

AWARENESS OF LIBRARIANS ON THE ADOPTION OF LIBRARY 2.0 APPLICATIONS FOR SERVICE DELIVERY IN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES IN KANO STATE

Auwalu Dansale Yahaya CLN¹
University Library, Bayero University Kano- Nigeria
dansalegwale@gmail.com +2348098415358

Manir Abdullahi Kamba Ph.D²
Department of Library and Information Sciences Bayero University, Kano-Nigeria
manirung@yahoo.com +2347068753355

ABSTRACT

The paper investigated the Awareness of Librarians on the adoption of Library 2.0 applications for Service delivery in University Libraries in Kano State. Data was collected from 132 Librarians working in University universities in Kano state of Nigeria through the use of quantitative survey technique as the methodology of the study. Findings of the paper revealed that there was high level of library 2.0 awareness among the librarians studied. However, all common library 2.0 applications are known by the librarians with facebook being the most known library 2.0 tool, followed by twitter, instant messaging, you tube, blog wikis, RSS feeds, podcast and vodcast, and flickr being the least known. the study also established that, the major source of the librarians' awareness of individual library 2.0 tools is the immediate friends/ colleagues, followed by Search engines, co-worker and/or professional colleagues, library websites, formal training from library schools, workshops/ conferences and seminar and tutorials being the least in that order.

Background to the study

It is obvious to say that, the Internet has introduced new form of learning material in which the dispersal of knowledge becomes easy, quick, and with minimal cost (Kamba, 2008). O., Reilly (2005) emphasized that Web 2.0 is the network as platform, spanning all connected devices; Web 2.0 applications are those that make the most of the intrinsic advantages of that platform: delivering software as a continually-updated service that gets better the more people use it, consuming and remixing data from multiple sources, including individual uses, while providing their own data and services in a form that allows remixing by others, creating network effects through an architecture of participation, and going beyond the page metaphor of web 1.0 to deliver rich user experiences. A web 2.0 site gives its users the free choice to interact or collaborate with each other in a social media dialogue as creators of user generated content in a virtual community, in contrast to websites where users are limited to the passive viewing of content that was created for them. Examples of Web 2.0 include social-networking sites, blogs, wikis, video sharing sites, hosted services, web applications (Thanuskodi, 2010). Web 2.0 tools like Blog, facebook, twitter, flickr etc., are available on the Internet websites, and are being used by different media for gathering and disseminating information. Librarians as information professionals and members of the global information society should not be ignorant of their availability. Interactive web tools allow patrons to participate in the tagging of materials, creating a wonderful value-add to catalogs and helping other patrons find materials they seek more easily. The application of interactive, collaborative, and multimedia web-based technologies to web-based library services and collections is what termed as *library 2.0* (Manes, 2006). Library 2.0 benefits libraries most directly by enabling them to connect with their patrons through the internet.

Library 2.0 tools such as blogs, Wikis, facebook, RSS, twitter, etc. allow people to access, share, and transfer information and knowledge.

Statement of the Problem

Literature has revealed that *Library 2.0* benefits librarians immensely, it is filled with success stories from libraries that have applied library 2.0 tools in various spheres of life. Researches as those of Manes (2006), Tripathi (2009), Khiwa (2010) and Thanuskodi (2012) etc, have been carried out to portray library 2.0 application by librarians in various spheres of life. Moreover, studies of Casey and Savastinuk (2006), Mansur and Idris (2010), and Muneja and Abungu (2012), have shown that, effectiveness of librarians' operations and services in the 21st century is enhanced by the use of library 2.0 tools.

Unfortunately, despite all these significance, the extent of library 2.0 Awareness is not being equally experienced by all libraries in the world particularly developing countries like Nigeria (Anunobi and Ogbonna, 2012). It appears that librarians in Nigeria are still at the early stage of getting themselves familiarized with library 2.0 tools. In Kano State particularly, there is lack of research on the librarians' level of awareness of Library 2.0 Applications for Service Delivery. However, there seems to be no studies that have examined the sources through which librarians in Kano State become aware of these tools which is important in developing web 2.0 applications in their libraries to meet their technological expectations. In response to this problems, a study of this nature became necessary in order to provide insight into the extent to which university librarians in Kano are aware of library 2.0 applications for service delivery and to ascertain their level of awareness with regards to common library 2.0 applications, as well as sources through which the librarians become aware of these applications because they are expected to spearhead the implementation of library 2.0 tools in their libraries.

Research Questions

1. What is the level of awareness of library 2.0 applications among librarians in university libraries in Kano State?
2. What are the sources through which the librarians become aware of library 2.0 applications for service delivery?

Objectives of the Study

1. To examine the level of library 2.0 Awareness among librarians in universities in Kano state
2. To examine the sources through which the librarians become aware of library 2.0 applications in libraries.

Methodology

This study adopted quantitative survey research design. Self-developed questionnaire was the instrument used for the collection of data relevant for the study. Total population sampling (census) was employed where data were collected from the entire 154 Librarians working in University universities in Kano state of Nigeria as the sample size is considered manageable by the researchers. About 132 copies of questionnaire were returned duly filled and used for the analysis. Descriptive survey method was used to analyze the data using frequencies and simple percentages with the aid of SPSS Version 16.0.

Review of Related Literature

It is obvious to note that, with the advent of modern information tools, users collaborate and participate more and share knowledge by means of Web 2.0 tools. Web 2.0 as the next incarnations of the worldwide web, where digital tools allow users to create, change and publish dynamic contents (Stephens, 2006). The use of new technology in libraries is very essential for providing opportunities for users to learn to operate in an information age. In the 21st century most of the educational sectors including universities are incorporating the use of internet into their daily transactions including library services. Academic librarians due to the professional nature of their job and their interaction with professors, students and researchers ought to empower users' skills in the usage of modern information tools such as Web 2.0 tools. So librarians using these tools will be able to share their knowledge with their colleagues in order to meet their users' needs faster and more efficiently (Hosseini and Hashempour, n.d).

Another major characteristic of Web 2.0 technologies is that they take advantage of the Read/Write Web, which is a Web in which users can both read and freely contribute content. Traditional types of media such as newspapers, radio, and television are static, while the internet can be dynamic. Once a page is printed on paper, it cannot be edited, but once a page is printed on the web, it can be edited. Because the Web is dynamic in this way and also designed for information to flow in all directions, it is possible to design tools which allow users of the web to alter and add to the pages they visit.

Several tools have commonly been recognized as Web 2.0 tools: blogs, RSS (Really Simple Syndication or Rich Site Summary) feeds, social networking tools such as Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube, RSS feeds, wikis, and Flickr, and social bookmarking sites such as Delicious and Library Thing (Kolonay, 2010). Currently, there are hundreds of web 2.0 websites which can be used by a Librarian to render effective and efficient services to corroborate the term library 2.0.

The term "Library 2.0" was coined by Michael Casey, a public librarian, on his LibraryCrunch1 blog in 2005. Library 2.0 is a term that is used to discuss the theory and practice of librarians seeking to incorporate into their libraries the changes occurring in web-based technologies and services after the 1990s (Eilers and Alexander, 2012). Library 2.0 technologies and services are participatory, dynamic, collaborative, and create content that is user designed or implemented.

In the recognition of the Significance of library 2.0, The Scottish Library and Information Council (SLIC) and the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals in Scotland (CILIPS), believed that the incorporation of services, such as Flickr and Twitter, has enhanced the communication model, enabling better support and promote libraries. They further emphasized that, The global nature of web based services means that libraries can reach a vast audience, serving more people in the virtual sphere than would be possible at a physical location. For example, by establishing a presence on social media websites, libraries can reach beyond the „walled garden“ to interact with users in online spaces that they are already visiting, rather than passively waiting for users to seek them out. This presents opportunities to reach user groups, such as teenagers or young males, who are traditionally less likely to visit the physical library building. The Scottish Library and Information Council (SLIC) and the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals in Scotland (CILIPS), also added that, A strong web presence, including representation on social media sites, improves awareness of library services and contributes to a progressive and modern image, which may in turn lead to increased physical visits.

In similar view, Beattie (no date) in Scotland was quoted by Scottish Library and Information Council and the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals in Scotland saying that:

Web 2.0 tools have allowed for increased participation among our staff and students. I like the way that Web 2.0 has opened up many doors to the library for our staff & students. I think it's important that everyone involved in delivering library services realizes the importance of Web 2.0 and makes the most of this opportunity to communicate and co-operate with the rest of the world.

Moreover, one of the immediate efforts of the use of these applications is the growing number of public they reach. Apart from the increase in the number of users reached, there are other less immediate but nonetheless beneficial effects from the use of Web 2.0 applications. These are:

- a. Increased importance of the library to the user;
- b. Improvement in the library's image;
- c. Potential of new interactive services to raise the level and quality of the service provided;
- d. increased involvement of users and improved communication of the library with such users;
- e. Improvement in communication among librarians;
- f. Greater ability to find quick solutions to meet the needs of users;
- g. Improvement in shared knowledge and collaboration.

Hence, we can conclude that, Web 2.0 tools benefit libraries most directly by enabling libraries to connect with their patrons. Library blogs not only are valuable devices for letting the public know about events going on at the library, they can also be a way to get more of the community involved in services the library offers. Interactive web tools allow patrons to participate in the tagging of materials, creating a wonderful value-add to catalogs and helping other patrons find materials they seek more easily. With library 2.0 application, libraries can respond quickly to user requests for information, such as "Ask-a-Librarian" service, and they can personalize services to patrons. Librarians also directly benefit from enhanced professional development opportunities, including everything from getting involved in issues that affect libraries, to taking part in webcasts, podcast, and collaborating easily with colleagues. Additionally, most Web 2.0/ library 2.0 tools are free or very inexpensive, allowing libraries to increase the impact of the library at little cost. The tools are typically easy to customize to fit the specific needs of each library. Despite all these benefits, Anunobi and Ogbonna (2012) highlighted that, though academic librarians in Nigeria are more aware of Web 2.0 than the rest of the librarians working in the public, school and special libraries, there is little or no awareness of the benefits provided by library 2.0 to librarians working in university Libraries. This is because only 7% of the librarians are aware of 2.0 tools aggregating tools which are applied in libraries. This corroborates what was discovered by Olusana (2006) where he discovered that library 2.0 use by Nigerian library professionals is not very popular. He attributed that to the Challenges of not being familiar with Web 2.0, low skills, restricted opportunity for use, lack of needed facilities and interest.

Types of Technologies for Library 2.0 Application

Obviously, the internet has broken down barriers of teaching, research, learning communication and information access from anywhere in the world. This is done through online platforms like Blog, Facebook, Instant messaging, Wiki, YouTube, twitter, podcast, vodcast, flickr and RSS among others.

Blog: It is a one-click process of publishing ideas on the web and to get comments from other users of web. Most libraries are maintaining their blogs by collaborative efforts. For instance, Swansea University's School of Health Science Library keeps a blog for its students, entitled "Swansea School of Health Science Library blog," which is posted to anonymously by "sushslibrary." The blog is hosted by the blogging service "Wordpress,". All posts are categorized, so readers can view all posts on a particular topic on the blog, and they are also tagged so that readers can link through to posts from other blogs on the same topic.

RSS: Rich Site Summary or Really Simple Syndication, RSS is another library 2.0 technology which helps library users to bring the updates and feeds from other websites. It is a very simple tool to bring the latest stories, updates from news groups, magazines, journals and blogs. It allows users to republish (syndicate) content from other sites on their own site and updating a user's feed when content on the other sites is updated. It was found that 19 to 62% of academic libraries in U.K., U.S. A., Canada and Australia use RSS to provide general and university news. Libraries have used RSS for several purposes, including conveying news, providing information about new arrivals, and communicating the schedule of various library activities.

Instant Messaging (IM)

A technology available through browsers from most of service providers which is used to provide quick online reference services. It is also a very useful tool which helps library professionals to provide library services. Maness (2006) claimed that Instant Messaging was initially Web 1.0 application because it often requires the downloading of software but IM was modified on library 2.0 because it is now available through browsers from most of service providers such as AOL, Meebo, MSN, Google Talk, etc. IM is vastly being used for online reference services in libraries. And „Ask a Librarian“ service is provided by instant messengers all over the world. A study of top 100 university libraries shows that IM features have extensively been applied in libraries to provide quick online reference services using IM technology (Harinarayan, and Rajua, 2010). Currie (2010) stated that libraries can provide online reference services by employing staff at public desks during nights and week-ends when the library is closed for other services.

Wikis: Wikis and similar text-based works of collaboration are web pages that can be modified by anyone who has the right to do so. Wikipedia is the most famous example of all wikis and "wiki-like" works. The basic idea behind wikis is to provide voluntary, decentralised and open information. Text can be added or corrected, and new sections can be added without the need to modify the structure of the entire page. Those who add new information are also the ones checking it. Having many individuals participate in a common task and the chance to take advantage of group intelligence are the greatest strengths of wikis (Toivo, n.d). Multiple users from all over the world can build a knowledge base by using this application. A library wiki as a service can enable social interaction among librarians and patrons, essentially moving the study group room online (Maness, 2006). Wikis can be used to create help files, tutorials with the help of users in libraries. The Portsmouth City Library (UK) applied Wikis to engage their readers with customized services such as wiki for book lovers and readers, and inviting them to share experiences through reviews and recommendations.

Flickr: An online image sharing application used to share images within communities and allows users to upload, share and tag images by keywords for retrieving relevant images. It is a very good source of sharing different events with the help of images and image sets. It allows users to upload, share and tag images by keywords. These tags are very useful for

retrieving relevant images (Angus, Thelwall & Stuart, 2008). The Library of Congress even worked with Flickr to make the precious national historic photographs collection accessible worldwide (Khan, 2013).

Podcast

The word podcast comes from the amalgamation of the words iPod and broadcast which is played on computers and mp3 players to exchange and share audio programmes among patrons over the Internet. This tool is used to exchange and share audio programmes among patrons over the Internet. King and Brown (2009) noted that libraries can share pictures, events, and instructions by podcast. Podcast is a catchy tool to market library services and attract new users (Lee, 2006). Students can listen to lectures through podcast instead of reading in the text format. Audio streams of lectures and book readings may be beneficial for university students who are visually challenged or have poor reading and comprehension competencies. Podcasts are frequently used to broadcast speeches and interviews of important personalities. Libraries use podcasts mainly for offering tips, using the audio format. For example the library of the University of Derby uses podcasts to deliver speeches of leading public figures.

Vodcast

A series of digital media files released episodically mainly used to deliver video clips on demand to patrons over the web which are typically 3 to 5 minutes in duration. A vodcast mainly is used to deliver videos on demand to patrons over the web. The functioning features and limitations of vodcast are similar to those of podcast. The size of video programmes is comparatively larger than the size of audio programmes. Certain information, such as the physical layout of the library, general searching skills, and the self-issuing and returning of books can be explained effectively through visual clips. For example, the Library of University of Leicester provides video streams over vodcast to explain the procedure for self-issuing and returning of books. Mount Allison University's Library provides video streams to demonstrate search strategy, plagiarism, and so forth.

Facebook

Facebook According to TOIVO (n.d) is the Internet's leading online community. Most consider Facebook as the very image of social media. The basic idea is to offer each registered user the chance to create a user profile with pictures and to keep in touch with their so-called "friends", or contacts they link to on the site. It was easy for users to adapt to it. Facebook was first available in February 2004 to Harvard students. Within one year, Facebook was used in almost all American schools, and was opened for public use in 2006. Facebook came to Finland in 2007, and at the time of writing, it has 1.5 million Finns registered as users. The worldwide fascination with Facebook is based on the possibility it offers to be in contact with people whose e-mail addresses and phone numbers have changed or become outdated. But an even more important feature of Facebook is the chance to create networks: Facebook's activity is based solely on communities. Being on Facebook isn't just limited to information within a group of friends. Through groups, users can form new networks.

Youtube

YouTube is the Internet's leading video service. It began operating in 2005, and grew very quickly, with 50 million visits to the site just by the end of the same year. In 2010, there were already more than 2 billion visits to You-Tube every day. The basic idea behind YouTube is that users upload videos to the site and at the same time, watch and comment on what they

see. Based on the number of viewers, the most popular videos on YouTube are music videos, entertainment programmes, and news videos, but there are also some user-made videos about personal problems that have found quite a large audience. (Toivo, n.d). Creative use of YouTube for a library can be as a method of introducing resources that are available on campus. According to Tunja and Zuma (2011) The use of You Tube by archives and libraries can represent a new type of exposure with a worldwide impact, at little cost and with wide access; it is also powerful tool for raising the institutional profile worldwide and a promising channel when exploited in the marketing operations of such institutions.

Twitter

Twitter is a free, Internet-based microblogging service, on which users can send short, 140-character messages to each other. Its use is based on quick exchanges of thoughts and information between friends, acquaintances, and all the users of the Twitter platform. Twitter messages are most commonly called “tweets”. These tweets form a current of messages that are followed in chronological order from a computer screen or some other screen, like that of a cell phone. A sort of keyword called a “hashtag” can be added to tweets to connect the current message to some other message, making it easier to follow the messages (TOIVO, n.d).

Awareness of Library 2.0 in Libraries

Awareness in the context of this study involves moving from a state of ignorance or being unaware to being aware of a new innovation. It is used synonymously with the words knowledge, understanding, grasp, appreciation, familiarity, and recognition. Hence, Awareness involves being aware about the existence of web 2.0 applications and its usefulness in library by the librarians.

Research studies were conducted on the librarians’ awareness of library 2.0 application. For Instance, Mansur and Idris (2010) studied the awareness of librarians at International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM). They discovered that 33% out of their 30 respondents were not aware of Web 2.0 applications being employed in libraries. The other 20 (67%) respondents who indicated awareness of Library 2.0, were categorized by having different levels of awareness as follows: (a) 5 (17%) respondents have heard about Web 2.0 applications employed in library, but do not know how, (b) 9 (30%) respondents have heard about Web 2.0 applications being employed in library and have seen some of the applications, but do not use it, and (c) 6 (20%) respondents have heard about Web 2.0 applications in library and have used some of its applications.

In addition, Al-Daihani (2009) explored the awareness of academic librarians in Kuwait, their familiarity with Web 2.0 tools, services and application of these to academic libraries. From a total of 37 academic librarians who completed the survey, it was found that most of them had lower awareness level on Web 2.0 tools, and majority of the librarians had never used social bookmarking (67%), but mostly only to view online content. Although most of the respondents had not used Web 2.0 tools, they were all in support of the suggestion that libraries should adopt Web 2.0 tools.

According to Thanuskodi (2012), 46.66% of information professionals at Annamalai university were not aware of web 2.0 applications being employed in libraries. Respondents who indicated awareness at library 2.0, admitted to the following: out of 48 respondents only 5 (8.34%) respondents have heard about web 2.0 applications employed in library, but do not know how, 10 (10.66%) respondents have heard about web 2.0 applications being employed in library and have seen some of the applications, but do not use it. About 17 (28.34%) have heard about web 2.0 applications in library and have used some of its application.

Similarly, Mulatiningish and Johnson (2013) surveyed awareness of Indonesian LIS Professional. Their participants were 39 LIS professionals who have attained at least an undergraduate degree in LIS out of which 31 of them representing 79% have heard the term library 2.0. Yet about 28 of the 39 representing about 72% of the participant have not heard about the term participatory library. They concluded that despite their familiarity with the term library 2.0, most respondents did not demonstrate an understanding of the concept beyond its connection with information technology, especially web 2.0 tools. Similarly, Charnigo and Barnett-Ellis (2007) surveyed 126 academic librarians at Jacksonville State University (JSU) and their awareness, experimentations and perceptions towards Facebook. On the basis of their findings, they reported that the overwhelming majority of 114 out of a total of 126 librarians were aware of Facebook's existence.

Moreover, Atulomah (2010) conducted a survey to investigate Awareness of Library 2.0 and Participating in the Global Discussion among Librarians in Southwest Nigeria Universities. His study was to collect information from 31 respondents selected from universities within Southwest Nigeria (University of Ibadan, Babcock University and Olabisi Onabanjo University). Based on his findings Only 9 (29 percent) of the surveyed respondents in these universities had knowledge of library 2.0 prior to his study and 67.7 percent were hearing of it for the first time during the survey. Seven respondents were able to identify RSS feeds and podcast while 8 (25.8 percent) could accurately identify open access. A summary of descriptive statistics of his research, suggests insufficient awareness and understanding of what constitutes Library 2.0, since on a 12- point scale, the respondents scored a mean of 3.9 (SD 1.94). He concluded that, Most important is the observed lack of formal workshops in this region to acquaint librarians with the emerging concept of Library 2.0.

In the study of the awareness and use of web 2.0 tools by librarians in university libraries in Nigeria by Baro and Idiodi (2013), It emerged that the librarians were more aware of library 2.0 tools like instant messaging, media sharing sites, blogs and wikis. The popularity of those web 2.0 tools made them the most frequently experienced by the librarians in Nigeria. Library 2.0 tools like Flickr, RSS Feeds, podcasts, social bookmarking, were among the least experienced.

Similarly, a research was done by Esse (2013) to examine the perception, knowledge and reception attitude of Information professionals at Covenant University Library Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria. At the time of her research work, 20 questionnaires were distributed to librarians and 18 (90%) librarians responded to the distributed questionnaire. The Covenant University librarians were asked to indicate their level of awareness. It was found that 3 (17%) respondents were not aware of Web 2.0 applications being employed in libraries. The other respondents who indicated awareness of Lib 2.0 include 3 (17%) respondents who have heard about Web 2.0 applications employed in libraries, but do not know how, followed by 2 (11 %) respondents who have heard about Web 2.0 applications being employed in libraries and have seen some of the applications, but do not use it, and majority of Covenant University librarians 10 (56%) have heard about Web 2.0 applications in libraries and have used some of its applications. Hence, her result shows a high level of awareness of Library 2.0 applications among information professionals at Covenant University Library.

In short, while majority of Indonesian LIS Professionals only heard the term library 2.0 as found by (Mulatiningish and Johnson, 2013). And most of librarians in Kuwait had lower awareness level on Web 2.0 tools, and majority of the librarians had never used social bookmarking in the study of Al-Daihani (2009). However in Southwest Nigeria Universities

only 29% of the librarians had knowledge of library 2.0 prior to the study of Atulomah (2010).

Therefore, from the reviewed literature above, it is clear from the study of [(Mansur and Idris (2010); Thanuskodi (2012); and Esse (2013)] that librarians at International Islamic University Malaysia, Annamalai university and Covenant University Nigeria are categorized by having different levels of awareness. Some librarians were not aware of Web 2.0 applications being employed in libraries. Some heard about Web 2.0 applications employed in library, but do not know how. some heard about Web 2.0 applications being employed in library and have seen some of the applications, but do not use it, and heard about Web 2.0 applications in library and have used some of its applications. But still the literature shows a high level of awareness of Library 2.0 applications among information professionals at Covenant University Library, Ogun state Nigeria.

It is obvious to note from the above available literature review that little or no study was written on the awareness of library 2.0 among librarians in universities in Kano State. Hence, this research is necessary to explore the level of the librarians understanding of the concept of Library 2.0 and the opportunities it creates for libraries to provide content and services to their communities of users.

Findings and Discussions

AWARENESS OF LIBRARY 2.0

The respondents were asked to indicate their awareness with the existence of library 2.0 application

Table 1.0 Awareness of Library 2.0 Application

AWARENESS OF LIBRARY 2.0	Frequency	Percent
YES	102	77.3
NO	16	12.1
Total	118	89.4

N not equal to 132 as some items of the Instruments were not filled by respondents

From the table above, it can be seen that majority 102(77.3%) of the respondents were aware of library 2.0 applications, and only 16(12.1%) of the respondents were not aware of the existence of library 2.0 in library services.

Table 2.0 LEVEL OF LIBRARY 2.0 AWARENESS

Respondents were asked to rate or indicate their level of awareness with regards to the library 2.0 applications in Libraries.

Level	Frequency	Percent
HIGHLY NOT AWARE	7	5.3
NOT SURE	5	3.8
HIGHLY AWARE	103	78.1
Total	115	87.1
Total N ≠	132	100.0

Table 2.0 indicates that more than half 86 (65.2%) of respondents were highly aware of library 2.0 applications. Other 7 (5.3%) of the respondents were highly not aware of the application of library 2.0 in libraries. While 5(3.8%) of the respondents were not sure about their level of awareness with regards to the application. This is an indication that majority of librarians in universities in under study were highly aware that library 2.0 technologies are employed in libraries.

Table 3.0 Librarians' level of library 2.0 awareness with regards to the following library 2.0 tools

Library 2.0 Technologies	High	Low
Blogs	53 (40.1%)	42(31.8%)
RSS feed	42(31.9%)	43(32.6%)
Instant Messaging	68(51.5%)	23(17.5%)
Wikis	49(37.1%)	38(28.8%)
Flickr	31(27.3%)	46(34.9%)
podcast	34(25.8%)	44(33.3%)
Vodcast	34(25.8%)	47(35.6%)
Facebook	92(69.7%)	16(12.2%)
Youtube	63(62.9%)	15(11.4%)
Twitter	81(61.3%)	21(15.9%)

Source: Generated by the researcher using SPSS version 16.0 from questionnaire response, 2015

Table 3.0 indicates that less than half 53 (40.1%) of the respondents had high level of awareness of Blog as library 2.0 application and 42(31.8%) of the respondents low awareness of Blog. This is an indication that majority of the librarians in Universities under study were highly aware of Blog as library 2.0 tool. The table also shows that 42 (31.9%) respondents were highly aware of RSS as library 2.0 technology. While 43(32.6%) respondents indicated low awareness of RSS. This is an indication that majority of the librarians in Universities under study had low awareness of RSS as library 2.0 tool. It also reveals that 68(51.5%) of the respondents were highly aware of Instant Messaging as library 2.0 tool and 23(17.5%) respondents indicated low awareness of Instant Messaging. This is an indication that majority of the librarians in Universities under study were highly aware of Instant Messaging as library 2.0 tool. Moreover, it indicates that, 49(37.1%) respondents were highly aware of Wikis as library 2.0 technology. While 38(28.8%) respondents indicated low level awareness of Wikis. This is an indication that majority of the librarians in Universities under study were highly aware of Wikis as library 2.0 tool.

With regards to the Flickr, the table shows that 31(27.3%) respondents were highly aware of Flickr as library 2.0 technology and 46(34.9%) indicated low level awareness of Flickr. This is an indication that majority of the librarians in Universities under study are had low awareness of Flickr as library 2.0 technology. However, less than half 34(25.8%) of

the respondents were highly aware of Podcast as library 2.0 technology. While 44(33.3%) admitted that they had low level awareness of Podcast. This is an indication that majority of the librarians in Universities under study had low awareness of Podcast as library 2.0 technology. The table also shows that, 34(25.8%) of the respondents had high level awareness of Vodcast, while 47(35.6%) of the respondents had low awareness of Vodcast as library 2.0 technology. This is an indication that most of the librarians in Universities under study are not highly aware of Vodcast as library 2.0 technology.

Also majority 92(69.7%) respondents were highly aware of Facebook as library 2.0 tool and 16(12.2%) respondents indicated low awareness of Facebook. Thus it is an indication that majority of the librarians in Universities under study are highly aware of Facebook as library 2.0 technology. However, more than half 63(62.9%) of the respondents were highly aware of Youtube as library 2.0 tool. Other 15(11.4%) of respondents indicated low awareness of Youtube. This is an indication that majority of the librarians in Universities under study were highly aware of Youtube as library 2.0 tool. Then the table finally reveals that majority 81(61.3%) of the respondents were highly aware of Twitter as library 2.0 tool. And less than half 21(15.9%) of the respondents indicated low awareness of Twitter. This is an indication that majority of the librarians in Universities under study were highly aware of Twitter as library 2.0 tool.

Table 4.0 SOURCE OF LIBRARY 2.0 AWARENESS

Source of Awareness	Frequency/ Percentages		Total
	Yes	No	
Through immediate friends/ colleagues	62(47.0%)	59(44.7%)	121(91.7%)
Through library websites	36(27.3%)	84(63.6%)	120(90.9%)
Through co-worker and/or professional colleagues	39(29.5%)	82(62.1%)	121(91.7%)
Through formal training from library schools	28(21.2%)	92(69.7%)	120(90.9%)
Through tutorials in the use of library and Internet	15(11.4%)	105(79.5%)	120(90.9%)
Through the use of Search engines	41(31.1%)	81(61.4%)	122(92.4%)
Through the use of specific library website	28(21.2%)	94(71.2%)	122(92.4%)
Through workshops/ conferences and seminar	24(18.2%)	98(74.2%)	122(92.4%)

N not equal to 132 as some items of the Instruments were not filled by respondents

Table 4.0 depicts that almost half of respondents 62 (47.%) were aware of the existence of library 2.0 applications through communicating with friends/ colleagues, while 36 (27.3%) were aware of the existence of library 2.0 applications through library websites. About 28(21.2%) respondents got library 2.0 awareness through formal training from library schools. The table also indicates that 39 (29.5%) were aware of the existence of library 2.0 applications through communicating with co-workers and/or professionals colleagues. And only 15 (11.4.%) were aware of library 2.0 technology through tutorials in the use of library

and internet, and about 41 (31.1%) became aware of library 2.0 technology through the use of search engines, while majority of the respondents 105 (79.5%) did not consider search engines as sources of their awareness of library 2.0. From the table, it is also indicated that only 28 (21.2%) respondents became aware of library 2.0 technology through the use of library specific website, while majority of the respondents 94 (71.2%) did not consider the use of specific library website as a source of their Library 2.0 awareness. However, only 24 (18.2%) of the respondents became aware of library 2.0 technology through tutorials workshops/conferences and seminar, while majority of the respondents 98 (74.2%) did not regard workshops/conferences and seminar as source of their awareness of library 2.0.

Summary of the Findings

1. In response to the level of library 2.0 awareness, the finding reveals that, though librarians in universities in Kano indicates varying degree of library 2.0 awareness (some highly aware, aware, not sure, not aware, highly not aware), the study established that majority 86 (65.2%) of librarians in universities in Kano were highly aware that library 2.0 technologies are employed in libraries. This corroborates the submission of Esse (2013), where her study shows high level awareness of library 2.0 among information professionals at covenant university Ogun state, Nigeria.
2. Also with regards to librarians' awareness of individual library 2.0 tools applied for library services, the study established that all common library 2.0 applications are known by the librarians with facebook being the most known library 2.0 tool. Followed by twitter, instant messaging, you tube, blog wikis, RSS feeds, podcast and vodcast, and flickr being the least known.
3. the study established that, the major source the librarians' awareness of individual library 2.0 tools is the immediate friends/ colleagues, followed by Search engines, co-worker and/or professional colleagues, library websites, formal training from library schools, workshops/ conferences and seminar and tutorials being the least in that order.

Conclusion

The debate of web 2.0 in a place of academia has been an occurring phenomenon since its inception. It seems that many librarians in Nigeria are so engaged with these tools, but in so many ways are yet to relate it to their library services. Library staff and users need to establish helping relationship through library 2.0 technology practice in order to complement interaction and collaboration outside the library building. Awareness of this technology in university libraries will help library staff by enhancing and shaping any negative behavior that may be harmful to the users' academic life. To achieve this, the following recommendations need to be put forward as the guiding principles.

Recommendations:

1. There should be adequate staff special training and re-training on the importance of library 2.0 technologies and how to use them for service delivery through workshops and seminars.
2. There is the need for the Provision of high level user-education on how to use library 2.0 for knowledge sharing which can be done through orientation organized for all university community who are the potential users of the library.
3. There is the need to enlighten and sensitize the library management and staff on the existence and importance of library 2.0 technologies in modern world. This will definitely help in creating technology awareness among library staff.

4. The concept of library 2.0 technology applications should be a major component in the Library and Information Science curriculum of Nigerian universities.

References

- Al-Daihani, S. (2009). Perceptions of Academic Librarians in Kuwait of Library 2.0. *Digest of Middle East Studies*, 18(2), 27-39. Doi:1111/j.1949-3606.2009.tb01103.x Retrieved from: [Onlinelibrary.wiley.com>Home Political Science > Middle Eastern Politics > Digest of Middle East Studies Volume 18 Issue 2](http://Onlinelibrary.wiley.com/Home/Political%20Science/Middle%20Eastern%20Politics/Digest%20of%20Middle%20East%20Studies/Volume%2018/Issue%202)
- Al-Daihani, S. (2009). The knowledge of Web 2.0 by library and information science academics. *Education for Information*, 27(1), 39-55.
- Angus, E., Thelwall, M., & Stuart, D. (2008). General patterns of tag usage among university groups in Flickr. *Online Information Review*, 32 (1), pp. 89-101. Retrieved from Emerald Database.
- Anunobi, C.V. and Ogbonna, A. U. (2012). "Web 2.0 Uses by Librarians in a State in Nigeria" Awka, Anambra State. Retrieved from :[www.iiste.org >Home>Vol 2, No 5 \(2012\)](http://www.iiste.org/Home/Vol%202/No%205/2012)
- Atulomah, B. C (2010) "Awareness of Library 2.0 and Participating in the Global Discussion among Librarians in Southwest Nigeria Universities" Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, Ogun State, Nigeria.
- Baro, E.E and Idiodi, E.O (2013) "Awareness and Use of Web 2.0 Tools by Librarians in University Libraries in Nigeria" *OCLC Systems and Services*, Vol. 29 iss: 3 pp. 170-188 Retrieved from: www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm...
- Casey, M. & Savastinuk, L. (2006). Library 2.0. *Library Journal*, 131(14).
- Casey, M. E. & Savastinuk, L. C. (2006). Library 2.0: Service for the Next-generation Library. *Library journal*. 9(1). Retrieved from: <http://cil733.pbworks.com/f/Library+2.0+Journal.pdf>
- Charnigo, L. & Barnett-Ellis, P. (2007). Checking out Facebook.com: the Impact of a Digital Trend on Academic Libraries. *Information Technology and Libraries*, 26(1).
- Currie, J. P. (2010). Web 2.0 for reference services staff training and communication. *Reference Services Review*, 38(1), pp. 152-157. Retrieved from: http://worksbeepress.com/jane_currie/2
- Esse, U.C (2013) "Library 2.0: Perception, Knowledge and Reception among Information Professionals at Covenant University Library" Retrieved Thursday 3rd July, 2014. www.connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles...
- Harinarayana, N. S. and Raju, N.V. (2010). Web 2.0 features in university library web sites. *The Electronic Library*, 28(1), pp.69-88
- Hosseini, E. and Hashempour, L. (n.d). The Status of Librarians' Knowledge Sharing by the Usage of Web 2.0 Tools: A Case Study of Central Libraries of Tabriz Governmental Universities. Iran: Alzahra University. Retrieved Wednesday, 3rd April, 2019 from: http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Leila_Hashempour/publication/280386723

- Kamba, M.A (2008) "The Changing Role of Researchers in Nigeria: The Internet as an Alternative Future to Modernity" Retrieved from: www.digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcont...
- Khan, I. (2013). Library, Librarian and Library Services in Web 2.0 Environment. International Journal of Digital Library Services Vol.3, Issue-4
- Khiwa, B. N (2010). Perception and Usage of Web 2.0 Tools by Librarians in Estonian University Libraries. Retrieved Tuesday 14th April, 2015 from: <http://e-ait.tlulib.ee/id/eprint/133>
- Kolonay, B. (2010). "Academic Law Library Use of Web 2.0 Tools" Retrieved Nov.2012 from: <https://lib.law.washington.edu/lawlibrarianship/CILLPapers/Kolonay2010.pdf>
- Maness, J. M. (2006). Library 2.0 Theory: Web 2.0 and Its Implications for Libraries. Webology, 3(2), Article 25. Retrieved August 17, 2013, from <http://www.webology.org/2006/v3n2/a25.html>
- Mansor, y. and Rabea Adawiy Idris, S. (2010). "Perceptions, Awareness and Acceptance of library 2.0 applications among librarians at the International Islamic University Malaysia" Retrieved Nov.2012 from: <http://www.webology.org/2010/v7n2/a81.html>
- Mulatiningish, B. and Johnson, K. (2013). "Indonesian LIS Professionals" Understanding of Library 2.0: a pilot study" IFLA WLIC 2013 conference poster. Retrieved Sunday 20th July, 2014. From: www.bmulatiningish.wordpress.com/ifla-w...
- Muneja, P.S and Abungu, A.K (2012). "Application of Web 2.0 tools in Delivering Library Services: A Case of selected Libraries in Tanzania" Presented at SCECSAL XXth Conference hosted by KLA on 4th-8th June 2012 venue Laico Regency Hotel Nairobi, Kenya.
- O'Reilly, T. (2005). What Is Web 2.0: Design Patterns and Business Models for the Next Generation of Software. Retrieved April 20, 2013, from <http://www.oreilly.com/..what-is-web-20.html>.
- Olasina, G. (2011). The Use of Web 2.0 Tools and Social Networking Sites by Librarians, Information Professionals, and Other Professionals in Workplaces in Nigeria" PNLA Quarterly, the official publication of the Pacific Northwest Library Association Volume 75, no. 3 (Spring 2011). Available at: www.pnla.org.
- Scottish Library and Information Council [SLIC] and the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals in Scotland [CILIPS]. (no date) A Guide to Using Web 2.0 in Libraries Retrieved June, 2013, from: <http://www.slainte.org.uk/files/pdf/web2/Web2GuidelinesFinal.pdf>
- Stephens, M. (2006). "Web 2.0 & Libraries: Best Practices for Social Software. In Library Technology Reports, 42(4) Chicago: ALA Techsource
- Tanja Merčun & Maja Žumer (2011). "Making Web 2.0 Work for Users and Libraries". In D.K. Gupta & R. Savard (Eds.) Marketing libraries in a Web 2.0 world (IFLA publications, 145) Berlin New York: De Gruyter :Saur, p.13-22.
- Thanuskodi, S. (2010). "Web 2.0 Awareness among Library and Information Science Professionals of the Engineering Colleges in Chennai City: A Survey" India: Library

and Information Science Wing, Directorate of Distance Education, Annamalai University. Retrieved Nov.2012 from: <http://www.krepublishers.com/02-Journals/JC/JC-01-0-000-10-Web/JC-01-2-000-10-Abst-PDF/JC-01-2-069-10-021-Thanuskodi-S/JC-01-2-069-10-021-Thanuskodi-S-Tt.pdf>

Thanuskodi, S. (2012). "Awareness of Library 2.0 Applications among Library and Information Science Professionals at Annamalai University, India" International Journal of Library Science 2012, 1(5): 75-83. Retrieved 19th November, 2013 from: www.article.sapub.org/10.5923.j.library...

Toivo, S. (n.d) "Social Media - The New Power of Political Influence" Centre for European Studies. Available at www.toivoajatuspaja.fi

Tripathi, M. (2009) "Use of Web2.0 tools by academic libraries" New Delhi, India: Indira Gandhi National Open University,. Retrieved from http://www.iatul.org/doclibrary/public/Conf_Proceedings/2009/Tripathi-text.pdf