of their lives online, which play into their role in their physical world. My hypothesis is that residence hall students who are members of online communities have a greater sense of belonging to their physical world. I believe that interactions online supplement the physical world in positive and negative ways.

Significance of Study

This research aimed to be a starting point of research conducted on the impact online communities present to the physical world. Understanding the impact these communities have on residence hall communities is just a starting point at uncovering the institutional impact experienced at universities across the United States. This research seeks also to provoke discussion amongst university administrators and officials in further exploring the challenges and benefits these technologies impose upon higher education.

Delimitations

1. This study is limited to students who had an email address which was supplied by the participating institutions and had access to their email accounts during their survey periods.
2. This study is limited to students living in on-campus housing.

3. This study is limited to institutions which were listed in the Carnegie Classifications and had access to Facebook.com as reported by Facebook.com on January 17, 2006.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are used in this study:

Confirmed Guest: A member of Facebook who has accepted an invitation to a Facebook party.

Facebook: An online community where membership is limited to those engaged in a relationship to a college or university.

Flame War: A term used to define a fight occurring on the World Wide Web through a series of postings. These postings traditionally occur on a weblog, though can occur on several other mediums online.

Group: An element of Facebook where members can create and join groups similar to an organization in the physical world.

Party: An element of Facebook where a member can set a date for an event and invite other members to attend.

Residence Hall: For the purpose of this study, a residence hall is a building that is owned and operated by a university with inhabitants (residents).

Wall: An element of Facebook where members can post messages on a person's profile visible to all.

Weblog: A reverse chronological listing of events posted online.

Summary

This study is an examination of the impacts online communities have on residence hall communities at a college/university. The results from this study aim to assist university

administrators and officials in preparing a response to the growing emergence of online communities and how they can use these technologies to better assist students.

CHAPTER TWO – REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Physical World Communities

Researchers across the board have defined community in various capacities. Each definition varies slightly from the other, but all encompass the understanding that people are involved to some extent. Thomas Bender's (1982) historical definition of community is:

A community involves a limited number of people in a somewhat restricted social space or network held together by shared understandings and a sense of obligation. Relationships are close, often intimate, and usually face-to-face. Individuals are bound together by affective or emotional ties rather than by a perception of individual self-interest. There is a 'wenness' in a community; one is a member. (Galston, 2004, p. 63)

Bender's definition echoes throughout the contemporary research defining community. A few key principals in his definition that have carried on are: limited membership, affective ties, and a sense of mutual obligation (Galston, 2004). In the field of student affairs, however, professionals are seeing a slightly different view of community.

Joseph Berger's research summarizes the major definitions of community explored in student affairs:

Astin: a small subgroup of students with a common sense of purpose that can build a sense of group identity, cohesiveness, and uniqueness.

Spitzberg and Thorndike: a small group of people living in a common area with shared values, practices, and goals.

McMillan and Chavis: components of membership, influence, integration and fulfillment of needs, and shared emotional connection. (Berger, 1997, p. 441-442)

Boyer combined Astin and Spitzberg and Thorndike's definitions to define community as the need for a larger search of purpose and a shared vision above all goals (Boyer, 1990). The essential element to draw from defining community is the notion that a "student's sense of community within their campus living units directly affects levels of social integration" (Berger, 1997, p. 443). The level of this affect varies from student to student; living environment to living environment.

Boyer (1990) provides a model of six aspects that should be examined when reviewing communities: purposeful, open, just, disciplined, caring, and celebrative. Purposeful serves as a foundation to the other five aspects of community. Every community has a purpose and without one the community will not thrive and grow. An open community encompasses a place where people are free to express themselves and where civil liberties are protected. Just communities are ones where people are held as the key resource and where diversity is aggressively pursued. Governance, policies, and procedures are essential for the smooth functioning of a community, the notion of discipline. A caring community supports its members and a celebrative communities honors traditions. Boyer's aspects become apparent when examining physical communities and could arguably carry over to the online communities being created today.

Online Communities

Since the creation of the World Wide Web in 1990, online communities have begun to dominate the Internet (Wikipedia, 2005). Prior to the first web page, online communities existed in a pure computer to computer connection as early as 1968, though the term "virtual

community” wasn’t coined till 1993. In the beginning, online communities existed between scientists sharing research and findings. Licklider and Taylor stated this about online communities in 1968: “In most fields they will consist of geographically separated members, sometimes group in small clusters, and sometimes working individually. They will be communities not of common location, but of common interest...” (Rheingold, 1993, p. 24). Licklider and Taylor could not have been any closer in their prediction as to how online communities would be created.

In his pinnacle research of virtual communities, Howard Rheingold (1993) defined them as, “social aggregations that emerge from the Net when enough people carry on those public discussions long enough, with sufficient human feelings, to form webs of personal relationships in cyberspace.” His work became foundational in the field as he recounted his interactions online and described how a sense of community was being derived.

Since Rheingold’s work, dozens of researchers and authors have offered their definitions of online community. Fernbeck (1999) offers simply that community is a process. Preece (2000, p. 10), a leading researcher in the field offers that: “an online community consists of people who interact socially as they strive to satisfy their own needs or perform special roles; a shared purpose that provides a reason for the community; policies that guide people’s interactions; and computer systems to support and mediate social interaction and facilitate a sense of togetherness.” Her work of purpose, people, and policies will be discussed at length later. Other researchers continue on the line of Preece, stating that there is a level of fulfillment of need in participating in an online community (Galston, 2004).

Online communities, unlike physical communities, which require the traditional face-to-face method of communication, can operate in means of asynchronous communication. Though

potentially passive in nature, asynchronous methods of communication dominate the World Wide Web. Though not all online communities operate in this manner, it becomes a point of interest when exploring the type of communities in which students engage (McInnerney and Roberts, 2004).

Critics of online communities argue that they are not communities at all. Weinreich (1997) argues firmly that a community requires face-to-face interaction to occur. He showed that in a study of one online community, 62% of respondents reported having met other users in person. These follow-up meetings, he argues, are what make online communities unsubstantial enough to stand on their own as communities.

How do these groups differ from any random online interaction? Jones (1997) provides four elements defining the distinction:

1. A minimum level of interactivity.
2. A variety of communicators.
3. Common public space
4. A minimum level of sustained membership.

Jones' elements state simply that there needs to be a somewhat regular population who exist in a realm where some degree of interaction occurs within the population. A community does not exist where one person posts a message on a site and no one replies (Wood and Smith, 2001).

Online communities exist in a five-stage life cycle. These stages could be said to mirror those stages found in a physical world community, merely differing in the realm of existence. Graber (2004) combined the works of Preece and Schwier to mold together a unified look at the life cycle of an online community. Before the community is formed, it goes through the pre-birth stage. In this stage, the policies are set to which the community will operate. The formation stage

is where new members enter the community and a sense of identity develops. The next stage of the life cycle is that of maturity. The community is now beginning to function independently and its purpose has been refined. The community may begin to shift with its new-found independence into something it originally was not; this stage is referred to as metamorphosis. Finally, the community may cease to exist either when members leave or the community has served its purpose, it's death (Garber, 2004).

Preece's Purpose, People, and Policies

Preece's (2000) idea of online community success rides on the community's ability to have a clear purpose, the people who exist within the community, and the policies that help to guide the behavior of its members. Before a community can begin to take-off, a sense of purpose needs to be established.

An online community with a reason for existing will have a better chance of making it to the maturation stage of its life cycle (Glaser, 1997). People may join a community to get information or support, to meet new people, or simply just see what's going on. The reason a community exists can greatly impact its membership. A clear sense of purpose is also said to deter the casual onlookers who lack commitment (Preece, 2000). Different mechanical instruments can also reflect the purpose of a community, such as requiring registration. This simple act can limit or increase membership through affecting people's desire and motivation to become a member.

People serve as the pinnacle role in any community, physical world included. Several researchers have commented on the depth of roles that individuals play in an online community: moderator, professionals, participants, and lurkers (Kim, 2000; Nonnecke, Preece, Andrews, &

Voutour, 2004; Preece, 2000; Reid, 1999; Wellman and Gulia, 1999). Each person plays a vital role in the community, and some members may play multiple roles.

The moderator usually begins as the founder of the community and then delegates the moderator role to a deserving participant. The moderator is charged with enforcing the policies the community has set and ensuring that the community sticks to its purpose. In the majority of communities, the role of the moderator is also to prevent spam and flames. “Spam” has become a household term used to refer to anything unwanted or undesired. “Flames,” however, refers to an online verbal attack of one person from another. Flames can be devastating to communities around the topics of health and personal support; however, some communities thrive on them, such as MetaFilter. Moderator responsibilities vary from community to community, but in the end they serve as those responsible for the longevity of it (Preece, 2000).

Professionals are people who carry with them some level of expertise. This role is usually seen in medical communities, but may also be found when guest authors or others are invited to join the community (Preece, 2000).

Participants play a vital role in the longevity and success of the online community. People play out their personalities or the creation of a new persona online. Some individuals have been known to take an opposite role from that which they play in the physical world. This notion is targeted to be explored in this research project. Participants provide the content in most communities and keep them alive and well. Some participants are destructive to communities, causing others to leave while others are constructive and invite new members to join (Preece, 2000).

The final role people may play is that of the lurker. On average, over half the population of an online community is comprised of lurkers (Nonnecke et al., 2004; Preece, 2000). A

“lurker” is a person who is a non-active participant in the community. Lurkers may be members who maintain membership, but do not contribute. Some may read posted content while others just browse when they feel the need (Nonnecke et al., 2004). For some participants, lurkers are a drawing force that feeds negatively to the community. People are not always comfortable posting knowing others are out there but not speaking. Preece (2000) notes that in some instances, lurkers become so entrenched in the information they feel they are participants. This creates an interesting dichotomy of membership.

Aside from the roles people play in communities, several researchers have commented on the basis from which membership is formed. The Internet allows for greater inclusion of people, forgoing physical and social appearance and cues (Katz and Rice, 2002; Lewis, Coursol, & Khan, 2001; Rheingold, 1993; Wellman and Gulia, 1999). This approach to inclusion allows for the most open and inviting place for a diverse community to be formed. Wellman and Gulia (1999) state that these communities also differ on the perception that people’s relationships appear to be intimate. Members of Internet communities exist around a common interest and are able to greatly support other members without the biases introduced in the physical world. People who may be overly shy face little risk for being outspoken online (Preece, 2000). Rheingold commented on this notion in his work:

Because we cannot see one another in cyberspace, gender, age, national origin, physical appearance are not apparent unless a person wants to make such characteristics public. People whose physical handicaps make it difficult to form new friendships find that virtual communities treat them as they always wanted to be treated – as thinkers and transmitters of ideas and feelings beings,

not carnal vessels with a certain appearance and way of walking and talking (or not walking and not talking). (Rheingold, 1993, p. 26)

Rheingold captures the ideas from which physical world communities attempt to create but so often fall short. Similar to the physical world, online communities can be exclusive, but online communities greatly differ in that members may also be separated by time (Graber, 2004). A person leaving a post online allows for minutes, hours, or at times days and weeks to pass before another member responds. The physical world may allow for this on a minute level but hardly to the extent an online community allows. The composition of the community and the roles being played are typically dictated by the policies set forth.

Policies serve as the final piece to Preece's (2000) definition and model of a successful online community. Essential to the formation of the group and its inevitable success, a group needs to have some manner of order and governance. How will members join and leave the group? Will there be a certain level of "netiquette" that will need to be maintained? (Netiquette refers to the etiquette used on the Internet.) What rules must the moderators follow? Will information be kept confidential? Will personal information be given away for any purposes? All of these questions begin to form the basis for which policies can be set and reviewed.

Preece's work has served as a foundation for how communities develop and are evaluated. Evaluative techniques are lacking and are challenging in the current state of the web (Nonnecke et al., 2004; Preece, 2001). People come and go instantaneously from online communities and getting an accurate response from a given membership requires one of the most challenging tasks in an online community, knowing who the membership truly is. For example, does one survey lurkers? If so, how? Several questions begin to surface when addressing the

simple notion of membership in online communities. Physical world communities are clear cut with a defined geographic membership (e.g. a residence hall).

Physical World Communities v. Online Communities

People do not divide their world into the physical world and the online world; rather people tie the two together to supplement each other (Wellman and Gulia, 1999). Critics who argue it takes away from the personal connection people are tied to a societal vision. Today, people see telephone calls as a personal means of communication, while in the 1940's it was seen as highly depersonalized (Wellman and Gulia, 1999). Researchers are beginning to argue that these new forms of community could be threatening to the physical communities that currently exist. In the same breath, they provide evidence that online communities benefit physical ones (Katz and Rice, 2002).

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine the social impacts online communities impose upon the physical world communities of residence halls on college and university campuses.

Research Question

The following research question guided this study:

What are the social impacts of online communities and their effect on the physical world communities of residence halls on a college/university campus?

Instrumentation

The survey instrument used was a self-created web-based survey designed to examine six main areas of evaluation: internet use, Facebook use, reading weblogs, writing blogs, online gaming, and physical world involvement (Appendix A)

Demographics were collected to evaluate overall trends in online and physical world involvement. These questions also included yes/no responses as to participation in activities to guide the remainder of the survey. General Internet usage data was collected including: amount of experience, time spent online, type of usage, and location of regular usage.

Facebook questions were focused on determining a level of involvement online through: types of usage and level of involvement, amount of time spent, and attitudes toward Facebook. Similar questions were used for reading blogs, writing blogs, and participation in online gaming.

The final section of the survey focused on a student's involvement and engagement in their physical world. Questions focused on level and type of involvement, time committed to building a physical world community, attitudes towards their physical world community, and comparison of engagement in activities, both online and in the physical world, between themselves and other students/roommates.

Pilot Study

The instrument was tested by five students from a representative sample of potential participants. The pilot was conducted for the intentions of timing the length of the survey for an average participant to complete. Data collected from the pilot was not included in the results of this study.

Population and Sample

The population for this study was college and university residence hall students. The sample was determined in a several step process. The Carnegie Classifications was used as a basis for the institutional sample. Institutions were separated into categories based on reported: size, type (public or private), and percentage of students housed in on-campus housing relative to total campus population. A complete breakdown and definition of each Carnegie Classification can be found in Appendix B.

Institutions were randomly selected from each of the twenty-four categories and were cross-referenced with a list of institutions with access to Facebook accounts. This list was obtained by request from Facebook.com. From this cross-referenced random selection, three institutions were chosen from each category netting a total of 71 potential institutional participants. Note: the private, very small, residential category yielded only two possible institutions after being cross-referenced; thereby leaving only 71 out of 72 possible institutions to consider.

Contact information was obtained via the ACUHO-I directory and institutional websites for the chief housing officer position at each institution. Phone calls were made when contact information was not available through the directory or institutional website. Contact information

was obtained for a total of 58 institutions. Thirteen of the 71 institutions failed to provide adequate contact information.

Chief housing officers were invited to participate via USPS (Appendix C). These invitations also included a summary sheet of the study and additional information regarding how they were selected (Appendix D). After two weeks, chief housing officers who haven't responded to the invitation were sent an email (Appendix E) re-inviting them to participate. As a result of the multiple contacts, six institutions were able to participate, 15 indicated they were unable to participate, and 37 never responded to the invitation. At the start of two of the institutional studies, it was determined that two of the institutions would not be able to participate due to technological limitations of their campus email system. The four remaining institutional participants were: Kansas State University, Samford University, the University of Florida, and the University of Kansas.

A total of 16,667 potential respondents were identified in the study from the four institutions. Of the 16,667, 86 bounced back as invalid email address and therefore have been discounted as potential respondents for this study, leaving a possible 16,581 respondents. Of the 16,581 potential respondents, 1490 opted-out of the study, 373 provided partial completion of the instrument (included in response rate), and 2776 fully completed the instrument, yielding a response rate of 18.99%. An institutional breakdown of response rates can be found in the next chapter.

Procedures

The procedure for administering this web-based survey was a two-step process. The entire process utilized the Kansas State University Survey System as an administrative tool to oversee survey implementation. Participants were sent a unique email invitation (Appendix F) in

the early morning of the start date informing them of the study and directions for taking the survey. Information for opting-out was included at the bottom of each invitation sent to students. Bounced emails and replied opt-out emails were taken into consideration as noted above. Following the survey release to an institution, students were given 11 days to complete the survey with a reminder email (Appendix G) sent the morning of every third day during the 11 day period. The 11 day period for each institution took into account any spring breaks the institutions would be experiencing, as to not have implementation of the survey occurring during these times of recess.

The survey was implemented starting March 6, 2006, for: Kansas State University, Samford University, and the University of Kansas. It was noted by a participant that there was a technical difficulty with the survey instrument. The instrument was failing to branch on conditional questions to the appropriate line of questioning. The survey was immediately pulled by noon on Monday, March 6, 2006. A message posted on the survey site indicated the survey was experiencing technical difficulties and participants would be emailed a new invitation. On Tuesday, March 7, 2006, a new invitation noting the technical difficulties (Appendix H) was sent to participants at the aforementioned institutions. These releases concluded on Friday, March 17, 2006.

The University of Florida offering began on Monday, March 27, 2006, and concluded Thursday, April 6, 2006. The invitation followed the original format (Appendix F).

Data Analysis Procedures

In order to answer the research question, data was analyzed using SPSS to compare the responses to online involvement to the levels of self-reported physical world involvement. To

address the research question, chi-square tests were performed and evaluated at no greater than at the $p < .05$ level.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations exist in this study:

1. This study is limited to students who had an email address which was supplied by the participating institutions and had access to their email accounts during their survey periods.
2. This study is limited to students living in on-campus housing.
3. This study is limited to institutions which were listed in the Carnegie Classifications and had access to Facebook.com as reported by Facebook.com on January 17, 2006.
4. The study is limited to the responses that have been received through the instrument.

Summary

This research was conducted at four institutions in the United State of America regarding on-campus residents' use of online communities and their relative physical world involvement. Data collected were self-reported in nature and were analyzed using descriptive information from the demographic portion of the survey. The research question was analyzed using a frequency and cross-tab comparisons of reported data. Results from the data and further details of the analysis are discussed in Chapter Four, which follows.

CHAPTER FOUR – PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Overview of Study

This study sought to examine the social impacts online communities have on the physical world communities of residence halls at colleges and universities in the United States using a self-created web-based survey instrument examining both online engagement and physical world engagement. Data were collected in the following areas: demographics, general Internet use, Facebook use, reading blogs, personal weblog use, online gaming, and physical world involvement.

For the purposes of this research paper, the investigation into the research question will focus on Facebook and its implications for the college campus. In exploring this topic, data will be presented as to the use and attitudes of Facebook as well as the perception of connectedness on the college campus. Additional information is provided as a basis of understanding of the population on the general Internet use of participants.

Institutional Response Rates

Kansas State University's Department of Housing and Dining Services provided a listing of 3257 residents residing in their traditional residence halls. Of the initial offering to 3257 residents, 5 email addresses bounced as invalid yielding 3252 potential respondents. Of this number, 347 opted-out of the survey and 724 completed the survey yielding a 22.26% response rate.

Samford University's Dean of Student's Office provided a listing of 1784 residents living on campus, of which no emails were returned as invalid. Of the 1784 potential respondents, 78 opted-out and 236 completed the survey yielding a 13.23% response rate.

The University of Florida’s Department of Housing and Residence Education provided a listing of 7195 residents living on campus, of which 11 email addresses bounced as invalid. This yielded 7184 potential respondents, of which 663 opted-out and 1597 completed the study yielding a 22.23% response rate.

The University of Kansas’s Department of Student Housing provided a listing of 4431 residents residing in their traditional residence halls and undergraduate apartments. Of the initial offering of 4431 residents, 70 email addresses bounced as invalid netting a potential respondent pool of 4361 residents. Of the 4361 potential respondents, 402 opted-out and 592 completed the survey yielding a 13.57% response rate.

Table 1: Response Rates by Institution

Institution	Original	Invalid	Total Valid	Total Opt-Out	Total Returned	Response Rate	Partial Response*
Kansas State University	3257	5	3252	347	724	22.26%	71
Samford University	1784	0	1784	78	236	13.23%	24
University of Florida	7195	11	7184	663	1597	22.23%	208
University of Kansas	4431	70	4361	402	592	13.57%	70
TOTAL	16667	86	16581	1490	3149	18.99%	373

* Included in Total Returned

Respondent Demographics

The following section provides information regarding the demographics self-reported by participants. Tables 2 – 9 provide information related to the first eight questions asked on the instrument: year in school, gender, ethnicity, age, years residing in residence halls, number of roommates, residence hall type, GPA, and sexual orientation. The data presented is the combined

results of the participants at the four researched institutions. A breakdown of each institutions response can be found in Appendix I.

Table 2 indicates that the majority of participants (65.9%) who've responded are first year undergraduate students with 34.1% being upperclassmen.

Table 2: Year in School Demographic Response

	N	Percent
1st Year Undergraduate	2064	65.9
2nd Year Undergraduate	591	18.9
3rd Year Undergraduate	287	9.2
4th Year Undergraduate	146	4.7
5th or more Year(s) Undergraduate	29	.9
Graduate Student	13	.4
Other	4	.1
Total	3134	100.0

Table 3 shows that 67.8% of respondents identified as female for this study.

Table 3: Gender Demographic Response

	N	Percent
Male	1001	32.0
Female	2121	67.8
Transgendered	8	.3
Total	3130	100.0

Cultural diversity in the residence halls is illustrated in Table 4, with a majority of participants identifying as Caucasian.

Table 4: Ethnicity Demographic Response

	N	Percent
African American	212	6.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	141	4.5
Caucasian	2397	76.7
Latino(a)/Chicano(a)	223	7.1
Middle Eastern	17	.5
Multi-Ethnic	86	2.8
Native American	13	.4
Other	35	1.1
Total	3124	100.0

The average participant age of the respondents was 19 years old, with a range of 12 – 48 years of age.

For the majority of respondents, this is their first year in the residence hall (68.8%), as shown in Table 5. Table 6 shows that the majority of participants (89.8%) have at least one roommate.

Table 5: Years in Residence Halls Demographic Response

	N	Percent
0-1 year	2151	68.8
1-2 years	600	19.2
2-3 years	246	7.9
more than 3 years	129	4.1
Total	3126	100.0

Table 6: Number of Roommates Halls Demographic Response

	N	Percent
0 (live alone)	320	10.2
1	1963	62.3
2	247	7.8
3 or more	619	19.7
Total	3149	100.0

Table 7 concludes the demographic information regarding the participants living situation which shows that a majority of participants live in a co-ed residence hall (73.4%) and of those participants grouped by gender typically by floor or by wing. The majority of participants indicate their GPA falls between 3.5 – 4.0 as shown in Table 8.

Table 7: Residence Hall Type Demographic Response

	N	Percent
Single Gender	833	26.6
Co-ed by Floor	1089	34.8
Co-ed by Wing	807	25.8
Co-ed by Room	401	12.8
Total	3130	100.0

Table 8: GPA Demographic Response

	N	Percent
3.5 - 4.0	1544	49.5
3.0 - 3.49	936	30.0
2.5 - 2.99	462	14.8
2.0 - 2.49	129	4.1
1.99 or less	49	1.6
Total	3120	100.0

The final demographic data collected indicated that 95.4% of participants identify as heterosexual, as illustrated in Table 9.

Table 9: Sexual Orientation Demographic Response

	N	Percent
Heterosexual	2977	95.4
Homosexual	44	1.4
Bisexual	41	1.3
Questioning	15	.5
Prefer not to respond	45	1.4
Total	3122	100.0

Overview of Online Involvement

Four questions were asked to guide the questioning on the instrument in regards to the participants involvement in online communities. Their responses are shown in Table 10.

Appendix J shows a breakdown of these numbers based on institution.

Table 10: Online Involvement Overview Response

		N	Percent
On Facebook	Yes	2972	94.4
	No	177	5.6
	Total	3149	100.0
Read Blogs	Yes	1502	47.7
	No	1647	52.3
	Total	3149	100.0
Own Blog	Yes	1008	32.0
	No	2141	68.0
	Total	3149	100.0
Play Online Games	Yes	1276	40.5
	No	1873	59.5
	Total	3149	100.0

General Internet Use Results

All participants were asked nine questions regarding their overall usage of the Internet. Tables 11 – 14 show the results from these series of questions with institutional results being reflected in Appendix K. A resounding majority of participants (97.8%) have 3 or more years experience using the Internet, as shown in Table 11.

Table 11: Use of Internet - Years

	N	Percent
0 - 1 years	6	.2
1 - 2 years	16	.5
2 - 3 years	47	1.5
3 or more years	3027	97.8
Total	3096	100.0

Table 12 illustrates the responses to the most common locations respondents indicate “regularly” using the Internet. Multiple responses were permitted by respondents and several additional responses were gathered indicating 29 other locations students regularly access the Internet. None of these other locations are statistically significant for the purposes of this research (where $p \leq .05$).

Table 12: Location of Internet Use

	N	Percent
Room	3047	96.8
Library	1639	43.5
Residence Hall Computer Lab	277	8.8
Other Computer Lab	707	22.5

Respondents were asked the frequency in which they engage in various activities online. As indicated in Table 13, respondents engage more frequently in instant messaging closely followed by emailing.

Table 13: Frequency of General Internet Activity Engagement

		N	Percent
Email	Hourly	885	28.7
	Daily	2037	66.1
	Weekly	126	4.1
	Monthly	12	.4
	Rarely	23	.7
	Total	3083	100.0
Instant Message	Hourly	825	29.7
	Daily	1123	40.5
	Weekly	457	16.5
	Monthly	111	4.0
	Rarely	259	9.3
	Total	2775	100.0
Find Information	Hourly	536	17.4
	Daily	1732	56.2
	Weekly	709	23.0
	Monthly	78	2.5
	Rarely	25	.8
	Total	3080	100.0
Make Purchases	Hourly	24	.9
	Daily	40	1.5
	Weekly	266	10.1
	Monthly	1013	38.4
	Rarely	1298	49.1
	Total	2641	100.0
Academic Research	Hourly	115	3.8
	Daily	761	24.9
	Weekly	1454	47.5
	Monthly	552	18.0
	Rarely	179	5.8
	Total	3061	100.0

The final question asked on general Internet usage pertained to the frequency of which the respondent uses the Internet throughout the week. Table 14 shows that respondents use the Internet more on weekdays (Monday – Friday) and less on Weekends (Saturday and Sunday).

Table 14: Frequency of Internet Use

		N	Percent
Weekday	0 - 30 minutes	43	1.4
	30 minutes - 1 hour	287	9.3
	1 hour - 3 hours	1232	39.9
	3 hours - 5 hours	869	28.2
	5 hours - 7 hours	374	12.1
	more than 7 hours	281	9.1
	Total	3086	100.0
Weekend	0 - 30 minutes	192	6.2
	30 minutes - 1 hour	522	16.9
	1 hour - 3 hours	1143	37.0
	3 hours - 5 hours	690	22.3
	5 hours - 7 hours	331	10.7
	more than 7 hours	210	6.8
	Total	3088	100.0

Facebook Engagement

Participants who indicated they were on Facebook (94.4%) were asked the following questions regarding their use of it. Tables 15 – 21 show the results from these questions. Following this section, information on those who indicated they were not on Facebook (5.6%) were asked for information as to their reasons for not using the online community. A breakdown by institution can be found in Appendix L.

The average participant spends less than 30 minutes on Facebook daily (Table 15).

Table 15: Frequency of Facebook Daily Use

	N	Percent
0 - 30 minutes	1539	53.9
30 minutes - 1 hour	837	29.3
1 hour - 2 hours	362	12.7
2 hours - 3 hours	89	3.1
more than 3 hours	30	1.1
Total	2857	100.0

Respondents were asked approximately how many “friends” were on their Facebook account. The average respondent had 145 friends at their institution and 127 friends at other institutions. The range of these responses were as low as 0 and as high as 1800 for one individual.

The next series of questions asked respondents the frequency to which they engage in various activities on Facebook. Four questions were asked as to the respondent’s involvement on

Facebook “walls.” Table 16 shows a breakdown of these activities. While on Facebook, respondents more frequently read their “wall,” read their friends’ “walls,” then write on their friends’ “walls.”

Table 16: Frequency of Facebook Wall Use

		N	Percent
Read Own Wall	Hourly	276	9.8
	Daily	1599	56.6
	Weekly	662	23.4
	Monthly	121	4.3
	Rarely	167	5.9
	Total	2825	100.0
Read Friend’s Wall	Hourly	69	2.5
	Daily	737	26.6
	Weekly	1191	43.0
	Monthly	345	12.5
	Rarely	425	15.4
	Total	2767	100.0
Write on Own Wall	Hourly	14	2.0
	Daily	25	3.6
	Weekly	70	10.2
	Monthly	74	10.8
	Rarely	502	73.3
	Total	685	100.0
Write on Friend’s Wall	Hourly	41	1.5
	Daily	468	16.9
	Weekly	1280	46.3
	Monthly	495	17.9
	Rarely	479	17.3
	Total	2763	100.0

Other activities that participants engage in on Facebook are shown in Table 17. These activities do not amount for a significant amount of time spent on Facebook.

Table 17: Frequency of Misc. Facebook Activity Use

		N	Percent
Search for New Friends	Hourly	22	.9
	Daily	99	4.1
	Weekly	602	24.7
	Monthly	697	28.6
	Rarely	1019	41.8
	Total	2439	100.0
Update Profile	Hourly	17	.6
	Daily	50	1.8
	Weekly	602	21.7
	Monthly	1213	43.7
	Rarely	894	32.2
	Total	2776	100.0
Create Groups	Hourly	8	.6
	Daily	7	.5
	Weekly	20	1.5
	Monthly	155	11.9
	Rarely	1113	85.4
	Total	1303	100.0
Create Parties	Hourly	10	1.8
	Daily	4	.7
	Weekly	13	2.3
	Monthly	50	8.8
	Rarely	493	86.5
	Total	570	100.0

Participants were asked to approximate levels of connectedness through their involvement in “groups” and “parties.” The average respondent is a member of 27 groups, an officer of 2 groups, and has created 1 group. The average respondent is a “confirmed guest” of 2 party and has created 1 party.

The final series of Facebook questions focused on participants attitudes towards Facebook, their use of it, and the reasons they engage in it. Table 18 shows that 59.6% of respondents agree to strongly agree with the statement: “I was excited to join Facebook.”

Table 18: Excitement Towards Joining Facebook

	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	94	3.3
Disagree	240	8.4
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	818	28.7
Agree	990	34.7
Strongly Agree	711	24.9
Total	2853	100.0

Three questions were asked as to the attitude of why the participant uses Facebook. Table 19 shows a majority of participants (81.9%) agree to strongly agree with the statement: “I use Facebook to stay connected to friends from high school.”

Table 19: Attitudes Towards Use of Facebook

		N	Percent
Meet New People	Strongly Disagree	591	20.7
	Disagree	1039	36.5
	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	619	21.7
	Agree	466	16.4
	Strongly Agree	134	4.7
	Agree		
	Total	2849	100.0
Stay Connected to High School Friends	Strongly Disagree	118	4.1
	Disagree	166	5.8
	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	230	8.1
	Agree	1221	42.8
	Strongly Agree	1115	39.1
	Agree		
	Total	2850	100.0
Keep Track of What Friends are Doing	Strongly Disagree	144	5.1
	Disagree	342	12.0
	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	563	19.8
	Agree	1217	42.7
	Strongly Agree	584	20.5
	Agree		
	Total	2850	100.0

Two questions were asked towards the attitude of respondents and their feelings toward feeling connected to people and making difficult social connections. Table 20 shows a slight majority (54.5%) feel connected to their friends on Facebook and 18.9% of respondents use Facebook to make social connections they could not find in person.

Table 20: Attitudes Towards Connectedness on Facebook

		N	Percent
Feel Connected to Friends on Facebook	Strongly Disagree	130	4.6
	Disagree	314	11.0
	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	852	29.9
	Agree	1127	39.6
	Strongly Agree	425	14.9
	Total	2848	100.0
Use to Make Social Connections Couldn't Find in Person	Strongly Disagree	708	24.8
	Disagree	984	34.5
	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	619	21.7
	Agree	386	13.5
	Strongly Agree	153	5.4
	Total	2850	100.0

The final attitude question shows that 31.3% of respondents agree to strongly agree with the statement: “I feel addicted to Facebook,” as shown in Table 21.

Table 21: Attitudes Towards Addiction to Facebook

	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	812	28.5
Disagree	652	22.9
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	494	17.3
Agree	573	20.1
Strongly Agree	320	11.2
Total	2851	100.0

Non Facebook Engagement

A small number of respondents (N=177=5.6%) indicated they were not involved on Facebook. These individuals were asked the reason(s) they have chosen to not participate in Facebook. Table 22 shows the results to this question. Institutional results can be viewed in Appendix M.

The number one reason people indicated not participating in Facebook was they were simply not interested. Other reasons, respectively, included it was too much of a fad, they weren't interested in releasing personal information online, and they had no time to participate in it.

Table 22: Reasons not Involved on Facebook

	N	Percent
Not Interested	123	69.5
Too Much of a Fad	78	44.1
No Time	59	33.3
Don't Know What it Is	10	5.6
Friends Don't do It	7	4.0
Don't Want to Put Personal Information Online	66	37.3

Physical World Engagement

The next section of the instrument begins to explore the participants' engagement in the physical world. This engagement was measured through: participation in attending and planning of events and activities, feeling of connectedness to physical world community, and level of involvement in physical world organizations. Participants were also asked to compare their engagement in online and physical world communities to other students on campus. Tables 23 – 27 show the data related to the physical world engagement of participants. Appendix N contains the institutional breakdown of these statistics.

Participants were asked to quantify the number of events/activities they participated in on their floor, in their building, and on campus. Table 23 shows that participants have attended more campus events than events located in their immediate living community.

Table 23: Attendance at Events/Activities

		N	Percent
Floor	0 Events/Activities	910	32.1
	1 - 3 Events/Activities	1063	37.4
	4 - 6 Events/Activities	501	17.6
	7 - 10 Events/Activities	146	5.1
	more than 10 Events/Activities	219	7.7
	Total	2839	100.0
Building	0 Events/Activities	850	29.9
	1 - 3 Events/Activities	1088	38.3
	4 - 6 Events/Activities	468	16.5
	7 - 10 Events/Activities	210	7.4
	more than 10 Events/Activities	227	8.0
	Total	2843	100.0
Campus	0 Events/Activities	217	7.6
	1 - 3 Events/Activities	644	22.7
	4 - 6 Events/Activities	749	26.4
	7 - 10 Events/Activities	509	17.9
	more than 10 Events/Activities	723	25.4
	Total	2842	100.0

Similarly, participants were asked to quantify the number of events/activities they assisted in planning in their physical world. Table 24 shows a slightly higher level of campus event planning than floor or building events.

Table 24: Planning of Events/Activities

		N	Percent
Floor	0 Events/Activities	2096	74.2
	1 - 3 Events/Activities	444	15.7
	4 - 6 Events/Activities	119	4.2
	7 - 10 Events/Activities	62	2.2
	more than 10 Events/Activities	103	3.6
	Total	2824	100.0
Building	0 Events/Activities	2225	78.5
	1 - 3 Events/Activities	316	11.2
	4 - 6 Events/Activities	119	4.2
	7 - 10 Events/Activities	60	2.1
	more than 10 Events/Activities	114	4.0
	Total	2834	100.0
Campus	0 Events/Activities	1708	60.2
	1 - 3 Events/Activities	613	21.6
	4 - 6 Events/Activities	269	9.5
	7 - 10 Events/Activities	113	4.0
	more than 10 Events/Activities	132	4.7
	Total	2835	100.0

Table 25 shows the level of connectedness to their physical world. Respondents indicated that they feel almost equally connected to those living on their floor (46.6%) to people on campus (46.0%).

Table 25: Connectedness to Physical World

		N	Percent
Floor	Strongly Disagree	506	17.8
	Disagree	510	18.0
	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	497	17.5
	Agree	857	30.2
	Strongly Agree	465	16.4
	Total	2835	100.0
Building	Strongly Disagree	507	17.9
	Disagree	622	22.0
	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	661	23.3
	Agree	737	26.0
	Strongly Agree	306	10.8
	Total	2833	100.0
Campus	Strongly Disagree	207	7.3
	Disagree	410	14.5
	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	938	33.2
	Agree	1043	36.9
	Strongly Agree	230	8.1
	Total	2828	100.0

When asked the attitude towards meeting new people at events/programs, respondents indicated they are more likely to attend campus events (40.8%) to meet new people. Table 26 shows that this number is followed closely by attendance at building events then floor events.

Table 26: Meeting New People at Physical World Events/Programs

		N	Percent
Floor	Strongly Disagree	641	22.7
	Disagree	800	28.3
	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	693	24.5
	Agree	577	20.4
	Strongly Agree	117	4.1
	Total	2828	100.0
Building	Strongly Disagree	636	22.5
	Disagree	794	28.1
	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	665	23.6
	Agree	597	21.2
	Strongly Agree	130	4.6
	Total	2822	100.0
Campus	Strongly Disagree	399	14.1
	Disagree	570	20.2
	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	701	24.8
	Agree	947	33.6
	Strongly Agree	204	7.2
	Total	2821	100.0

Table 27 shows data related to participants involvement in housing related and campus organizations. Of those responding, 63.3% of respondents indicated that they have some level of involvement in a student organization on campus. Few respondents indicated an involvement in a housing related organization (hall government, residence hall association, or National Residence Hall Honorary).

Table 27: Student Organization Involvement

		N	Percent
Hall Government	Strongly Disagree	1733	61.4
	Disagree	635	22.5
	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	167	5.9
	Agree	125	4.4
	Strongly Agree	162	5.7
	Total	2822	100.0
Residence Hall Association or National Residence Hall Honorary	Strongly Disagree	1837	65.3
	Disagree	641	22.8
	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	161	5.7
	Agree	69	2.5
	Strongly Agree	106	3.8
	Total	2814	100.0
Campus Student Organization	Strongly Disagree	478	17.0
	Disagree	255	9.0
	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	209	7.4
	Agree	774	27.5
	Strongly Agree	1102	39.1
	Total	2818	100.0

Research Question Analysis

Investigating the driving research question lies in exploring the cross-relation between online community engagement and physical world engagement. Due to the large amount of data collected, only significant results will be presented in this chapter. The research question asks: What are the social impacts of online communities and their effect on the physical world communities of residence halls on a college/university campus?

Facebook Uses and Perceptions

When further exploring the population who regularly engages in Facebook use, Table 28 shows the breakdown of these populations demographically. Following, Tables 29 – 31 explore the perceptions behind this use. According to the data presented, the following populations of people engage more frequently in using Facebook: women, students of color, students with lower GPAs, first year undergraduates, and those living in co-ed environment.

Table 28: Demographics * Facebook Daily Use Cross-tabulation

	0 - 30 minutes	30 minutes - 1 hour	More than 1 hour	<i>p</i>
Male	65.0	25.8	9.2	.000
Female	48.8	30.9	20.2	.000
Caucasian	54.8	29.9	15.3	.000
Minority	50.7	27.3	22.0	.000
3.5 – 4.0 GPA	57.7	28.2	14.2	.000
3.0 – 3.49 GPA	52.9	29.4	17.7	.000
2.99 or less GPA	45.8	31.7	22.5	.000
1 st Year Undergraduate	29.6	30.7	19.7	.000
2 nd Year Undergraduate	55.8	30.4	13.9	.000
3 rd Year or Older Student	70.6	21.7	7.7	.000
0 – 1 Years in Halls	50.6	30.5	18.9	.000
1 – 2 Years in Halls	57.0	29.1	14.0	.000
More than 2 Years in Halls	67.4	23.1	9.5	.000
Single Gender Hall	58.1	28.5	13.4	.004
Co-ed by Floor Hall	52.1	31.2	16.7	.004
Co-ed by Wing Hall	50.9	28.2	20.9	.004
Co-ed by Room	55.3	28.2	16.5	.004

* shown in percentages

No significant statistics are found when exploring the cross-tabulations between demographics and the reasons participants use Facebook. Significance does appear when looking at the level of connectedness participants experience when using Facebook. Table 29 illustrates these perceptions. Only demographics with $p < .05$ are presented. Not shown in the table is that those who identified as non-heterosexual (homosexual, bisexual, or questioning) have a strong attitude towards feeling connected on Facebook with a SA level at 20.6% and heterosexuals having a SA level at 14.7%. In exploring connectedness online, we find the following subsets of populations have a greater level of perception towards connectedness: women and students who've been on campus for a fewer number of years.

Table 29: Demographics * Facebook Connectedness Cross-tabulation

	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	Strongly Agree/Agree	<i>p</i>
Male	21.5	45.3	.000
Female	12.8	58.7	.000
3.5 – 4.0 GPA	16.4	54.3	.000
3.0 – 3.49 GPA	16.0	54.2	.000
2.99 or less GPA	12.7	45.8	.000
1 st Year Undergraduate	13.5	56.7	.000
2 nd Year Undergraduate	16.5	52.3	.000
3 rd Year or Older Student	23.5	47.7	.000
0 – 1 Years in Halls	14.0	56.4	.000
1 – 2 Years in Halls	15.9	51.5	.000
More than 2 Years in Halls	24.4	47.0	.000

* shown in percentages

The next area explored when looking at the demographics of the participants is the use of Facebook to make connections to individuals they couldn't make in the physical world. Table 30 shows that students of color, those identifying as non-heterosexuals, and students with low GPAs have a greater level of use of engaging in Facebook to make difficult social connections.

Table 30: Demographics * Facebook Difficult Social Connections Cross-tabulation

	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	Strongly Agree/Agree	<i>p</i>
Caucasian	60.2	17.8	.033
Minority	56.4	23.0	.033
Heterosexual	59.9	18.4	.000
Non-Heterosexual	47.4	28.2	.000
3.5 – 4.0 GPA	64.1	16.9	.000
3.0 – 3.49 GPA	57.3	19.6	.000
2.99 or less GPA	50.9	22.8	.000

* shown in percentages

The final look at perception and Facebook use lies in the participants' attitude towards feeling addicted to Facebook. Table 31 shows that women, students with lower GPAs, and younger students have greater levels of perception towards being addicted to Facebook.

Table 31: Demographics * Facebook Addiction Cross-tabulation

	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	Strongly Agree/Agree	<i>p</i>
Male	65.8	18.7	.000
Female	44.8	37.1	.000
3.5 – 4.0 GPA	54.0	28.8	.005
3.0 – 3.49 GPA	50.8	32.1	.005
2.99 or less GPA	45.8	36.2	.005
1 st Year Undergraduate	47.5	34.8	.000
2 nd Year Undergraduate	53.8	17.7	.000
3 rd Year or Older Student	66.2	19.8	.000
* shown in percentages			

Physical World Engagement and Perception

Little to no significance was found when investigating the amount of activities respondents participated in through their physical world; however, significance was found when looking at the perception of respondents feeling connected to their various physical world communities. Tables 32 – 35 explore the statically significant ($p < .05$) demographics in relation to physical world connectedness.

Few notable significances are found when looking at connectedness on a participants residence hall floor. Table 32 shows that men and Caucasian students have a greater level of connectedness to those students living on their floor.

Table 32: Demographics * Connectedness to Floor Cross-tabulation

	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	Strongly Agree/Agree	<i>p</i>
Male	31.0	51.3	.004
Female	37.9	44.5	.004
Caucasian	34.1	59.5	.000
Minority	42.0	36.6	.000
* shown in percentages			

Table 33 expands on the demographical significance when looking at participants and their perception of connectedness to their building. Though gender doesn't carry statistical significance when looking at connectedness to building, the type of residence hall and years of attendance do play a factor.

Table 33: Demographics * Connectedness to Building Cross-tabulation

	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	Strongly Agree/Agree	<i>p</i>
Caucasian	37.9	40.1	.000
Minority	46.6	25.2	.000
1 st Year Undergraduate	38.7	34.6	.000
2 nd Year Undergraduate	44.7	38.8	.000
3 rd Year or Older Student	39.2	43.7	.000
0 – 1 Years in Halls	34.4	38.8	.000
1 – 2 Years in Halls	33.3	38.8	.000
More than 2 Years in Halls	38.2	47.2	.000
Single Gender Hall	29.5	50.3	.000
Co-ed by Floor Hall	46.1	29.7	.000
Co-ed by Wing Hall	34.9	37.2	.000
Co-ed by Room	54.7	27.0	.000

* shown in percentages

These trends continue when looking at social connectedness to the participants' campus.

Table 34 shows that students who are: Caucasian, live in a single-gender residence hall, and have been on campus longer have greater levels of connectedness to campus. Though less statistically significant ($p = .058$), students with higher GPAs feel more connected to campus than those with lower GPAs.

Table 34: Demographics * Connectedness to Campus Cross-tabulation

	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	Strongly Agree/Agree	<i>p</i>
Caucasian	19.6	48.3	.000
Minority	28.8	34.0	.000
1 st Year Undergraduate	21.9	43.4	.000
2 nd Year Undergraduate	20.6	48.5	.000
3 rd Year or Older Student	22.8	47.9	.000
0 – 1 Years in Halls	23.5	43.0	.000
1 – 2 Years in Halls	20.4	47.5	.000
More than 2 Years in Halls	20.1	52.0	.000
Single Gender Hall	15.0	55.4	.000
Co-ed by Floor Hall	24.9	41.5	.000
Co-ed by Wing Hall	22.8	40.4	.000
Co-ed by Room	25.3	42.6	.000

* shown in percentages

Two additional areas require exploration when investigating statistical significance between demographics and the physical world: participants attending events to meet new people and the planning of events to feel socially connected. Table 35 shows that women are more likely to attend events on their floor, in their hall, or on campus to meet new people over men. The table also reflects a stronger attitude towards attending campus events to meet new people over floor events in both genders.

Table 35: Gender * Attendance at Events to Meet New People Cross-tabulation

	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	Strongly Agree/Agree	<i>p</i>
Floor Events			
Male	56.0	20.4	.000
Female	48.5	26.5	.000
Building Events			
Male	54.0	23.0	.014
Female	49.1	27.1	.014
Campus Events			
Male	40.7	35.8	.000
Female	31.2	43.3	.000

* shown in percentages

Online Community Impact on Social Connectedness

In efforts to address the research question posed, additional statistical significance can be found when exploring the relationship between Facebook use and a participants feeling of connectedness to campus. Little statistical significance is seen when looking at the relationship Facebook use has on being connected to a participant’s floor ($p = .512$) and a participant’s building ($p = .145$).

Table 36 illustrates that the more time participants spend on Facebook the more connected they feel to campus.

Table 36: Facebook Daily Use * Connectedness to Campus Cross-tabulation

	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	Strongly Agree/Agree	<i>p</i>
0 – 30 minutes	23.3	42.4	.002
30 minutes to 1 hour	18.2	48.5	.002
More than 1 hour	20.9	51.7	.002

* shown in percentages

Summary

Overall, participants indicate a medium to high level of involvement in online communities and low to medium levels of involvement in physical world communities. Less than half of participants feel connected to their physical world while slightly more participants feel more connected to individuals through Facebook. Demographically women and minority participants indicated heavier use of Facebook and a greater feeling of disconnect from their physical world. The next chapter of this paper will further explore these levels of involvement and connectedness.

CHAPTER FIVE – DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Summary of Study

This study was conducted at four institutions throughout the United States. With the advent of Facebook in 2004, online communities and their implications for higher education has had a significant impact the life of college students. In conducting this research, several key aspects become unveiled with the growth of technology on the college campus and in the daily routine life of today's college student.

As students use of the Internet continues to increase, so does the need for institutions to understand the role the Internet is playing on the college campus. Little research has been done exploring how students are using the Internet, specifically Facebook, and how it is impacting campus life. This study has aimed to answer the looming questions surrounding Facebook: "How is it being used?" and "How is it impacting the college campus?"

While institutions continue to take a reactive approach to this new innovation, information is being provided with the light of this study, how institutions can take a proactive stance toward Facebook and other online communities. This paper is just the start of the research regarding the implications online communities have for higher education. With a focal point on residence hall populations, more research is called for on more specific areas of online community use and its role on campus. No statistically significant data was found in exploring the relationship between spending time online (either Internet use or Facebook engagement) and participation in a student's physical world.

Discussion of Online Community Involvement

The majority of students on any given day are spending between one and five hours on the Internet with over 96% of them accessing it from the comfort of their residence hall room. Of

this time, up to one hour of time may be spent engaging in Facebook. The highest area for use on Facebook is staying connected to high school friends. One would expect more people using Facebook to connect to college peers; however a very small percentage (21.1%) are using it for this purpose. This becomes important when exploring the administrative response to Facebook in relation to this study.

There are some demographics that become key when exploring who the users of Facebook are and what role they are playing in it. Women and students of color are two large populations of individuals who engage more frequently on Facebook. It is very clear that first year students would engage more frequently in Facebook than third year students due to the timing of Facebook release to the college campus.

Following these trends are the levels of connectedness these populations experience when evaluating their relationship with their friends. The higher the use of Facebook the more connected they feel to the people online. These trends further extend into looking at students feeling addicted to Facebook. This follows perfect deductive logic as the more frequently one engages on Facebook the more addicted one would perceive themselves to be.

Universities argue that Facebook becomes an interference on the academic success of college students on campus. A dichotomy exists between this negative aspect (including the fact that students who spend more time on Facebook have lower GPAs) and the elements of social connectedness that Facebook provides. As universities continue to build initiatives towards diversifying campuses, the important element of the retention of these students comes through them feeling connected to campus.

Discussion of Research Question

What are the impacts being experienced on college campuses by online communities? A complex question to answer, but a question that begins to have some answers when exploring the use of Facebook in relation to a student's campus experience. Facebook use on a college campus comes with negative and positive implications.

As noted above, heavy Facebook use tends to be seen in students with a lower GPA. Though it cannot be said that Facebook is the cause for the lower GPA, there is a significant relationship ($p = .000$) between these two variables. Aside from GPA, there are no other statistical negative implications that this study has explored. There are constant reports coming from campuses indicating the use of Facebook as a tool for punishing criminal actions, a tool for stalking students, and a background check for future employers.

Positive implications revolve around the idea of being connected to the college campus. Students of color and students who identify as non-heterosexual engage use Facebook as a tool to make social connections they could not make in person. This quality of Facebook alone pushes high above any negative implications Facebook has. University administrators are constantly looking for tools to connect students to campus have evoke a 'feeling of home' within the student body. In the case of looking at students of color, these students report feeling less connected to their floor, residence hall, or campus than any other subset of students (e.g. those with low GPA).

What also becomes important is that students who use Facebook more feel more connected to campus. Students who use Facebook more than one hour daily report feeling 9.3% ($p = .002$) more connected to campus than students who use Facebook less than 30 minutes daily.

The weight these implications play on any college campus fall to the hands of university administrators. Students have empirically reported using Facebook to advertise for campus events or build community on a residence hall floor. As with any new technology, it is important to understand how to use it and what it is being used for; along with educating users about proper use of online technologies (i.e. Facebook) and learn about the level of responsibility associated with its use.

Contributions to the Field

This research has aimed to shed a preliminary light onto millennial college students and their increased use of online communities. The research provided is a starting point at beginning to understand how students are engaging in online communities. With the use of the information provided in the is research, institutions can better reach out to populations with the understanding of effective approach mediums. Institutions can further use this information to determining populations of students who are better approached in the physical world.

It was the intention of this research to begin to examine and illustrate the positive implications online communities have on the college campus of today. There are hundreds of more possibilities for using online communities to enhance the college experience than what are explored in this research. Additional data were collected regarding weblogs and online gaming which just begin to touch the surface of those areas.

Recommendations for Future Research

As noted above, there are endless areas of years of research in this area of academia. One area which should be explored more specifically with these technologies is the impact they are specifically having on academics. As universities begin to explore connecting students academically to each-other online, so must these technologies be evaluated and examined for the

impact they bring to the college campus. Can Facebook enhance a student's academics through the creation of study groups? Could a blog be used to enhance out-of-classroom discussions around an academic topic? Discussion boards begin to do this, but could a weblog further enhance the discussion and education?

In addition, research should be conducted on how online communities impact other populations of college students, aside from residence hall students. Are there any notable differences in use by commuter students, fraternity/sorority members, or even non-traditional students? How are college faculty and staff using online communities?

Conclusion

This research has been a stepping-stone towards the future of higher education. As new technologies continue to land in the laps of college students, so will the need for university administrators to understand them and their implications for college campuses. Though these technologies carry a potential negative effect of lowering a student's GPA, the positive effects of feeling grounded and connected to campus is dominant. As resources like Facebook continue to evolve, it is important for researchers to continue their practice and study the implications online communities have on higher education.

REFERENCES

- Berger, J. B. (1997). Students' sense of community in residence halls, social integration, and first-year persistence. *Journal of College Student Development*, 38(5), 441-452.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Campus life. in search of community*. Princeton, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Fernback, J. (1999). Ther is a there there. notes toward a definition of cyber-community. In S. Jones (Ed.), *Doing internet research. critical issues and methods for examining the net* (pp. 203-220). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Galston, W. A. (2004). The impact of the internet on civic life: An early assessment. In V. Gehring (Ed.), *The internet in public life* (pp. 59-78). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Garber, D. (2004). Growing virtual communities. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 5(2). Retrieved August 29, 2005, from <http://www.irrodl.org/content/v5.2/technote4.html>
- Gergen, K. J. *Technology, self and the moral project*. Unpublished manuscript. Retrieved September 27, 2005, from <http://www.swarthmore.edu/SocSci/kgergen1/web/page.phtml?id=manu30&st=manuscripts&hf=1>
- Glaser, M. (1997, March 3, 1997). Building online communities. *NewMedia*, 7(3) 36-46.

- Jones, Q. Virtual-communities, virtual settlements & cyber-archaeology: A theoretical outline. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 3(3). Retrieved September 30, 2005, from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol3/issue3/jones.html>
- Katz, J. E., & Rice, R. E. (2002). *Social consequences of internet use. access, involvement, and interaction*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Kim, A. J. (2000). In Wildman J., Morgan B. (Eds.), *Community building on the web*. Berkeley, California: Peachpit Press.
- Lewis, J., Coursol, D., & Khan, L. (2001). College students@tech.edu: A student of comfort and the use of technology. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42(6), 625-631.
- McInnerney, J. M., & Roberts, T. S. (2004). Online learning: Social interaction and the creation of a sense of community. *Educational Technology & Society*, 7(3), 73-81.
- Nonnecke, B., Preece, J., Andrews, D., & Voutour, R. (2004). Online lurkers tell why. New York, New York. August 2004
- Preece, J. (2001). Sociability and usability in online communities: Determining and measuring success. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 20(5), 347-356.
- Preece, J. (2000). *Online communities. designing usability, supporting sociability*. Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons, LTD.
- Reid, E. (1999). Hierarchy and power: Social control in cyberspace. In M. Smith, & P. Kollock (Eds.), *Communities in cyberspace* (pp. 107-133). London, England: Routledge.

Rheingold, H. (1993). *The virtual community: Homesteading on the electronic frontier*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Weinreich, F. (1997). Establishing a point of view toward virtual communities. *Computer-Mediated Communication Magazine*, 4(2). Retrieved September 30, 2005, from <http://www.december.com/cmc/mag/1997/feb/weinon.html>

Wellman, B., & Gulia, M. (1999). Virtual communities as communities: Net surfers don't ride alone. In M. Smith, & P. Kollock (Eds.), *Communities in cyberspace* (pp. 167-194). London, England: Routledge.

Wikipedia. (2005). *World wide web*. Retrieved September 30, 2005 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_wide_web

Wood, A. F., & Smith, M. J. (2001). *Online communication. linking technology, identity, and culture*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

APPENDIX A – SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Online Communities Research Study

Opening Instructions

Thank you for volunteering to participate in this research survey. The purpose of this survey is to learn more about how involved residence hall students are in online communities and how their involvement impacts their college/university community.

You have been chosen to participate in this survey. We greatly value your input regarding the following questions. This survey is voluntary and you may withdraw from taking this survey at anytime without penalty. This survey will take approximately 5-10 minutes to complete.

If you have any questions about this survey, please contact: Matthew Vanden Boogart via email at: mrvb@k-state.edu or via phone at: 785.532.3492.

Your privacy and confidentiality is protected

By clicking "next," you understand this project is research and that your participation is completely voluntary and will be held confidential. You also understand that if you decide to participate in this study, you may withdraw your consent at any time, and stop participating at any time without explanation, penalty, or loss of benefits, or academic standing to which you may otherwise be entitled. Your privacy and confidentiality are protected by the Institutional Review Board at Kansas State University. Questions for the IRB at Kansas State University can be directed to: 203 Fairchild Hall, Manhattan, KS 66506 or via phone at: 785.532.3224.

You verify that clicking "next" indicates that you have read and understand this consent form and willingly agree to participate in this study under the terms described.

Page 1

Question 1

What is your year in school?

- 1st Year Undergraduate Student
- 2nd Year Undergraduate Student
- 3rd Year Undergraduate Student
- 4th Year Undergraduate Student

- 5th or more Year(s) Undergraduate Student
- Graduate Student
- Other:

Question 2

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Transgendered

Question 3

What is your ethnicity?

- African American
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Caucasian
- Latino(a)/Chicano(a)
- Middle Eastern
- Multi-Ethnic
- Native American
- Other:

Question 4

How old are you?

(maximum of 2 characters)

Question 5

Approximately how long have you lived in the residence halls (including this year)?

- 0 - 1 year
- 1 - 2 years
- 2 - 3 years
- more than 3 years

Question 6 ** required **

How many roommates, if any, do you currently live with?

- 0 (I live alone)
- 1
- 2
- 3 or more

Question 7

The residence hall you live in is:

- Single Gender
- Co-ed by Floor
- Co-ed by Wing
- Co-ed by Room

Question 8

Approximately what is your cumulative GPA?

- 3.5 - 4.0
- 3.0 - 3.49
- 2.5 - 2.99
- 2.0 - 2.49
- 1.99 or less

Question 9

What is your sexual orientation?

- Heterosexual
- Homosexual
- Bisexual
- Questioning
- Prefer not to respond

Question 10 ** required **

Are you on Facebook?

- Yes
- No

Question 11 ** required **

Do you read blogs/online journals?

- Yes
- No

Question 12 ** required **

Do you have your own blog/online journal?

- Yes
- No

Question 13 ** required **

Do you play online games?

- Yes
- No

Page 2

Please answer the following questions regarding your use of the Internet.

Question 14

Approximately how many years of experience do you have using the Internet?

- 0 - 1 years
- 1 - 2 years
- 2 - 3 years
- 3 or more years

Question 15

Please indicate places where you regularly use the Internet. (mark all that apply)

- Room
- Library

- Residence Hall Computer Lab
- Other Computer Lab
- Other:

Question 16

On a scale of hourly, daily, weekly, monthly, rarely, and I don't do this, please indicate how often you participate in the following activities on the Internet.

1 - Hourly | 2 - Daily | 3 - Weekly | 4 - Monthly | 5 - Rarely
6 - I don't do this

	1	2	3	4	5	6
16.1 Email	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.2 Instant Message	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.3 Find Information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.4 Make Purchases	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.5 Academic Research	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Question 17

On an average **week day (Monday - Friday)**, how much time per day do you use the Internet?

- 0 - 30 minutes
- 30 minutes - 1 hour
- 1 hour - 3 hours
- 3 hours - 5 hours
- 5 hours - 7 hours
- more than 7 hours

Question 18

On an average **weekend day (Saturday & Sunday)**, how much time per day do you use the Internet?

- 0 - 30 minutes
- 30 minutes - 1 hour
- 1 hour - 3 hours

- 3 hours - 5 hours
- 5 hours - 7 hours
- more than 7 hours

Page 3

Fill out this page only if you answered:

- Yes on question 10. Are you on Facebook? on page 1 .

The following questions ask you about your level of involvement on Facebook.

Question 19

On an average day, how much time do you spend on Facebook?

- 0 - 30 minutes
- 30 minutes - 1 hour
- 1 hour - 2 hours
- 2 hours - 3 hours
- more than 3 hours

Question 20

Approximately how many "friends" do you currently have on Facebook from **your school**?

(maximum of 5 characters)

Question 21

Approximately how many "friends" do you currently have on Facebook **not from your school**?

(maximum of 5 characters)

Question 22

On a scale of hourly, daily, weekly, monthly, rarely, and I don't do this, please indicate how often you participate in the following activities on Facebook.

1 - Hourly | 2 - Daily | 3 - Weekly | 4 - Monthly | 5 - Rarely
6 - I don't do this

	1	2	3	4	5	6
22.1 Read my wall	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22.2 Read my friend's wall	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22.3 Write on my own wall	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22.4 Write on my friend's wall	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22.5 Search for new friends to add	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22.6 Update my profile	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22.7 Create groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22.8 Create parties	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Question 23

Approximately how many "groups" are you a member of?

(maximum of 4 characters)

Question 24

Approximately how many "groups" are you an officer of?

(maximum of 4 characters)

Question 25

Approximately how many "groups" have you created?

(maximum of 4 characters)

Question 26

Approximately how many "parties" are you a confirmed guest of?

(maximum of 4 characters)

Question 27

Approximately how many "parties" have you created?

(maximum of 4 characters)

Question 28

Please indicate your response of a scale of: strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, and strongly agree.

1 - Strongly Disagree | 2 - Disagree
3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 4 - Agree | 5 - Strongly Agree

	1	2	3	4	5
28.1 I was excited to join Facebook.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28.2 I use Facebook to meet new people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28.3 I use Facebook to stay connected to friends from high school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28.4 I use Facebook to keep track of what my friends are doing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28.5 I feel connected to my friends on Facebook.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28.6 I use Facebook to make social connections that I couldn't find in person.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28.7 I am addicted to Facebook.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Page 4

Fill out this page only if you answered:

- No on question 10. Are you on Facebook? on page 1 .

The following questions ask you about your reasons for not being involved on Facebook.

Question 29

Please indicate the reason(s) you have chosen not to be involved on Facebook. (mark all that apply)

- Not Interested
- Too Much of a Fad
- No Time

- Don't Know What it Is
- Friends Don't do It
- Don't Want to Put Personal Information Online
- Other:

Page 5

Fill out this page only if you answered:

- Yes on question 11. Do you read blogs/online journals? on page 1 .

Question 30

On an average day, how much time do you spend reading, posting, and/or commenting to other people's blogs/online journals?

- 0 minutes - 30 minutes
- 30 minutes - 1 hour
- 1 hour - 2 hours
- 2 hours - 3 hours
- more than 3 hours

Question 31

On a scale of hourly, daily, weekly, monthly, rarely, and I don't do this, please indicate how often you participate in the following activities regarding blogging/online journals.

1 - Hourly | 2 - Daily | 3 - Weekly | 4 - Monthly | 5 - Rarely
6 - I don't do this

	1	2	3	4	5	6
31.1 Read blogs/online journals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31.2 Read blogs/online journals of people on my floor?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31.3 Read blogs/online journals of people in my building?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31.4 Post/comment on the blogs/online journals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31.5 Post/comment on the blogs/online journals of people on my floor?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

31.6 Post/comment on the blogs/online journals of people in my building?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31.7 Email the owner of the blog/online journal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31.8 Email other authors who have posted/commented on blogs/online journals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Page 6

Fill out this page only if you answered:

- No on question 11. Do you read blogs/online journals? on page 1 .

The following questions ask you about why you do not read blogs/online journals.

Question 32

Please indicate the reason(s) you don't read blogs/online journals. (mark all that apply)

- Not Interested
- Too Much of a Fad
- No Time
- Don't Know What it Is
- Friends Don't do It
- Other:

Page 7

Fill out this page only if you answered:

- Yes on question 12. Do you have your own blog/online j.. on page 1 .

Question 33

On a scale of hourly, daily, weekly, monthly, rarely, and I don't do this, please indicate how often you participate in the following activities on your blog/online journal.

1 - Hourly | 2 - Daily | 3 - Weekly | 4 - Monthly | 5 - Rarely
6 - I don't do this

	1	2	3	4	5	6
33.1 Update your blog/online journal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33.2 Respond to comments/posts left by other people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33.3 Email other people who have left comments/posts on your blog/online journal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Question 34

Please indicate your response of a scale of: strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, and strongly agree.

1 - Strongly Disagree | 2 - Disagree
3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 4 - Agree | 5 - Strongly Agree

	1	2	3	4	5
34.1 I use my blog/online journal to keep my family updated with what's going on in my life.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34.2 I use my blog/online journal to keep my friends updated with what's going on in my life.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34.3 I feel my blog/online journal helps me feel connected to those who read it.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34.4 I use my blog/online journal to rant, complain, or vent about things that are/have happened to me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34.5 I use my blog/online journal to make announcements about good things that are happening/have happened in my life.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34.6 I have used my blog/online journal to "yell" at someone about something they have done.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34.7 I have gotten in online "fights" through my blog/online journal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34.8 I have negatively singled out someone (named names) on my blog/online journal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34.9 I have said things through my blog/online journal that I wouldn't say to someone's face.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34.10 I have posted information on my blog/online journal that I wouldn't want my parents to know.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

34.11 I have deleted a post on my blog/online journal after having someone talk to me about it.



Question 35

Why, aside from those you've noted above, do you have a blog/online journal?

A large, empty text input box with a scroll bar on the right side and a horizontal scroll bar at the bottom, indicating it can accommodate a large amount of text.

(maximum of 750 characters)

Page 8

Fill out this page only if you answered:

- No on question 12. Do you have your own blog/online j.. on page 1 .

The following questions ask you about why you don't have your own blog/online journal.

Question 36

Please indicate the reason(s) you don't have your own blog/online journal. (mark all that apply)

- Not Interested
- Too Much of a Fad
- No Time
- Don't Know What it Is
- Friends Don't do It
- Don't Want to Put Personal Information Online
- Other:

Page 9

Fill out this page only if you answered:

- Yes on question 13. Do you play online games? on page 1 .

Question 37

On an average **week day (Monday - Friday)**, how much time do you spend playing games online?

- 0 - 30 minutes
- 30 minutes - 1 hour
- 1 hour - 2 hours
- 2 hours - 3 hours
- more than 3 hours

Question 38

On an average **weekend day (Saturday & Sunday)**, how much time do you spend playing games online?

- 0 - 30 minutes
- 30 minutes - 1 hour
- 1 hour - 2 hours
- 2 hours - 3 hours
- more than 3 hours

Question 39

On a scale of 1 to 7, 1 being very infrequent to 7 being very frequent, please respond to the following questions about online gaming.

1 - Very Infrequent | 2 - - | 3 - - | 4 - - | 5 - - | 6 - -
 7 - Very Frequent
 8 - I don't do this

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
39.1 How often do you play online games with people on your floor?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
39.2 How often do you play online games with people in your building?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
39.3 How often do you play with people you've never met in person?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Question 40

Please indicate your response of a scale of: strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, and strongly agree.

1 - Strongly Disagree | 2 - Disagree
3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 4 - Agree | 5 - Strongly Agree

	1	2	3	4	5
40.1 I play online games to meet new people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
40.2 I play online games to stay connected to friends from high school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
40.3 I play online games to make social connections that I couldn't find in person.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
40.4 I feel connected to the people I play games with online.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
40.5 I am addicted to playing online games.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Page 10

Fill out this page only if you answered:

- No on question 13. Do you play online games? on page 1 .

The following questions ask you about why you are not involved in online gaming.

Question 41

Please indicate the reason(s) you don't play online games. (mark all that apply)

- Not Interested
- Too Much of a Fad
- No Time
- Don't Know What it Is
- Friends Don't do It
- Other:

Fill out this page only if you answered:

- 0 (I live alone) OR 1 OR 2 OR 3 or more on question 6. How many roommates, if any, do you.. on page 1 .

Question 42

On the following scale, please respond to the following questions about your involvement this current year.

- 1 - 0 Events/Activities
- | 2 - 1 to 3 Events/Activities
- 3 - 4 to 6 Events/Activities
- | 4 - 7 to 10 Events/Activities
- 5 - more than 10 Events/Activities

	1	2	3	4	5
42.1 How many events/activities did you participate in on your floor?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
42.2 How many events/activities did you participate in on your hall?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
42.3 How many events/activities did you participate in on campus?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
42.4 How many events/activities did you help plan on your floor?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
42.5 How many events/activities did you help plan in your hall?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
42.6 How many events/activities did you help plan on campus?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Question 43

Please indicate your response of a scale of: strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, and strongly agree.

- 1 - Strongly Disagree | 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 4 - Agree | 5 - Strongly Agree

	1	2	3	4	5
43.1 I feel connected to the people on my floor.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

43.2 I feel connected to the people in my hall.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
43.3 I feel connected to the people on campus.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
43.4 I attend floor events/programs to meet new people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
43.5 I attend hall events/programs to meet new people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
43.6 I attend campus events/programs to meet new people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
43.7 I am involved in my Hall Governing Board.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
43.8 I am involved in the Residence Hall Association or the National Residence Hall Honorary (NRHH).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
43.9 I am involved in a student organization on campus.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Question 44

Please indicate on a scale of: much less, less, about the same, more, and much more; respond to the question: I do this _____ than other students on campus.

1 - Much Less | 2 - Less | 3 - About the Same | 4 - More
5 - Much More

	1	2	3	4	5
44.1 Use the Internet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
44.2 Use Facebook	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
44.3 Read blogs/online journals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
44.4 Post on blogs/online journals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
44.5 Play online games	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
44.6 Attend floor events/programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
44.7 Attend hall events/programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
44.8 Attend campus events/programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Fill out this page only if you answered:

- 1 OR 2 OR 3 or more on question 6. How many roommates, if any, do you.. on page 1 .

Question 45

Please indicate on a scale of: much less, less, about the same, more, and much more; respond to the question: I do this _____ than my roommate(s).

1 - Much Less | 2 - Less | 3 - About the Same | 4 - More
5 - Much More

	1	2	3	4	5
45.1 Use the Internet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
45.2 Use Facebook	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
45.3 Read blogs/online journals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
45.4 Post on blogs/online journals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
45.5 Play online games	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
45.6 Attend floor events/programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
45.7 Attend hall events/programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
45.8 Attend campus events/programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Closing Message

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Your input is greatly valued and appreciated. The information collected will be used to assist housing professionals in developing strategies to work with online communities.

If you have any questions regarding this study or are interested in receiving a copy of the results, please contact:

Matthew Vanden Boogart
Kansas State University
mrvb@k-state.edu
785.532.3492

You may also contact the faculty supervisor for this study at:

Dr. Adrienne Leslie-Toogood
Kansas State University
atoogood@k-state.edu
785.532.5516

- End of Survey -

APPENDIX B – CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATIONS

VS4/NR: Very small four-year, primarily nonresidential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of fewer than 1,000 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. Fewer than 25 percent of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus** (includes exclusively distance education institutions).

VS4/R: Very small four-year, primarily residential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of fewer than 1,000 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. 25-49 percent of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus.

VS4/HR: Very small four-year, highly residential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of fewer than 1,000 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. At least half of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus.

S4/NR: Small four-year, primarily nonresidential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of 1,000–2,999 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. Fewer than 25 percent of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus (includes exclusively distance education institutions).

S4/R: Small four-year, primarily residential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of 1,000–2,999 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. 25-49 percent of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus.

S4/HR: Small four-year, highly residential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of 1,000–2,999 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. At least half of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus.

M4/NR: Medium four-year, primarily nonresidential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of 3,000–9,999 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. Fewer than 25 percent of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus (includes exclusively distance education institutions).

M4/R: Medium four-year, primarily residential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of 3,000–9,999 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. 25-49 percent of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus.

M4/HR: Medium four-year, highly residential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of 3,000–9,999 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. At least half of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus.

L4/NR: Large four-year, primarily nonresidential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of at least 10,000 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. Fewer than 25 percent of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus (includes exclusively distance

education institutions).

L4/R: Large four-year, primarily residential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of at least 10,000 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. 25-49 percent of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus.

L4/HR: Large four-year, highly residential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of at least 10,000 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. At least half of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus.

* FTE: Full-time equivalent enrollment was calculated as full-time plus one-third part-time.

** On campus is defined as institutionally-owned, -controlled, or -affiliated housing.

Carnegie Classifications (2006). Retrieved April 18, 2006 from:
<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=790>.

APPENDIX C – INSTITUTIONAL PARTICIPATION INVITATION

February 2, 2006

NAME
ADDRESS
CITY, ST ZIP

NAME,

Over this past academic year, Matthew Vanden Boogart has been working on a Master's thesis project involving how online communities (e.g. blogging and Facebook) impact the desire residence hall professionals have to build a tight-knit community. As these technologies continue to increase, so will their impact on the residence halls and the manner in which residence halls work towards building community. This research is cutting-edge, as few studies have currently been conducted regarding the impacts of online communities on a college campus.

We are requesting permission to conduct a research study in the residence halls at INSTITUTION. Your institution has been randomly selected as a SIZE, PUBLIC/PRIVATE, RESIDENTIAL TYPE institution. The study will be conducted through a voluntary online survey and information submitted will be held confidential. This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board (#3720) at Kansas State University.

With the support of your department, we would like to invite you to participate in this ground-breaking study. If you would be willing to participate, we would request an electronic listing of student names and email addresses who currently are residing on campus.

In exchange for your support and time, we'd be happy to provide you with a final copy of the results as well as a personalized summary of INSTITUTION residence hall students and their involvement both online and in the physical world. The conclusions to this study will aim to provide suggestions as to how residence hall staff can use the latest Internet technologies to bring residents and communities together.

Thank you for your time. If you have any questions regarding this study, please do not hesitate to ask. Matthew will be following up with you in the upcoming weeks to address any questions you may have and to help determine your participation in this study. If you have any questions in the meantime, please don't hesitate to contact Matthew at mrvb@k-state.edu or via phone at **785.395.6406**.

Sincerely,

Dr. Adrienne Leslie-Toogood
Assistant Professor
Kansas State University

encl.

APPENDIX D – ONLINE COMMUNITIES RESEARCH FACT SHEET

Online Community Research Fact Sheet

Survey Overview

- 5 – 10 minute web-based survey
- Question topics include:
 - o Demographical information
 - o General Internet
 - o Facebook
 - o Weblogs
 - o Online gaming
 - o Residence hall involvement
- Questions aimed to assess level of involvement in various online and residence hall communities and gain insight to the reasons for said level of involvement.
- Approved by Kansas State University Institutional Review Board (#3720)

Institutional Benefit

- Department will receive a comprehensive summary of institution's individual findings as well as a copy of the final research report.
- Current and cutting-edge information about how online communities are impacting the residence halls on campus.
- Information on how institution compares to peer institutions (as participation allows).

What's Needed from Participating Institutions

- Electronic roster (spreadsheet or database) of students living in the residence halls including: first name, last name, and email address
 - o Roster will be held confidential and will only be used for study and for no other purposes without the permission of the participating institution

Student Participation

- Voluntary: students may chose to withdraw from survey at any point without consequence
- Confidential: no personal identifying information is collected and results are unable to be traced back to participants

Institutions Being Contacted

- Institutions were randomly selected based on Carnegie Classifications as follows:
 - *VS4/NR*: Very small four-year, primarily nonresidential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of fewer than 1,000 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. Fewer than 25 percent of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus** (includes exclusively distance education institutions).
 - *VS4/R*: Very small four-year, primarily residential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of fewer than 1,000 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. 25-49 percent of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus.

- *VS4/HR*: Very small four-year, highly residential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of fewer than 1,000 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. At least half of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus.
- *S4/NR*: Small four-year, primarily nonresidential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of 1,000–2,999 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. Fewer than 25 percent of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus (includes exclusively distance education institutions).
- *S4/R*: Small four-year, primarily residential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of 1,000–2,999 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. 25-49 percent of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus.
- *S4/HR*: Small four-year, highly residential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of 1,000–2,999 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. At least half of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus.
- *M4/NR*: Medium four-year, primarily nonresidential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of 3,000–9,999 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. Fewer than 25 percent of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus (includes exclusively distance education institutions).
- *M4/R*: Medium four-year, primarily residential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of 3,000–9,999 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. 25-49 percent of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus.
- *M4/HR*: Medium four-year, highly residential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of 3,000–9,999 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. At least half of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus.
- *L4/NR*: Large four-year, primarily nonresidential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of at least 10,000 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. Fewer than 25 percent of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus (includes exclusively distance education institutions).
- *L4/R*: Large four-year, primarily residential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of at least 10,000 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. 25-49 percent of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus.
- *L4/HR*: Large four-year, highly residential. Fall enrollment data show FTE enrollment of at least 10,000 degree-seeking students at these bachelor's degree granting institutions. At least half of degree-seeking undergraduates live on campus.
- ** On campus is defined as institutionally-owned, -controlled, or -affiliated housing.”

Carnegie Classifications

(<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=790>)

- Institutions were selected randomly from this listing based on being identified as public or private institutions, were cross-referenced with those having on-campus housing operations, and were identified as having access to Facebook (www.Facebook.com) as an institution.

Contact Information

- Primary Researcher
 Matthew Vanden Boogart
 Kansas State University
 104 Pittman Building
 Manhattan, KS 66506
mrvb@k-state.edu
 785.395.6406

Faculty Supervisor
 Adrienne Leslie-Toogood
 Counseling & Ed. Psych
 331 Bluemont
 Manhattan, KS 66506
atoogood@k-state.edu
 785.532.5516

APPENDIX E – INSTITUTIONAL INVITATION EMAIL FOLLOW-UP

Subject: Online Communities Study Follow-Up

NAME:

I want to follow-up briefly regarding the information we sent you regarding the Online Communities study at Kansas State University. My apologies if you haven't received your materials yet. If this is the case, please let me know and I'll be happy to forward you an electronic copy of the materials we sent.

I wanted to touch base with you regarding the study to see if you had any questions that I could answer for you. This study aims to unveil the reasons why residents on campus are using online communities and how it is impacting their involvement on their floor, in their hall, and on campus. As an added incentive towards your participation, I would like to offer you an individualized summary of your institution's results and a comparative look at your peer institutions (as participation allows - institutional names will not be included on comparative results.).

I'd be happy to talk with you if you have any questions. Please let me know when you'd be available and I'd be happy to answer any of your questions and work with you in your institution's participation.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this ground-breaking study. This is a great opportunity to gain much-needed insight into the students of today and their role in campus communities.

I look forward to hearing from you.
- Matthew VB

Matthew Vanden Boogart
Kansas State University
mrvb@k-state.edu
785.395.6406

APPENDIX F – PARTICIPANT INVITATION EMAIL

Subject: Online Communities (e.g. Facebook) Research Study Invitation

I am writing to ask for your help in a study of residence hall students across the country. This study is seeking to learn about university students' use of Facebook and other online technologies and what they are using it for.

You have been selected to participate as a resident of INSTITUTION. We are interested in learning about how often you use the Internet, why you are involved in online communities (e.g. Facebook), and how involved you are on campus.

Results from this study will be used to help university officials, including administrators at INSTITUTION, understand how students are using these technologies. By better understanding students' use, administrators will be better able to use them to benefit the campus community.

Your answers will be completely confidential and will only be released in summaries in which your no individual's answers can be identified. When you have completed this survey, your name will be deleted from the mailing list and never connected with your answers. This survey is voluntary; however, you can help us greatly by taking 5-10 minutes to complete it. If you do not wish to participate, you may remove yourself from the study by clicking the opt-out link below.

If you have any questions or comments about this study, we would be happy to talk with you. Please email or call at the information provided below.

Thank you very much for helping with this important study.

Sincerely,

Matthew Vanden Boogart
Kansas State University
104 Pittman Building
Manhattan, KS 66506
mrvb@k-state.edu

APPENDIX G – PARTICIPANT REMINDER EMAIL

Subject: Online Communities (e.g. Facebook) Research Study Invitation

A survey was recently emailed to you about your use of online communities (e.g. Facebook) and your involvement on campus. Our records indicate that you have not yet completed this survey.

Please take a few short minutes to answer a few questions. We are especially grateful for your participation; it's only through the answers you provide and that we're able to better understand students' use of these technologies at INSTITUTION.

Thank you for taking the time to help us in this important study.

Matthew Vanden Boogart
Kansas State University
104 Pittman Building
Manhattan, KS 66506
mrvb@k-state.edu

APPENDIX H – TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES INVITATION EMAIL

Subject: Research Study Technical Difficulties - Online Communities Re-Release

Yesterday you received an invitation to participate in an online study being conducted regarding student's use of online technologies (e.g. Facebook). Due to technical difficulties, the survey was halted yesterday and is now being re-released to you. If you have taken this survey yesterday, I apologize as your results were lost. I would invite you to take this short survey again. Please find below the original invitation and a new email link that you can use to take this important survey.

I am writing to ask for your help in a study of residence hall students across the country. This study is seeking to learn about university students' use of Facebook and other online technologies and what they are using it for. We are interested in learning about how often you use the Internet, why you are involved in online communities (e.g. Facebook), and how involved you are on campus.

Results from this study will be used to help university officials, including administrators at INSTITUTION, understand how students are using these technologies. By better understanding students' use, administrators will be better able to use them to benefit the campus community.

Your answers will be completely confidential and will only be released in summaries in which your no individual's answers can be identified. When you have completed this survey, your name will be deleted from the mailing list and never connected with your answers. This survey is voluntary; however, you can help us greatly by taking 5-10 minutes to complete it. If you do not wish to participate, you may remove yourself from the study by clicking the opt-out link below.

If you have any questions or comments about this study, we would be happy to talk with you. Please email at the information provided below.

Thank you very much for helping with this important study.

Sincerely,

Matthew Vanden Boogart
Kansas State University
104 Pittman Building
Manhattan, KS 66506
mrvb@k-state.edu

APPENDIX I – DEMOGRAPHICS BY INSTITUTION

Table 37: Year in School by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
1 st Year Undergraduate Student	444	61.7	96	40.7	1120	70.5	404	68.5
2 nd Year Undergraduate Student	158	21.9	64	27.1	272	17.1	97	16.4
3 rd Year Undergraduate Student	72	10.0	44	18.6	117	7.4	54	9.2
4 th Year Undergraduate Student	31	4.3	27	11.4	64	4.0	24	4.1
5 th or more Year(s) Undergraduate Student	11	1.5	0	0.0	9	.6	9	1.5
Graduate Student	3	.4	5	2.1	4	.3	1	.2
Other	1	.1	0	0.0	2	.1	1	.2
Total (N=3134)	720	100.0	236	100.0	1588	100.0	590	100.0

Table 38: Gender by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Male	273	38.0	58	24.7	493	31.1	177	29.9
Female	443	61.7	177	75.3	1087	68.5	414	70.1
Transgendered	2	.3	0	0.0	6	.4	0	0.0
Total (N=3130)	718	100.0	235	100.0	1586	100.0	591	100.0

Table 39: Ethnicity by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
African American	11	1.5	7	3.0	177	11.2	17	2.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	24	3.4	0	0.0	89	5.6	28	4.8
Caucasian	631	88.1	223	94.5	1049	66.2	494	84.0
Latino(a) / Chicano(a)	18	2.5	1	.4	180	11.4	24	4.1
Middle Eastern	4	.6	1	.4	8	.5	4	.7
Multi-Ethnic	17	2.4	0	0.0	53	3.3	16	2.7
Native American	4	.6	1	.4	5	.3	3	.5
Other	7	1.0	3	1.3	23	1.5	2	.3
Total (N=3124)	716	100.0	236	100.0	1584	100.0	588	100.0

Table 40: Years in Residence Halls by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
0 – 1 Year	484	67.4	99	41.9	1128	71.3	440	74.7
1 – 2 Years	150	20.9	64	27.1	291	18.4	95	16.1
2 – 3 Years	51	7.1	44	18.6	112	7.1	39	6.6
More than 3 Years	33	4.6	29	12.3	52	3.3	15	2.5
Total (N=3126)	718	100.0	236	100.0	1583	100.0	589	100.0

Table 41: Number of Roommates by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
0	80	11.0	18	7.6	174	10.9	48	8.1
1	555	76.7	161	68.2	929	58.2	318	53.7
2	41	5.7	22	9.3	133	8.3	51	8.6
3 or More	48	6.6	35	14.8	361	22.6	175	29.6
Total (N=3149)	724	100.0	236	100.0	1597	100.0	592	100.0

Table 42: Residence Hall Type by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Single Gender	308	42.8	234	99.6	92	5.8	199	33.9
Co-ed by Floor	129	19.3	0	0.0	885	55.7	297	50.6
Co-ed by Wing	224	31.1	1	.4	285	17.9	297	50.6
Co-ed by Room	49	6.8	0	0.0	326	20.5	26	4.4
Total (N=3130)	720	100.0	235	100.0	1588	100.0	587	100.0

Table 43: GPA by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
3.5 – 4.0	316	44.1	118	50.2	862	54.6	248	42.2
3.0 – 3.49	209	29.1	81	34.5	481	30.4	165	28.1
2.5 – 2.99	144	20.1	32	13.6	174	11.0	112	19.0
2.0 – 2.49	39	5.4	4	1.7	44	2.8	42	7.1
1.99 or Less	9	1.3	0	0.0	19	1.2	21	3.6
Total (N=3120)	717	100.0	235	100.0	1580	100.0	588	100.0

Table 44: Sexual Orientation by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Heterosexual	683	95.7	231	97.9	1509	95.3	554	94.2
Homosexual	10	1.4	3	1.3	23	1.5	8	1.4
Bisexual	4	.6	1	.4	29	1.8	1	.2
Questioning	3	.4	1	.4	10	.6	1	.2
Prefer not to Respond	14	2.0	0	0.0	13	.8	18	3.1
Total (N=3122)	714	100.0	236	100.0	1584	100.0	588	100.0

APPENDIX J – ONLINE INVOLVEMENT BY INSTITUTION

Table 45: Online Involvement Overview by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
On Facebook	676	93.4	222	94.1	1523	95.4	551	93.1
Read Blogs	340	47.0	104	44.1	761	47.7	297	50.2
Own Blog	237	32.7	68	28.8	493	30.9	210	35.5
Play Online Games	362	50.0	60	25.4	610	38.2	244	41.2

* percent listed by affirmative response

APPENDIX K – GENERAL INTERNET USE BY INSTITUTION

Table 46: Internet Years of Experience by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
0 – 1 Year	3	.4	1	.4	2	.1	0	0.0
1 – 2 Years	4	.6	0	0.0	7	.4	5	.9
2 – 3 Years	13	1.8	3	1.3	21	1.3	10	1.7
3 or More Years	691	97.2	232	98.3	1537	98.1	567	97.4
Total (N=3096)	771	100.0	236	100.0	1567	100.0	582	100.0

Table 47: Regular Internet Access Locations by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Room	688	95.0	234	99.2	1556	97.4	569	96.1
Library	293	40.5	182	77.1	582	36.4	312	52.7
Residence Hall	80	11.0	13	5.5	72	4.5	112	18.9
Computer Lab								
Other Computer Lab	124	17.1	98	41.5	347	21.7	138	23.3

* percent based off total response for institution

Table 48: Frequency of Email Use by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Hourly	230	32.3	60	25.4	447	28.7	148	25.5
Daily	448	63.0	172	72.9	1010	64.9	407	70.2
Weekly	30	4.2	4	1.7	73	4.7	19	3.3
Monthly	2	.3	0	0.0	7	.4	3	.5
Rarely	1	.1	0	0.0	19	1.2	3	.5
Total (N=3083)	711	100.0	236	100.0	1556	100.0	580	100.0

Table 49: Frequency of Instant Message Use by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Hourly	121	19.9	26	13.1	566	38.6	112	22.3
Daily	273	44.8	80	40.2	573	39.1	197	39.2
Weekly	126	20.7	53	26.6	176	12.0	102	20.3
Monthly	24	3.9	12	6.0	48	3.3	27	5.4
Rarely	65	10.7	28	14.1	102	7.0	64	12.7
Total (N=2775)	609	100.0	199	100.0	1465	100.0	502	100.0

Table 50: Frequency of Finding Information by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Hourly	81	11.4	11	4.7	360	23.2	84	14.5
Daily	389	54.8	139	58.9	864	55.6	340	58.6
Weekly	203	28.6	75	31.8	296	19.0	135	23.3
Monthly	32	4.5	8	3.4	25	1.6	13	2.2
Rarely	5	.7	3	1.3	9	.6	8	1.4
Total (N=3080)	710	100.0	236	100.0	1554	100.0	580	100.0

Table 51: Frequency of Making Purchases by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Hourly	4	.7	1	.5	12	.9	7	1.4
Daily	7	1.2	.1	.5	26	1.9	6	1.2
Weekly	35	6.2	19	9.6	162	11.8	50	9.9
Monthly	218	38.3	71	36.0	516	37.7	208	41.0
Rarely	305	53.6	105	53.3	652	47.7	236	46.5
Total (N=2641)	569	100.0	197	100.0	1368	100.0	507	100.0

Table 52: Frequency of Academic Research by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Hourly	25	3.5	6	2.6	71	4.6	13	2.3
Daily	147	20.8	51	21.8	396	25.6	167	29.1
Weekly	326	46.1	136	58.1	725	46.9	267	46.6
Monthly	166	23.5	32	13.7	254	16.4	100	17.5
Rarely	43	6.1	9	3.8	101	6.5	26	4.5
Total (N=3061)	707	100.0	234	100.0	1547	100.0	573	100.0

Table 53: Frequency of Week Day Daily Internet Use by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
0 – 30 Minutes	11	1.5	6	2.6	13	.8	13	2.2
30 Mins. – 1 Hour	93	13.1	48	20.4	81	5.2	65	11.2
1 Hour – 3 Hours	307	43.2	122	51.9	534	34.2	269	46.4
3 Hours – 5 Hours	190	26.8	43	18.3	494	31.6	142	24.5
5 Hours – 7 Hours	66	9.3	10	4.3	248	15.9	50	8.6
More than 7 Hours	43	6.1	6	2.6	191	12.2	41	7.1
Total (N=3086)	710	100.0	235	100.0	1561	100.0	580	100.0

Table 54: Frequency of Weekend Daily Internet Use by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
0 – 30 Minutes	46	6.5	31	13.1	69	4.4	46	7.9
30 Mins. – 1 Hour	135	19.0	66	28.0	203	13.0	118	20.3
1 Hour – 3 Hours	271	38.2	96	40.7	551	35.3	225	38.8
3 Hours – 5 Hours	164	23.1	34	14.4	375	24.0	117	20.2
5 Hours – 7 Hours	63	8.9	5	2.1	210	13.4	53	9.1
More than 7 Hours	31	4.4	4	1.7	154	9.9	21	3.6
Total (N=3088)	710	100.0	2336	100.0	1562	100.0	580	100.0

APPENDIX L – FACEBOOK USE BY INSTITUTION

Table 55: Frequency of Facebook Daily Use by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
0 – 30 Minutes	363	55.5	136	61.5	758	52.2	282	53.3
30 Mins. – 1 Hour	196	30.0	60	27.1	420	28.9	161	30.4
1 Hour – 2 Hours	80	12.2	22	10.0	190	13.1	70	13.2
2 Hours – 3 Hours	13	2.0	1	.5	61	4.2	14	2.6
More than 3 Hours	2	.3	2	.9	24	1.7	2	.4
Total (N=2857)	654	100.0	221	100.0	1453	100.0	529	100.0

Table 56: Mean Count of Facebook Statistics by Institution

	Kansas State University	Samford University	University of Florida	University of Kansas
At School Friends	132.14	187.30	145.55	140.71
At Other School Friends	104.62	192.14	124.69	130.59
Groups Member	24.45	20.54	29.16	25.69
Groups Officer	1.74	1.33	2.17	1.84
Groups Created	.71	.89	1.42	.79
Parties Guest	1.39	1.04	2.77	2.25
Parties Created	.10	.11	.88	.14

Table 57: Frequency of Reading Personal Wall by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Hourly	52	8.1	18	8.1	153	10.7	53	10.1
Daily	353	55.0	141	63.8	784	54.6	321	60.9
Weekly	162	25.2	53	24.0	334	23.3	113	21.4
Monthly	29	4.5	2	.9	65	4.5	25	4.7
Rarely	46	7.2	7	3.2	99	6.9	15	2.8
Total (N=2825)	642	100.0	221	100.0	1435	100.0	527	100.0

Table 58: Frequency of Reading Friend's Wall by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Hourly	12	1.9	4	1.8	36	2.6	17	3.3
Daily	148	23.4	62	28.2	367	26.3	160	30.9
Weekly	294	46.4	107	48.6	576	41.2	214	41.4
Monthly	76	12.0	24	10.9	183	13.1	62	12.0
Rarely	103	16.3	23	10.5	235	16.8	64	12.4
Total (N=2767)	633	100.0	220	100.0	1397	100.0	517	100.0

Table 59: Frequency of Writing on Personal Wall by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Hourly	1	.5	0	0.0	10	2.9	3	2.4
Daily	6	3.2	0	0.0	13	3.8	6	4.9
Weekly	18	9.5	3	9.7	32	9.4	17	13.8
Monthly	22	11.6	3	9.7	36	10.6	13	10.6
Rarely	143	75.3	25	80.6	250	73.3	84	68.3
Total (N=685)	190	100.0	31	100.0	341	100.0	123	100.0

Table 60: Frequency of Writing on Friend's Wall by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Hourly	10	1.6	1	.5	20	1.4	10	1.9
Daily	105	16.8	34	15.7	225	16.1	104	20.0
Weekly	291	46.6	110	50.7	627	44.8	252	48.4
Monthly	100	16.0	38	17.5	266	19.0	91	17.5
Rarely	118	18.9	34	15.7	263	18.8	64	12.3
Total (N=2763)	624	100.0	217	100.0	1401	100.0	521	100.0

Table 61: Frequency of Searching for New Friends by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Hourly	5	.9	0	0.0	14	1.2	3	.6
Daily	22	3.8	5	2.5	49	4.1	23	4.8
Weekly	149	25.9	50	25.1	263	22.1	140	29.5
Monthly	161	28.0	65	32.7	334	28.1	137	28.8
Rarely	238	41.4	79	39.7	530	44.5	172	36.2
Total (N=2439)	575	100.0	199	100.0	1190	100.0	475	100.0

Table 62: Frequency of Updating Profile by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Hourly	4	.6	1	.5	9	.6	3	.6
Daily	13	2.1	0	0.0	26	1.8	11	2.1
Weekly	123	19.5	35	16.4	311	22.0	133	25.6
Monthly	285	45.2	94	43.9	614	43.5	220	42.3
Rarely	206	32.6	84	39.3	451	32.0	153	29.4
Total (N=2776)	631	100.0	214	100.0	1411	100.0	520	100.0

Table 63: Frequency of Creating Groups by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Hourly	1	.4	0	0.0	6	.9	1	.4
Daily	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	.6	3	1.2
Weekly	8	2.9	0	0.0	11	1.6	1	.4
Monthly	25	9.1	11	12.0	91	13.2	28	11.4
Rarely	241	87.6	81	88.0	579	83.8	212	86.5
Total (N=1303)	275	100.0	92	100.0	69.1	100.0	245	100.0

Table 64: Frequency of Creating Parties by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Hourly	1	.9	0	0.0	7	2.2	2	2.0
Daily	1	.9	0	0.0	3	.9	0	0.0
Weekly	3	2.6	1	3.3	8	2.5	1	1.0
Monthly	10	8.5	2	6.7	32	9.9	6	5.9
Rarely	102	87.2	27	90.0	272	84.5	92	91.1
Total (N=570)	117	100.0	30	100.0	322	100.0	101	100.0

Table 65: Excitement of Joining Facebook by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	21	3.2	5	2.3	52	3.6	16	3.0
Disagree	46	7.1	8	3.6	136	9.4	50	9.5
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	214	33.0	53	24.0	399	27.4	152	28.7
Agree	232	35.7	82	37.1	498	34.3	178	33.6
Strongly Agree	136	21.0	73	33.0	369	25.4	133	25.1
Total (N=2853)	649	100.0	221	100.0	1454	100.0	529	100.0

Table 66: Use Facebook to Meet New People by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	125	19.3	58	26.2	332	22.9	76	14.4
Disagree	248	38.2	90	40.7	517	35.6	184	34.9
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	158	24.3	36	16.3	286	19.7	139	26.4
Agree	90	13.9	30	13.6	246	16.9	100	19.0
Strongly Agree	28	4.3	7	3.2	71	4.9	28	5.3
Total (N=2849)	649	100.0	221	100.0	1452	100.0	527	100.0

Table 67: Use Facebook to Stay Connected to HS Friends by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	26	4.0	12	5.4	60	4.1	20	3.8
Disagree	51	7.9	10	4.5	74	5.1	31	5.9
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	64	9.9	6	2.7	105	7.2	55	10.4
Agree	290	44.8	105	47.5	605	41.6	221	41.9
Strongly Agree	217	33.5	88	39.8	609	41.9	201	38.1
Total (N=2849)	648	100.0	221	110.0	1453	100.0	528	100.0

Table 68: Use Facebook to Keep Track of Friends by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	31	4.8	10	4.5	80	5.5	23	4.4
Disagree	69	10.6	19	8.6	184	12.7	70	13.3
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	142	21.9	48	21.7	273	18.8	100	19.0
Agree	286	44.1	93	42.1	602	41.4	236	44.8
Strongly Agree	121	18.6	51	23.1	314	21.6	98	18.6
Total (N=2850)	649	100.0	221	100.0	1453	100.0	527	100.0

Table 69: Connectedness to Friends on Facebook by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	24	3.7	10	4.5	73	5.0	23	4.4
Disagree	64	9.9	19	8.6	167	11.5	64	12.2
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	225	34.7	66	30.0	408	28.1	153	29.1
Agree	249	38.4	92	41.8	584	40.2	202	38.4
Strongly Agree	87	13.4	33	15.0	221	15.2	84	16.0
Total (N=2848)	649	100.0	220	100.0	1453	100.0	526	100.0

Table 70: Use Facebook to Make Non-In-Person Connections by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	153	23.6	63	28.5	387	26.6	105	19.9
Disagree	214	33.0	75	33.9	509	35.0	186	35.2
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	177	27.3	34	15.4	270	18.6	138	26.1
Agree	76	11.7	35	15.8	206	14.2	69	13.1
Strongly Agree	28	4.3	14	6.3	81	5.6	30	5.7
Total (N=2850)	648	100.0	221	100.0	1453	100.0	528	100.0

Table 71: Addiction to Facebook by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	223	34.4	52	23.5	396	27.3	141	26.7
Disagree	138	21.3	75	33.9	314	21.6	125	23.7
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	125	19.3	33	14.9	240	16.5	96	18.2
Agree	111	17.1	40	18.1	319	22.0	103	19.5
Strongly Agree	52	8.0	21	9.5	184	12.7	63	11.9
Total (N=2851)	649	100.0	221	100.0	1453	100.0	528	100.0

APPENDIX M – NON-FACEBOOK USE BY INSTITUTION

Table 72: Non-Facebook Usage by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Not Interested	35	72.9	8	57.1	54	73.0	26	63.4
Too Much of a Fad	23	47.9	9	64.3	33	44.6	13	31.7
No Time	14	29.2	9	64.3	25	33.8	11	26.8
Don't Know What It Is	3	6.3	0	0.0	1	1.4	6	14.6
Friend's Don't Do It	3	6.3	0	0.0	1	1.4	3	7.3
Don't Want to Put Personal Information Online	19	39.6	7	50.0	29	39.2	11	26.8

* percent listed by those listing negative response to being on Facebook

APPENDIX N – PHYSICAL WORLD INVOLVEMENT BY INSTITUTION

Table 73: Frequency of Participation in Floor Events by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
0 Events	165	25.0	87	39.7	487	34.0	171	32.5
1 – 3 Events	250	37.9	74	33.8	548	38.2	191	36.3
4 – 6 Events	132	20.0	40	18.3	232	16.2	97	18.4
7 – 10 Events	42	6.4	3	1.4	74	5.2	27	5.1
More Than 10 Events	71	10.8	15	6.8	93	6.5	40	7.6
Total (N=2839)	660	100.0	219	100.0	1434	100.0	526	100.0

Table 74: Frequency of Participation in Building Events by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
0 Events	180	27.3	72	32.9	472	32.9	126	23.9
1 – 3 Events	238	36.1	80	36.5	562	39.1	208	39.4
4 – 6 Events	11	16.8	35	16.0	223	15.5	99	18.8
7 – 10 Events	63	9.5	11	5.0	8	5.9	51	9.7
More Than 10 Events	69	10.3	21	9.6	94	6.5	44	8.3
Total (N=2843)	660	100.0	219	100.0	1436	100.0	528	100.0

Table 75: Frequency of Participation in Campus Events by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
0 Events	65	9.9	3	1.4	94	6.5	55	10.4
1 – 3 Events	201	30.5	30	13.7	281	19.6	132	25.0
4 – 6 Events	177	26.9	56	25.6	384	26.7	132	25.0
7 – 10 Events	105	15.9	54	24.7	249	17.3	101	19.1
More Than 10 Events	111	16.8	76	34.7	428	29.8	108	20.5
Total (N=2842)	659	100.0	219	100.0	1436	100.0	528	100.0

Table 76: Frequency of Planning of Floor Events by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
0 Events	438	66.8	155	71.4	1116	78.3	387	73.6
1 – 3 Events	135	20.6	44	20.3	181	12.7	84	16.0
4 – 6 Events	34	5.2	8	3.7	52	3.6	25	4.8
7 – 10 Events	16	2.4	5	2.3	31	2.2	10	1.9
More Than 10 Events	33	5.0	5	2.3	45	3.2	20	3.8
Total (N=2824)	656	100.0	217	100.0	1425	100.0	526	100.0

Table 77: Frequency of Planning of Building Events by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
0 Events	480	72.9	142	65.1	1200	83.8	403	76.6
1 – 3 Events	90	13.7	59	27.1	110	7.7	57	10.8
4 – 6 Events	32	4.9	11	5.0	46	3.2	30	5.7
7 – 10 Events	18	2.7	1	.5	27	1.9	14	2.7
More Than 10 Events	38	5.8	5	2.3	49	3.4	22	4.2
Total (N=2834)	658	100.0	218	100.0	1432	100.0	526	100.0

Table 78: Frequency of Planning of Campus Events by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
0 Events	424	64.5	94	43.1	836	58.3	354	67.2
1 – 3 Events	136	20.7	71	32.6	319	22.3	87	16.5
4 – 6 Events	49	7.5	41	18.8	134	9.4	45	8.5
7 – 10 Events	24	3.7	9	4.1	61	4.3	19	3.6
More Than 10 Events	24	3.7	3	1.4	83	5.8	22	4.2
Total (N=2835)	657	100.0	218	100.0	1433	100.0	527	100.0

Table 79: Connectedness to Floor by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	78	11.8	37	17.1	304	21.2	87	16.6
Disagree	74	11.2	32	14.7	320	22.4	84	16.0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	125	18.9	33	15.2	263	18.4	76	14.5
Agree	246	37.2	77	35.5	362	25.3	172	32.8
Strongly Agree	139	21.0	38	17.5	182	12.7	106	20.2
Total (N=2835)	662	100.0	217	100.0	1431	100.0	525	100.0

Table 80: Connectedness to Building by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	71	10.8	36	16.6	321	22.4	79	15.0
Disagree	105	15.9	32	14.7	400	28.0	85	16.2
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	201	30.5	19	8.8	324	22.7	117	22.2
Agree	207	31.4	76	35.0	297	20.8	157	29.8
Strongly Agree	76	11.5	54	24.9	88	6.2	88	16.7
Total (N=2833)	660	100.0	217	100.0	1430	100.0	526	100.0

Table 81: Connectedness to Campus by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	37	5.6	5	2.3	121	8.5	44	8.4
Disagree	81	12.3	13	6.0	232	16.2	84	16.1
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	250	37.8	29	13.4	480	33.6	179	34.2
Agree	234	35.4	125	57.9	511	35.8	173	33.1
Strongly Agree	59	8.9	44	20.4	84	5.9	43	8.2
Total (N=2828)	661	100.0	216	100.0	1428	100.0	523	100.0

Table 82: Attend Floor Events to Meet New People by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	118	17.9	55	25.3	354	24.8	114	21.8
Disagree	182	27.6	60	27.6	408	28.6	150	28.7
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	174	26.4	57	26.3	335	23.4	127	24.3
Agree	151	22.9	37	17.1	282	19.7	107	20.5
Strongly Agree	34	5.2	8	3.7	50	3.5	25	4.8
Total (N=2828)	659	100.0	217	100.0	1429	100.0	523	100.0

Table 83: Attend Building Events to Meet New People by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	114	17.4	54	24.9	354	24.9	114	21.8
Disagree	183	27.9	61	28.1	398	27.9	152	29.0
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	173	26.3	50	23.0	323	22.7	119	22.7
Agree	152	23.1	43	19.8	291	20.4	111	21.2
Strongly Agree	35	5.3	9	4.1	58	4.1	28	5.3
Total (N=2822)	657	100.0	217	100.0	1424	100.0	524	100.0

Table 84: Attend Campus Events to Meet New People by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	78	11.9	21	9.7	217	15.2	83	15.9
Disagree	153	23.3	28	13.0	287	20.2	102	19.5
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	185	28.1	58	26.9	323	22.7	135	25.8
Agree	196	29.8	95	44.0	490	34.4	166	31.7
Strongly Agree	46	7.0	14	6.5	107	7.5	37	7.1
Total (N=2821)	658	100.0	216	100.0	1424	100.0	523	100.0

Table 85: Involved in Hall Government by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	378	57.3	136	62.7	900	63.4	319	60.8
Disagree	132	20.0	38	17.5	340	23.9	125	23.8
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	45	6.8	28	12.9	69	4.9	25	4.8
Agree	40	6.1	8	3.7	55	3.9	22	4.2
Strongly Agree	65	9.8	7	3.2	56	3.9	34	6.5
Total (N=2822)	660	100.0	217	100.0	1420	100.0	525	100.0

Table 86: Involved in Residence Hall Association or the National Residence Hall Honorary by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	428	65.4	152	70.0	918	64.7	339	64.7
Disagree	151	23.1	39	18.0	328	23.1	123	23.5
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	40	6.1	22	10.1	74	5.2	25	4.8
Agree	11	1.7	1	.5	46	3.2	11	2.1
Strongly Agree	24	3.7	3	1.4	53	3.7	26	5.0
Total (N=2814)	654	100.0	217	100.0	1419	100.0	524	100.0

Table 87: Involved in Campus Student Organization by Institution

	Kansas State University		Samford University		University of Florida		University of Kansas	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	117	17.9	21	9.8	216	15.2	124	23.6
Disagree	56	8.5	14	6.5	123	8.6	62	11.8
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	57	8.7	11	5.1	105	7.4	36	6.9
Agree	180	27.5	55	25.6	402	28.3	137	26.1
Strongly Agree	245	37.4	114	53.0	577	40.5	166	31.6
Total (N=2818)	655	100.0	215	100.0	1423	100.0	525	100.0
