

**UTILISATION OF WEB 2.0 TOOLS FOR EFFECTIVE LIBRARY SERVICES BY
LIBRARIANS IN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES IN SOUTHWEST NIGERIA**

Dr. Bamigboye, Olusola Bamidele, Ekeh, Esther Motunrayo, Dr. Agboola, Idayat Odunola
'Nimbe Adedipe Library, Federal University of Agriculture, P.M.B.2240, Abeokuta Ogun State Nigeria

ABSTRACT: *This paper examines utilisation of Web 2.0 tools for effective library services by librarians in University Libraries in Southwest Nigeria. Two hundred and three (203) copies which are (94%) were duly completed and found usable for this study. Questionnaire was used as instrument for data collection. The questionnaire was on types of Web 2.0 tools available, services available and influence of Web 2.0 use. Data obtained was analysed using descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, mean, and standard deviation. Findings of the study revealed that 54% respondents indicated Youtube as the major type of Web 2.0 tools, followed by Facebook 50.5% and Twitter with 48% by librarians in University Libraries in Southwest Nigeria. Some of the recommendations were that Libraries management should provide internet access to staff and users of their libraries, and due to the dynamic nature of Web 2.0 tools, librarians need to keep themselves abreast of the new technology and remain relevant on their duties.*

KEYWORDS: utilisation, web 2.0 tools, library services, librarians, university libraries

INTRODUCTION

Information and communication technologies have changed the way information is generated, organised, stored, processed and disseminated but more importantly, how ICT is being used for studying, research making, teaching and learning. ICT has enhanced interest in the use of new web-based technologies offered by social media popularly known as Web 2.0 which has positively influenced the way individuals and organisations collaborate, interact and connect online. Web 2.0 is definitely an improvement on the less dynamic and rigid Web 1.0 which was developed in the 1990, characterised by the use of static web pages, essentially read-only pages for visitors as one way communication.

Zadeh, Veisi and Zadeh (2013) said that the use of these Web 2.0 tools and applications will constitute substantive and significant changes if created and synchronised with librarianship. The traditional task of university libraries has been to select, collect, preserve information and to facilitate access to and use of this information. Earlier, university libraries were stationed service-providers and users have to visit the library to consult the catalogue and use the physical collection of books, journals, and multi-media materials. In the print-based context, libraries are held in high esteem as they are seen as the centre of the university and the librarian acts as a mediator to the collection of information. The impact of the library is derived from the amount of information stored locally, the mediation process, such as cataloguing, classification, and reference and circulation services. The libraries also allow users to use the information collections, and the training programmes that help users to locate the information within library collections, such as information literacy, research and citation skills training.

Web 2.0 tools are assisting librarians to overcome barriers to communication and information dissemination (Stuart, 2010). According to Habib (2006), the introduction of Web 2.0 tools into library encourages communication between users and the library thus expanding library services to users not only physically present but also located a long way from the library.

Web 2.0 tools provides users with the opportunity to be proactively engaged in information work and activities through online collaboration, communication and sharing of information and knowledge. Web 2.0 tools have helped to bridge, expand and promote information services to the patrons in libraries. University libraries are change agents involved in advancement of knowledge through development, creation and preservation of intellectual information. Web 2.0 tools provides really social interaction and exchange of information, knowledge and communication involving the librarians and the users. In addition, Web 2.0 tools helps library to bridge the knowledge gap between the rich and the poor. Information is available to all provided the right information infrastructure is put in place. Modern university libraries must provide multifaceted physical libraries that meet the information and the technology needs of their users as it will naturally attracts generation of users to the library.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to assist the users to attain excellence, the university libraries have to provide a very wide range of information assistance. Services provided by the library to users can include instruction on how to access and use library materials; reference services to provide quick and in-depth answers to student questions; and materials delivery services that provide users with access to library materials online or items delivered to users' homes. Traditionally, the response towards users' needs and demands in any library and information systems have never been given the desired attention. Librarians have always been guided by the philosophy in the profession that users normally use library services whether informed or not. This practice has always created a one directional approach that never takes care of the needs of the users. The competitive information environment and new business paradigms have forced libraries to involve in provision of information services. In the online information environment, providing balanced user centered services involves Web 2.0 tools solutions. Recently, universities libraries are seen as social systems that must engage and provide competitive services. Web 2.0 tools including YouTube, MySpace, Facebook, Meebo, Flickr, chat reference and instant messages are some of the solutions that provide effective and efficient means of providing information services. Technology provides the easiest platform for exchanging and sharing of information and communication. This helps information professionals to provide quality services to the users. In general, establishing and nurturing customer services via technology helps to provide quality services, increases productivity and efficiency in information work.

Some of the various services rendered in the university libraries to users in form of both direct and indirect services through communication technologies are: lending services, interlibrary loan, reservation services, reference services, current awareness services (CAS), selective dissemination of information (SDI), circulation of new arrivals lists, translation services, referral services,

reprographic services, user education, multimedia services, Internet services, CD/DVD based services and Consortia collaboration. These activities are carried out by the librarians in order to assist users in various areas of information needs. The lending services involve the borrowing library materials to the users who cannot stay in the library to use them. Interlibrary loan involves the librarian going extra mile to borrow materials that are not available in the library for the users. Current awareness services involve sending messages to users especially on new arrivals in order for the users to know what is available. User education is instructions giving to users on how to use the library effectively. Selective dissemination of information has to do with the librarians selecting materials based on interest areas to the user and sending such information materials to the users.

Librarians are to explore new ways to reposition themselves in view of the high expectations of their various stakeholders so as to be relevant in the discharge of their duties because users have become more aware of the possibilities of information technologies and find it easier to go to Google than visit the library to search for information (Stuart, 2010). Thus librarians in view of the high expectations, face immense challenges on how to effectively meet the needs and preferences of their users especially in this information age. Ramos (2014) suggested that the contemporary role of librarians is to see themselves as partners in information literacy education; computer literacy providers, database builders, and excellent guides in determining and using available information sources. The new environment in which the university library has found themselves has proved that libraries are not only crucial but as knowledge providers and have become even more significant in this age. Accordingly, librarians are trained to be experts in information searching, selecting, acquiring, organising, preserving, repackaging, disseminating, and serving of information. Therefore, in response to these changing information landscapes, university libraries are making efforts to meet the diversifying needs and growing expectations of the users by adopting new technology and tools. It should however be noted that while Web 2.0 tools had actually proved its mettle by the virtue of its impacts on professional service delivery, there still exist some constraints that hinder the full impact of Web 2.0 tools on the library services provisions. It is in view of this that the study intends to examine the use of Web 2.0 tools for effective provision of library services by librarians in selected universities in Southwest, Nigeria.

Research Questions

The study provided answers to the following research questions:

1. What are the various types of Web 2.0 tools available for effective provision of library services in selected university libraries in Southwest, Nigeria?
2. What are the services available in the selected university libraries in Southwest, Nigeria?
3. What influence does the use of Web 2.0 tools have on the effective provision of library services in selected university libraries in Southwest, Nigeria?

Objectives of the study

The following objectives guided the study:

1. identify the various types of Web 2.0 tools that are available for use in the selected university libraries in Southwest, Nigeria;

2. identify the library services available in the selected university libraries in the Southwest, Nigeria; and
3. identify the factors influencing the use of Web 2.0 tools for effective provision of library services in the selected university libraries in Southwest, Nigeria.

METHODOLOGY

Survey research design was used for the study. The population of this study was made up of two hundred and fifteen (215) librarians working in the selected universities libraries in Southwest, Nigeria. Questionnaire served as the instrument for data collection. However, the instrument was categories into three sections covering the research questions. Two hundred and three (203) copies which are (94%) were duly completed and found usable for this study. Data obtained was analysed using descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, mean, and standard deviation.

Data Presentation and Interpretation

Table 1: Types of Web 2.0 tools available in selected universities libraries in Southwest, Nigeria **N= 203**

S/N	Items	SD	D	A	SA	\bar{X}	S.D
1	LinkedIn	26 12.9%	28 13.9%	52 25.7%	96 47.5%	3.08	1.06
2	You Tube	37 18.3%	22 10.9%	34 16.8%	109 54.0%	3.06	1.18
3	Whatsapp	20 9.9%	49 24.3%	44 21.8%	89 44.1%	3.00	1.04
4	Twitter	32 15.8%	33 16.3%	40 19.8%	97 48.0%	3.00	1.13
5	Facebook	39 19.3%	32 15.8%	29 14.4%	102 50.5%	2.96	1.20
6	Mashup	38 18.8%	32 15.8%	52 25.7%	80 39.6%	2.86	1.14
7	Tagging	30 14.9%	49 24.3%	47 23.3%	76 37.6%	2.84	1.09
8	Wikis.	43 21.3%	26 12.9%	55 27.2%	78 38.6%	2.83	1.16
9	Blogs	39 19.3%	32 15.8%	61 30.2%	70 34.7%	2.80	1.12
10	Podcast/Vodcast	49 24.3%	38 18.8%	31 15.3%	84 41.6%	2.74	1.23
11	Social Bookmarking	46 21.3%	33 16.3%	55 27.2%	68 33.7%	2.72	1.16

12	Instant Messaging	51 25.2%	33 16.3%	39 19.3%	79 39.1%	2.72	1.22
13	Flickr	58 28.7%	28 13.9%	43 21.3%	73 36.1%	2.65	1.24
14	Really Simple Syndication(RSS)	65 32.2%	40 19.8%	33 16.3%	64 31.7%	2.48	1.24
15	Web Mapping	59 29.2%	49 24.3%	36 17.8%	58 28.7%	2.46	1.19
Weighted mean =2.81							

Key: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree

This study revealed the various types of Web 2.0 tools that are available for effective provision of library services in selected universities libraries in Southwest, Nigeria, such as LinkedIn, YouTube, WhatsApp, Twitter, Facebook among others.

Table 2: Services available in the selected university libraries in Southwest, Nigeria

S/N	Items	Not Available	Available	\bar{X}	S.D
1	Reprographic services	31 (15.3%)	172 (84.7%)	3.48	0.93
2	Internet services	31 (15.3%)	172 (84.7%)	3.42	0.95
3	User education	32 (15.8%)	171 (84.1%)	3.41	0.99
4	Multimedia services	40(19.3%)	163 (80.7%)	3.36	0.99
5	CD/DVD based services	40 (19.8%)	163 (80.7%)	3.31	1.01
6	Reference services	51 (25.3%)	152 (74.8%)	3.19	1.05
7	Inter-library loan	53 (26.3%)	150 (73.7%)	3.16	1.10
8	Consortia collaboration	56 (27.8%)	147 (72.85)	3.16	1.14
9	Current Awareness Services (CAS)	50 (24.7%)	153 (75.3%)	3.15	1.03
10	Reservation services	54 (26.7%)	149 (73.3%)	3.14	1.10
11	Translation services	50 (24.7%)	153 (75.3%)	3.11	1.04
12	Referral services	63 (31.2%)	140 (68.8%)	3.05	1.12
13	Selective Dissemination of Information (SDI)	65 (32.1%)	138(67.9%)	3.01	1.15
14	Lending service	69 (34.1%)	134 (65.9%)	2.95	1.18
15	Circulation of New arrivals list	68 (33.6%)	135 (66.4%)	2.95	1.14
Weighted mean =3.19					

Key: Not Available =NA, Available = A

The study established that there are various library services available in the selected university libraries in Southwest, Nigeria such as interlibrary loan, selective dissemination of Information (SDI), online services, reference services, reprographic services, circulation services, current awareness service among others.

Table 3: Factors influencing the use of Web 2.0 tools for the effective provision of library services in selected university libraries in Southwest, Nigeria

S/N	Perceived Usefulness	SD	D	A	SA	\bar{x}	S.D
1	Use of Web 2.0 tools provide up to date information to users	8 4.0%	14 6.9%	26 12.9%	154 76.2%	3.61	0.79
2	Use of Web 2.0 tools enhance the image of the library	13 6.4%	15 7.4%	20 9.9%	154 76.2%	3.56	0.89
3	Use of Web 2.0 tools solicit for quick response to user	11 5.4%	13 6.4%	31 15.3%	147 72.8%	3.55	0.84
4	Use of Web 2.0 tools increase library's patronage	12 5.9%	10 5.0%	42 20.8%	138 68.3%	3.51	0.84
5	Use of Web 2.0 tools brings interpersonal relationship between the librarians and their users	16 7.9%	17 8.4%	27 13.4%	142 70.3%	3.46	0.95
Weighted mean =				3.54			
Perceived Ease of Use							
1	I find Web 2.0 tools easy to use	27 13.4%	13 6.4%	29 14.4%	133 65.8%	3.33	1.08
2	Web 2.0 tools make learning easy	24 11.9%	14 6.9%	45 22.3%	119 58.9%	3.28	1.03
3	Web 2.0 tools help me accomplish my daily tasks more quickly	27 13.4%	20 9.9%	35 17.3%	120 59.4%	3.23	1.09
4	Web 2.0 tools are reliable for learning	34 16.8%	21 10.4%	34 16.8%	113 55.9%	3.12	1.15

5	I find Web 2.0 tools useful for my professional work	44	11	38	109	3.05	1.21
		21.8%	5.4%	18.8%	54.0%		
6	Web 2.0 tools make it easy for me to collaborate with my peers	45	20	35	102	2.96	1.23
		22.3%	9.9%	17.3%	50.5%		
Weighted mean =						3.16	

Attitude

1	I feel satisfied using Web 2.0 tools for library service provision	16	15	29	142	3.47	0.94
		7.9%	7.4%	14.4%	70.3%		
2	I am comfortable using Web 2.0 tools as its provide library with sufficient information	36	16	27	123	3.17	1.17
		17.8%	7.9%	13.4%	60.9%		
3	I feel fulfilled using Web 2.0 tools as it allows information to be accurately presented	28	29	29	116	3.15	1.12
		13.9%	14.4%	14.4%	57.4%		
4	I feel elated when using Web 2.0 tools to provide clear and unambiguous information	44	21	26	111	3.01	1.24
		21.8%	10.4%	12.9%	55.0%		
5	My professional instinct is aroused when Web 2.0 tools helps me to provide meaningful information	51	26	31	94	2.83	1.26
		25.2%	12.9%	15.3%	46.5%		
6	I feel accomplished when I use Web 2.0 tools to provide up to date information	66	17	32	87	2.69	1.32
		32.7%	8.4%	15.8%	43.1%		
7	I feel information is easily transferred/received using Web 2.0 tools	66	25	31	80	2.62	1.30
		32.7%	12.4%	15.3%	39.6%		
Weighted mean =						2.99	

Behavioural Intention to Use

1	I will use Web 2.0 tools for librarians activities on a regular basis	35	17	38	112	3.12	1.15
		17.3%	8.4%	18.8%	55.4%		

2	I intend to use Web 2.0 tools for library services provision as frequently as possible.	44	19	31	109	3.02	1.22
		21.3%	9.4%	15.3%	54.0%		
3	I intend to use Web 2.0 tools whenever possible for library services	50	20	26	106	2.93	1.27
		24.8%	9.9%	12.9%	52.5%		
4	I will strongly recommend other university/users to use Web 2.0 tools for library services	46	20	39	97	2.93	1.22
		22.8%	9.9%	19.3%	48.0%		
5	I will use Web 2.0 tools to communicate with library users	50	22	33	97	2.88	1.25
		24.8%	10.9%	16.3%	48.0%		
6	I will use Web 2.0 tools to access library materials	56	20	39	87	2.78	1.26
		27.7%	9.9%	19.3%	43.1%		
Weighted mean				2.94			

Institutional Policies

1	Learning environment	29	27	22	124	3.19	1.14
		14.4%	13.4%	10.9%	61.4%		
2	Programmes Management	29	44	20	112	3.08	1.13
		12.9%	21.8%	9.9%	55.4%		
3	Research Environment	45	27	28	102	2.93	1.24
		22.3%	13.4%	13.9%	50.5%		
4	Facilities and Resources	58	22	21	101	2.82	1.32
		28.7%	10.9%	10.4%	50.0%		
5	Collaboration with other institutions	64	13	43	82	2.71	1.29
		31.7%	6.4%	21.3%	40.6%		
Weighted mean =				2.95			

Level of Skills

1	I have in-depth knowledge in the use of Web 2.0 tools	33	35	24	10	3.04	1.17
		16.3%	17.3%	11.9%	54.5%		

2	I have relevant internet skills	36	26	41	99	3.00	1.16
		17.8%	12.9%	20.3%	49.0%		
3	I have adequate skills on use of electronic communication	30	32	52	88	2.98	1.09
		14.9%	15.8%	25.7%	43.6%		
4	I have ability to use Web 2.0 tools effectively	39	35	35	93	2.90	1.18
		19.3%	17.3%	17.3%	46.0%		
5	I have the knowledge on ICT to use Web 2.0 tools	61	31	43	67	2.57	1.23
		30.2%	15.3%	21.3%	33.2%		
Weighted mean						2.90	
Infrastructural facilities							
1	I have the knowledge necessary to use Web 2.0 tools	35	41	33	93	2.91	1.16
		17.3%	20.3%	16.3%	46.0%		
2	Web 2.0 tools make work more interesting	54	37	26	85	2.70	1.26
		26.7%	18.3%	12.9%	42.1%		
3	I like using Web 2.0 tools	59	35	32	76	2.62	1.26
		29.2%	17.3%	15.8%	37.6%		
4	Web 2.0 tools are not compatible with other technologies I use	62	33	31	76	2.60	1.27
		30.7%	16.3%	15.3%	37.6%		
5	My interaction with Web 2.0 tools will be clear and understandable	63	39	25	75	2.55	1.27
		31.2%	19.3%	12.4%	37.1%		
Weighted mean =						2.68	

Key: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree

The study revealed the factors influencing the use of Web 2.0 tools for the effective provision of library services in selected university libraries in Southwest, Nigeria and the result shows that the factors influencing the use of Web 2.0 tools. The finding revealed that majority of the respondents 76.2% with the mean value of ($\bar{x}=3.61$) claimed that the use of Web 2.0 tools provide up to date information to users and also enhance the image. Also, 65.8% with the mean value of ($\bar{x}=3.33$) claimed that they find Web 2.0 tools easier to use. 70.3% with the mean value of ($\bar{x}=3.47$) claimed that they feel satisfied using Web 2.0 tools for library service provision. 55.4% of the respondents with mean value of ($\bar{x}=3.12$) state that they use Web 2.0 tools for library activities on a regular basis. Also, 61.4% of respondents with mean value of ($\bar{x}=3.19$) claimed that the learning environment is a major factor on the use of Web 2.0 tools. The finding also revealed that 54.5%

of respondents with the mean value of (\bar{x} =3.04) has in-depth knowledge in the use of Web 2.0 tools. 46% of the respondent with the mean value of (\bar{x} =2.91) submitted that they have the knowledge necessary to use Web 2.0 tools.

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The findings established that 54% respondents indicated Youtube as the major type of Web 2.0 tools, followed by Facebook 50.5% and Twitter with 48% respondents. This study was supported by Macaskill and Owen (2016), that revealed that Facebook 104 (96.3%) was the most widely used Web 2.0 tool across the universities surveyed, others were Twitter, Instant Message and Internet Forum, and YouTube. Also, Collins and Quan-Haase (2014) surveyed academic libraries usage pattern of Facebook, Twitter, YouTube and Flickr as the most popular Web 2.0 tools. Findings also revealed that adoption and use of Web 2.0 tools were higher in the South-Western Ontario whilst in the Eastern and Northern Ontario libraries adoption and use was low.

The findings of this study also revealed that 84.7% respondents indicated reprographic service and internet service are the most available services in the university library. This was closely followed by user education 84.1% respondents. Aduko and Dadsie (2013) supported that most of the information resources available for reprographic services are works protected by intellectual property rights, as such reprographic services in libraries can only be carried out within the ambit of the law.

The findings from this study also revealed the following that Web 2.0 tools provides up to date information to its users, users find Web 2.0 tools easy to use, users feels satisfied using Web 2.0 tools, the learning environment is a major factor for the use of Web 2.0 tools and finally, users also has in-depth knowledge in the use of Web 2.0 tools. This finding is supported by Mahmood and Richardson (2011) state that the applications of Web 2.0 have opened new avenues for libraries as they have enabled them to involve users in their activities and solicit their feedback for improvement in service delivery.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Web 2.0 tools have great potentials for effective library services provision. The conclusions have been drawn from the findings based on the research questions formulated to guide this study. Facebook, YouTube and WhatApps were the major types Web 2.0 tools available for effective provision of library services in selected universities libraries in Southwest, Nigeria.

Facebook, YouTube and WhatApps were the major types Web 2.0 tools available for effective provision of library services in selected universities libraries in Southwest, Nigeria. Library services that could be carried out with the use of Web 2.0 tools include Reprographic services, User education, Multimedia services and Internet services. Librarians' perception indicated that all the Web 2.0 tools selected for library services are excellent for use. Facebook, WhatApps and Wikis were the most frequently used Web 2.0 tools. Librarians in Southwest, Nigeria university libraries were skilled enough in the use of Web 2.0 tools. The factors influencing the use of Web

2.0 tools for effective provision of library services are Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Behavioural Intention of Use, Institutional Policies, Level of Skills and Infrastructural facilities. Technical hitches like unstable Internet access, erratic power supply and institutional policies were the major barrier facing the use of Web 2.0 tools for library service provision.

The following recommendations were made:

1. Libraries management should provide internet access to staff and users of their libraries, the new dispensation of university library users are becoming more comfortable with Web 2.0 application platforms. It will therefore be appropriate to provide internet access to be made available for effective library service provision.
2. The library management in university libraries in Southwest, Nigeria should provided uninterrupted electricity power supply source to curb the erratic power situation being experienced and encourage the use of Web 2.0 tools for effective library service provision.
3. Due to the dynamic nature of Web 2.0 tools, librarians need to keep themselves abreast of the new technology and remain relevant on their duties, therefore, there is need for periodic training and re-training of librarians in university libraries in Southwest, Nigeria to be equipped especially the librarians with necessary skill, as there are numbers of Web 2.0 tools in use and many of them can become obsolete quickly.
4. The University managements in Southwest, Nigeria should do more in terms of policy formulation to guide the conduct and usage of Web 2.0 tools for implementation, availability and use of Web 2.0 tools for library service delivery.

REFERENCES

- Aduko, A. A., and Dadsie, P. 2013. Social media challenges in marketing of library and information services at the Balme Library, University of Ghana. *Innovation: Journal of Appropriate Librarianship and Information Work in Southern Africa: Ethical Dimension Of Social Media In The Information Society*, 47, 213–230.
- Collins, G., and Quan-Haase, A. 2014. Are social media ubiquitous in university libraries? A longitudinal study of adoption and usage patterns. *Journal of Web Librarianship*, 8(1), 48–68.
- Habib, M. 2006. Conceptual model for university library 2.0 Michael Habib's weblog on library and information science. Retrieved March 30, 2018, from <http://mchabib.blogspot.com/2006/06/conceptual-model-for-university-library.html>.
- Macaskill, W. and Owen, D. 2016. Web 2.0. Paper Presented at LIANSA Conference, Wellington. Retrieved March 15 2018 from http://www.liansa.org.ns/library/files/store_013/Web2ToGo_WMMacaskill.pdf.
- Mahmood, K. and Richardson, J. V. 2011. Adoption of Web 2.0 in US university libraries: a survey of ARL library websites. *Program: Electronic Library and Information Systems*, 45(4), 365–375.
- Ramos, M. M. 2014. The role of librarian in the 21st century. Available online at www.slideshare.net/

- Stuart, D. 2010. What are libraries doing on Twitter? Exploring Technology Resources for Information Professionals, 34(1), 45–47. Retrieved from <http://www.infoday.com/Online/jan10/index.shtml>
- Zadeh, S. K., Veisi, A. G. and Zadeh, E. K. 2013. Web 2.0 and Libraries. Advanced Research vol x, issue xxxx. Retrieved May 29th2018 from <http://www.journalijar.com>.