International Journal of Information technology and Computer Engineering
ISSN: 2455-5290
Vol: 02, No. 02, Feb- Mar 2022
http://journal.hmjournals.com/index.php/IJITC
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55529/ijitc.22.17.21

A Charter to Machineries Universally Used by School Learners

Muzamil Hussain ALHussaini*

**PhD Scholar Qurtuba University, Pakistan*

*Corresponding Email: *muzamilqurtuba@gmail.com*

Received: 30 October 2021 **Accepted:** 20 January 2022 **Published:** 25 February 2022

Abstract: Students today, members of the "Net generation," regularly use technology as a means of connection and communication. Compared to those from any other generation, they utilize the Internet, e-mail, instant messaging, blogs, and social networking websites like Facebook and My Space more frequently (Fox and Madden, 2005; Junco and Mastrodicasa, 2007; Lenhart and Madden, 2007; Rainie and Tancer, 2007). However, student affairs professionals utilise technology differently and less frequently than their students do, lagging behind in the adoption of emerging modes of communication (Junco and Mastrodicasa, 2007). In fact, there is a negative correlation between age and utilising the Internet for academic research, text messaging, using social networking websites, instant messaging, reading, and having high-speed access at home.
Knowing how students utilise technology is crucial for student affairs professionals, especially given that newer technologies can be leveraged to improve educational results by increasing student involvement (Astin, 1999; Hu and Kuh, 2001; Nelson Laird and Kuh, 2005). This chapter examines the studies on school kids' use of technology, the more common tech tools they use now, and the significance of this knowledge for those working in student affairs.

Keywords: Learner Uses, Social Contacts, Media Types, Machinery Factors, Schools.

1. INTRODUCTION

Activating Technologies for Students

Students at schools employ a variety of technological tools for connection, communication, and involvement. They seldom ever distinguish between offline and online contact. They frequently allude to "talking to" a friend when, in reality, they are referring to an online interaction. For them, internet relationships are only an extension of their capacity for communication on a human level (Junco, 2005). However, it's interesting to note that students are more willing to share details and images online (such as in blogs and profiles) that they wouldn't share with people face-to-face (Junco, 2005). (Chapter Six addresses the topic of

International Journal of Information technology and Computer Engineering
ISSN: 2455-5290
Vol: 02, No. 02, Feb- Mar 2022
http://journal.hmjournals.com/index.php/IJITC
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55529/ijitc.22.17.21

privacy.) The technologies that have the best chance of being employed as instruments to engage and educate pupils are covered in the sections that follow. Additionally, the majority of people use these technology.

Websites for social networking.

Users of social networking websites can establish connections with one another based on common hobbies, pastimes, or personality traits. On their profile page (personal home page), which features a list of each user's friends, users can submit personal details and pictures. Additionally, social networking websites offer a variety of ways for members to communicate with one another, including blogs, private messaging, wall posts, photographs, and comments. Facebook and MySpace are the two most widely used social networking websites among school pupils (comScore, 2007).

Facebook

Students' preferred social networking website is Facebook, which was created in 2004. (Facebook, 2007a). It was the fourteenth most popular website in the US as of August 2007. (com Score, 2007). At the moment, Facebook has more than 100 million active users and controls 85% of the market for four-year American colleges and institutions (Facebook, 2008). More than half of people log in every day.

Websites That Enable Content Creation by Users.

Aside from blogs, other websites also let students quickly publish original information. There are websites where kids can publish their movies, photos, and artwork (YouTube, Google Video) (deviant ART). Ayvrqcx NIFs recent instances of campus police tapering students at the University of Florida and the University of California, Los Angeles, respectively. These occurrences were videotaped and released on YouTube.com practically immediately after they took place. Nowadays, YouTube is regarded as the preferable venue for propagating contentious videos like these that would not have found a home in mainstream media. If these videos even existed before YouTube, they would never have reached the general audience.

Messaging instantly.

Instant messaging (IM) is the practice of exchanging messages in real time (synchronously) over the internet. Using particular software programmes or, more lately, the instant messaging function of websites like Facebook and Myspace, one can send and receive instant messages. A list of a user's online contacts is displayed by IM software. The IM user can type in a chat box by clicking on a contact's name. A pane that shows on the user's screen notifies them of the message when they get an IM. Because IM communications are synchronous, they are commonly referred to as "chatting" while they take place. Students frequently mention "talking" to someone while they were actually engrossed in another activity.

Compared to those from other generations, school pupils are more likely to utilize instant messaging. Shiu and Lenhart (2004) discovered that IM use dropped significantly with older generations, with 62 percent of the Net generation using it compared to 37 percent of Generation Xers. 75.5 percent of school kids used IM, according to Junco and Mastrodicasa's

International Journal of Information technology and Computer Engineering
ISSN: 2455-5290
Vol: 02, No. 02, Feb- Mar 2022
http://journal.hmjournals.com/index.php/IJITC
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55529/ijitc.22.17.21

2007 study. The majority of users (15%) were logged on twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, according to the Junco and Mastrodicasa (2007) study, which found that students used IM services a median of 35 hours per week. Eighty minutes a day are said to be spent actively chatting by IM users (this is a median). Undergraduate Students and Information: A Study at the EDUCAUSE Center for applied Research.

Online worlds.
Virtual worlds are not extensively covered in this volume, but student affairs professionals will undoubtedly find them to be quite useful over the next ten years (New Media Consortium, 2007). Virtual worlds are areas where users can communicate with one another in a three-dimensional setting. One of the most well-known virtual worlds is Second Life, created by Linden Labs and accessible to the general public since 2003 (Linden Lab, 2003). The Campus: Second Life initiative was created in 2004 to assist learning at the collegiate level by giving instructors and students access to a space that fosters cooperation and real-time experimentation (Linden Lab, 2004). More than 250 community schools, colleges, and institutions have used this application for leadership development and educational activities to far (Sussman, 2007). There are several options for enhancing educational experiences in these venues, including lectures, art displays, and in-person science lab demonstrations.

Professionals in student affairs use technology
In order to better engage their students, student affairs professionals must be aware of how students use technology. Increased student engagement may result from the usage of technology (Hu and Kuh, 2001).

2. REFERENCES

1. Agee, A. S., and Zenelis, J. G. “Technology Across the Curriculum: Information Literacy and IT Fluency.” In B. L. Hawkins, J. A. Rudy, and W. H. Wallace, Jr. (eds.), Technology Everywhere: A Campus Agenda for Educating and Managing Workers in the Digital Age. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2002.
2. Astin, A. W. “Student Involvement: A Developmental Theory for Higher Education.”
3. Journal of School Student Development, 1999, 40, 518–529.
4. Ayers, E. L. “The Academic Culture and the IT Culture: Their Effect on Teaching and Scholarship.” EDUCAUSE Review, 2004, 39, 48–62.
5. Blumberg, S. J., and Luke, J. V. “Wireless Substitution: Early Release of Estimates Based on Data from the National Center for Health Statistics.” National Center for Health Statistics, 2007. Retrieved June 5, 2007, from http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis.htm.
6. Brown, M., Higgins, K., and Hartley, K. “Teachers and Technology Equity.” Teaching Exceptional Children, 2001, 33, 32–39.
7. Campbell, A. J., Cumming, S. R., and Hughes, I. “Internet Use by the Socially Fearful: Addiction or Therapy?” Cyberpsychology and Behavior, 2006, 9(1), 69–81.
8. comScore. “comScore Media Metrix: Top 50 Properties.” Reston, Va.: comScore, Aug. 2007.Cooper, J., and Weaver, K. D. Gender and Computers: Understanding the Digital Divide.Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum, 2003.

International Journal of Information technology and Computer Engineering
ISSN: 2455-5290
Vol: 02, No. 02, Feb- Mar 2022
http://journal.hmjournals.com/index.php/IJITC
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55529/ijitc.22.17.21

9. Dahne, M. "What's the Fuss over Facebook?" Leadership Exchange, 2006, 4(1), 24–25. DeBell, M., and Chapman, C. Computer and Internet Use by Children and Adolescents in 2001.
10. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, 2003.
11. Duderstadt, J. J., Atkins, D. E., and Van Houweling, D. Higher Education in the Digital Age: Technology Issues and Strategies for American Schools and Universities. Westport, Conn.: American Council on Education, 2002.
12. Elling, T. W., and Brown, S. J. "Advancing Technology and Student Affairs Practice."In R. B. Winston Jr., D. G. Creamer, T. K. Miller, and Associates (eds.), The Profes- sional Student Affairs Administrator: Educator, Leader, and Manager. New York: Rout- ledge, 2001.
13. Facebook. "Press Room: Statistics." 2007. Retrieved Sept. 15, 2007, from http:// www.new.facebook.com/press/info.php?statistics.
14. Facebook. "Statistics." 2008. Retrieved Feb. 1, 2008, from http://www.facebook.com/ press/info.php?statistics.
15. Fallows, D. How Women and Men Use the Internet. Washington, D.C.: Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2005.
16. Farrell, E. F. "Judging Roommates by Their Facebook Cover." Chronicle of Higher Edu- cation, September 1, 2006, p. A53.
17. Fox, S., and Madden, M. "Generations Online." 2005. Retrieved Sept. 25, 2006, fromhttp://www.pewInternet.org/pdfs/PIP_Generations_Memo.pdf.
18. Gumport, P. J., and Chun, M. "Technology and Higher Education: Opportunities and Challenges for the New Era." In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, and P. J. Gumport (eds.), American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.
19. Hawke, C. S. Computer and Internet Use on Campus. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2001.
20. Hollander, P. A. "Legal Liabilities and Ethical Issues." In J. L Baier and T. S. Strong (eds.), Technology in Student Affairs. Lanham, Md.: American School Personnel Asso- ciation, 1995.
21. Horrigan, J. B. Home Broadband Adoption 2006. Washington, D.C.: Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2006.
22. Hu, S., and Kuh, G. D. "Computing Experience and Good Practices in Undergraduate Education: Does the Degree of Campus `Wiredness' Matter?" Education Policy Analy-sis Archives, 2001, 9(49). Retrieved Sept. 20, 2007, from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/
23. Jackson, L. A., Ervin, K. S., Gardner, P. D., and Schmitt, N. "Gender and the Internet: Women Communicating and Men Searching." Sex Roles, 2001, 44(5/6), 363–379.
24. Joiner, R., and others. "Gender, Internet Identification, and Internet Anxiety: Correlatesof Internet Use." Cyberpsychology and Behavior, 2005, 8(4), 371–378.
25. Jones, S. The Internet Goes to School: How Students Are Living in the Future with Today's Technology. Washington, D.C.: Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2002.
26. Junco, R. "Technology and Today's First-Year Students." In M. L. Upcraft, J. N.

International Journal of Information technology and Computer Engineering
ISSN: 2455-5290
Vol: 02, No. 02, Feb- Mar 2022
http://journal.hmjournals.com/index.php/IJITC
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55529/ijitc.22.17.21

Gardner, and B. O. Barefoot (eds.), Challenging and Supporting the First-Year Student: A Hand- book for Improving the First Year of School. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.

27. Junco, R. "School Student Technology Use and Its Relationship to Academic Success." Unpublished manuscript (in preparation).
28. Junco, R., and Mastrodicasa, J. Connecting to the Net.Generation: What Higher Education Professionals Need to Know About Today's Students. Washington, D.C.: National Asso- ciation of Student Personnel Administrators, 2007.
29. Kaiser Family Foundation. Survey Snapshot: The Digital Divide. Menlo Park, Calif.: Kaiser Family Foundation, 2004.
30. Kleinglass, N. "Who Is Driving the Changing Landscape in Student Affairs?" In K. Kruger (Ed.), Technology in Student Affairs: Supporting Student Learning and Services. New Directions for Student Services, no. 112. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.
31. Kraut, R., and others. "Internet Paradox Revisited." Journal of Social Issues, 2002, 58(1), 49–74.
32. Lenhart, A., and Madden, M. Teen Content Creators and Consumers. Washington, D.C.: Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2005.
33. Lenhart, A., and Madden, M. "Social Networking Web sites and Teens: An Overview." Jan. 2007. Retrieved July 11, 2007, from http://www.pewinternet.org/pdfs/PIP_SNS_Data_Memo_Jan_2007.pdf.