

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)

Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Fall 9-11-2017

INFLUENCE OF INFORMATION LITERACY SKILLS ON USE OF WEB 2.0 TECHNOLOGIES BY STUDENTS IN TWO MONOTECHNICS IN OYO STATE, NIGERIA

JOHN OLUWASEYE ADEBAYO, CLN

University of Ibadan, NIGERIA, johnoluwaseye@yahoo.com

Idris Tunde SALau Mr

boldasventures@yahoo.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac>



Part of the [Collection Development and Management Commons](#), and the [Information Literacy Commons](#)

ADEBAYO, CLN, JOHN OLUWASEYE and SALau, Idris Tunde Mr, "INFLUENCE OF INFORMATION LITERACY SKILLS ON USE OF WEB 2.0 TECHNOLOGIES BY STUDENTS IN TWO MONOTECHNICS IN OYO STATE, NIGERIA" (2017). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 1613.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1613>

**INFLUENCE OF INFORMATION LITERACY SKILLS ON USE OF WEB 2.0
TECHNOLOGIES BY STUDENTS IN TWO MONOTECHNICS IN OYO STATE,
NIGERIA**

BY

ADEBAYO JOHN OLUWASEYE, CLN

Department of Library Archival and Information Studies, University of Ibadan, Nigeria

and

SALAU IDRIS TUNDE

**Serials Librarian, Oyo State College Agriculture and Technology, Igbo-Ora, Oyo State,
Nigeria**

ABSTRACT

This study investigated influence of information literacy skills on web 2.0 technologies use by students in two monotechnics in Oyo State Nigeria using descriptive survey design of correlational type. Four (4) research questions were raised; one (1) research hypothesis that was tested at 0.5 level of significance was formulated. The population of the study comprised two monotechnics (Federal College of Forestry (FCF) and Federal College of Animal Health and Production (FCAHP). With the use of structured questionnaire, data was collected from samples of 273 respondents that were purposively selected with aid of sampling frame. Simple frequency count of percentage distribution in table was used to present the demographic information and as well answer the research questions, while Pearson's correlation and multiple regression analysis were used to test the hypotheses. The results revealed that respondents in both monotechnics had skills in using Web 2.0 technologies. Most of the respondents regularly used Web 2.0 technologies for personal development, research and project writing. Meanwhile, slow internet network, erratic power supply, and lack of information literacy skills were the main barriers to the use of Web 2.0 technologies by the respondents. The results showed that there was a significant positive correlation between Information Literacy Skills and use of Web 2.0 technologies ($r = .259^{**}$; $df = 110$; $p < 0.05$) in FCF and ($r = .167^*$; $df = 158$; $p < 0.05$) in FCAHP. Recommendations were made to both the monotechnics administrators and students.

Keywords: Information Literacy Skills, ICTs Infrastructures, Internet Use, and Web 2.0 Technologies

Introduction

Monotechnics offers a mono-disciplinary or a cluster of related programmes such as Agriculture, Electrical Engineering, Catering and Hotel Management, Surveying, Accountancy etc. leading to the award of National Diploma (ND) and Higher National Diploma (HND). Monotechnic curriculums often include the professional courses needed to practice in the field at the level of training, general studies and computer courses. However, the basic science courses to be included may depend on the field of specialization. In order to achieve the educational goal of monotechnics, National Board for Technical Education (2014) stated that there are established libraries to support the students' learning and research information needs. The library could be well stocked with relevant books and non-book items, ventilated and properly staffed coupled with sufficient e-learning materials especially in the era of Web-based communication technologies.

Previously held concepts of personal expression, privacy, and interpersonal relationships have been replaced by re-envisioned Web 2.0 conceptualizations. As students strive to get national and international recognition, and in order to remain competitive with their counterparts, higher institutions around the world are moving rapidly towards the incorporation of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) into all aspects of teaching and learning (Abulibdeh and Hassan, 2011). To this end, various ICTs are being experimented, implemented and reviewed by different educational institutions to know the best technologies that will suit the needs of the staff and students in their schools. In recent times, monotechnics have invested heavily in Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs). Web 2.0 is one the latest ICTs tools that are currently being adopted by monotechnics across the globe to enhance their academic service delivery.

The impact of ICTs on learning is currently in relation to use of digital media, computers and the internet to facilitate teaching and learning. ICTs are the technologies used in conveying, manipulating and storing of data by electronic means. They provide an array of powerful tools that may help in transforming the present isolated teacher-centered and text-bound classrooms into rich, student-focused, interactive knowledge environments. New technologies are impacting the daily work of academic libraries and librarians more and more, with Web 2.0 services at the fore front. The focus of this study is web 2.0 use by students. Meanwhile web 2.0 is only accessible through ICT infrastructure, internet. Justifying its relevance to library operations,

McManus (2009) opined that web 2.0 services are becoming part of library patrons' primary online activities when accessing information. Hence, exploration of web 2.0 as a concept is however imperative.

Web 2.0 refers to the second generation of web based services that emphasize online collaboration and sharing among users (Abdullah et.al, 2013). Web 2.0 has changed the traditional chain of knowledge transfer, and students are no longer just consumers of knowledge but they also participate actively in generating and creating knowledge, through the application of Web 2.0 tools. Since the launch of Web 2.0, the internet has undergone lot of revolutionary changes which makes many software applications portable, responsive and flexible to use with many internet enabled devices. It enables users to participate directly in the creation, refinement and distribution of shared content. These new technologies change the way documents are created, used, shared, and distributed, and make sharing content among participants much easier than in the past (Abdullah, et.al , 2007). Yoo and Huang (2011) noted that Web 2.0 is a collective term for a group of web-based technologies that broaden users' communication capabilities and options. Examples of Web 2.0 given by these authors included blogs, wikis, RSS feeds, online video sharing (e.g., YouTube, Google Video), and online social networking sites (e.g., Facebook, LinkedIn, Ning). However, when users' first experiences of system usage were positive, the information about the system started to spread to other students. Therefore, certain set of skills are imperative for students while using Web 2.0 technologies.

Statement of the problem

Web 2.0 technologies are interactive and independent for connecting with people and information resources. Observations have shown that students in monotechnics in Oyo State seldom use web 2.0 tools for their academic activities; parents, lecturers and librarian are worried that present age students in Nigerian higher institution spend much time on the internet chatting rather than focusing on their academic activities. Literature also show that most Nigerian students do not have the required information literacy skills necessary for locating and retrieving relevant information in this era of the information explosion. However, despite the opportunities presented by Web 2.0 technologies use to enhance academic activities, literature has not revealed much on the influence of Information Literacy Skills (ILS) on use of Web 2.0 technologies for academic activities by students. It appears there is a low information literacy skill among

Nigerian monotechnic students when it comes to use of Web 2.0 technologies for academic activities. Currently, few empirical studies exist in Nigeria that examined the use of web 2.0 for learning among monotechnic students. It is to this end that this study sets out to assess influence of information literacy skills of students in two monotechnics in Oyo State, Nigeria; identify the purposes for which web 2.0 are used by the students; determine the frequency of use of web 2.0 technologies; find out the challenges students encounter while using web 2.0. The selected technologies were considered appropriate for the study because they are popular and commonly used by students in higher institutions as observed by the researchers while the two schools were considered suitable because of their location in the State Capital, availability of modern ICT facilities and easy internet connectivity.

Research questions

This study was carried out to provide answers to the following questions:

1. What are information literacy skills of students in two monotechnics in Oyo State Nigeria?
2. What are the purposes for which Web 2.0 technologies are used by students in the monotechnics in Oyo State Nigeria?
3. What is the frequency of use of Web 2.0 technologies by students in the monotechnics?
4. What are the challenges to the use of Web 2.0 technologies by students in monotechnics in Oyo State Nigeria?

Research hypothesis

The research hypothesis below guided the study and was tested at 0.05 level of significance:

1. H_{01} : There is no significant relationship between information literacy skills and use of Web 2.0 technologies.

Literature Review

Use of web 2.0 by Tertiary Institution Students

Web 2.0 is an emergent key driver changing learning paradigms at academic institutions. Stern (2012) affirmed that Web 2.0 is a term that describes the changing trends in the use of World Wide Web technology and Web design that aim to enhance creativity, secure information sharing, increase collaboration, and improve the functionality of the Web as we know it (Web

1.0). These have led to the development and evolution of Web-based communities and hosted services, such as social-networking sites (i.e. Facebook, MySpace), video sharing sites (i.e. YouTube), wikis, blogs, etc. A wiki, for instance, is a collaborative website that anyone within the community of users can contribute to or edit. A wiki can be open to a global audience or can be restricted to a select network or community. Wikis can cover a specific topic or subject area. Wikis also make it easy to search or browse for information. Many wikis are open to alteration by the general public. Many edits can be made in real-time and appear almost instantly online (Stern, 2012). Aside wiki, other web 2.0 technologies are also used for different purposes by students in higher institutions.

Besides technology, Web 2.0 challenges intellectual property and transform consumers in active users creating and curating knowledge. The use of Web 2.0 technologies can support innovative teaching methods and is associated with concepts like communities of practice, syndicated content, learning as a creative activity, peer-to-peer learning, creation of personal learning environments, and non-formal education (Bartolomé, 2008). Such tools can be used to develop Learning 2.0 strategies that can enhance student motivation, improve participation, facilitate learning and social skills, stimulate higher order cognitive skills, and increase self-directed learning (Redecker, 2009). Ajjan and Hartshorne (2007) conducted a study to assess faculty's awareness of the benefits of Web 2.0 to supplement in-class learning and better understand faculty's decisions to adopt these tools using the decomposed theory of planned behavior (DTPB) model. Findings indicated that while some faculty members feel that some Web 2.0 technologies could improve students' learning, their interaction with faculty and with other peers, their writing abilities, and their satisfaction with the course; few choose to use them in the classroom. Additional results indicated that faculty's attitude and their perceived behavioral control are strong indicators of their intention to use Web 2.0.

Research about the use of Web 2.0 tools in the classroom has shown that the use of technology is appreciated by students; linked to greater motivation; technologies like blogs have been responsible for improvements in students' writing (Goodwin-Jones, 2005; Stanley, 2006).). As reported by Lemke, Coughlin, Garcia, Reifsneider and Baas (2009), the exciting aspect of students' familiarity with these technologies is that they not only access and consume but also develop, edit, and share their work with classmates and others via the Web. Research is needed regarding the tensions schools and higher institutions, students and lecturers are experiencing, as

well as the ease of use of Web 2.0 technologies for learning in order to help students learn to use them beneficially. Though higher institutions' administrators see potential in these Web 2.0 tools, they have concerns regarding the existence and implementation of adequate policies to monitor and support students adopting Web 2.0 for academic matters. Hence, it is important to understand what may be affecting students' use of Web 2.0 technologies regarding what is needed, where to locate, how to access, and how to evaluate the source. This will help the academic libraries to predict, explain, and increase user acceptance of the web 2.0 technology.

Information Literacy Skills and Use of Web 2.0 Technologies by Students of Tertiary Institutions

Information literacy is a set of skills which requires an individual to recognise when information is needed and has the ability to locate, evaluate and use effectively the needed information (ALA, 1990). Information is very important in every society and the growth of information due to the industrial and information technology revolution leaves people with avalanche of information and information resources to interact with. Ojedokun and Lumade (2005) describe information literacy as the ability to locate, evaluate, manage and use information from a range of sources not only for problem solving, but also for decision making and research. Information literacy can no longer be defined without considering technology literacy in order for individuals to function in an information-rich, technology infused world.

The definition implies that a person considered to be information literate is knowledgeable to determine the nature and extent of the information needed; access information effectively and efficiently; evaluate information and its sources critically and incorporate selected information into his or her knowledge base; use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose and understand the economic, legal and social issues surrounding the use of information. It has been observed that undergraduates often experience difficulty searching and using information effectively, this may be because they are ignorant or have low information literacy skills. Lack of information literacy competence could be at the root of undergraduates' information search difficulties and library use. Cultivation of appropriate information literacy skills is pertinent to undergraduates' ability to search and use information effectively (Ilogho and Nkika, 2014).

Nazir and Shabir (2015) conducted a survey at a horticulture and forestry university in Pradesh, India to identify the most popular places, gadgets, searching tools and techniques adopted by undergraduates while searching electronic information resources (EIRs). They reported that 'Google' is the most popular search engine used by all scientists and students of the university with all (100%) of them using it as first priority, followed by 'Yahoo' as second choice. However, the fact that majority (79.8) of the users are searching the information through 'title' approach, followed by 'keyword/subject term' (58.6%) is contrary to the findings which substantiate that 'keyword' approach is the popular most search approach across the literary world. The library users are not well versed with most of the advanced search techniques and resort to search information through simple search slots.

Ivanitskaya, Hanisko, Garrison, Janson and Vibbert (2012) used a qualitative approach to elicit students' reflections on building health information literacy skills at Central Michigan University. The findings revealed that students intended to develop library skills, Internet skills and information evaluation skills. The researchers concluded their study by stating that it is very important to provide health pre-professional students with resources to improve skills on their own, remote access to library staff members, and instruction on the complexity of building health literacy skills, while also building relationships among students, librarians, and faculty.

According to Rainie (2010), 73% of teenagers today have created and shared content online. Not only is this group turning to their peers and friends in their social networks for information, but they are also creating the information themselves. Even though the Net Generation are adept at creating, sharing, searching for, and finding information online, they are limited to the Web 2.0 technologies with which they are familiar and the Information Literacy skills that they have picked up along the way (Koltay, 2010). The problem that libraries may face is determining the best course of action for meeting the needs of this user group (Hendrix, 2011).

The profiles of new library users have changed drastically. Rather than imposing traditional academic standards of authority when it comes to research, Web 2.0 librarians can help their patrons especially students understand how to use a Web 2.0 tool as a starting point and how to move their search fluidly from there into a library database. The most important responsibility of the Web 2.0 librarian may not be to teach Information Literacy, but rather to build upon and refine the skills that students already have (Koltay, 2010). However, knowledge of the challenges faced while using web 2.0 technologies is essential.

Challenges Faced in the Use of Web 2.0 Technologies by Students of Tertiary Institutions

Literature has documented the challenge of getting students and educators to adopt Web 2.0 tools for educational purposes (Jucevičienė and Valinevičienė, 2010). Some research explained that the limited adoption is due to lack of understanding of the behaviour of users thereby shifting focus from what users want to what is technologically achievable (Ennew and Fernandez-Young, 2006). Though innovative educators appreciate and use Web 2.0 technologies, others are afraid that these technologies would disrupt young people's engagement with "traditional" education (Njenga and Fourie, 2010). These challenges and debates on them have been noticed in higher education of developed economies (Jucevičienė and Valinevičienė, 2010). However, these technologies are potentially useful in learning activities.

Furthermore, in most monotechnics there is apparently no concern about an acceptable use policy for ICT and Web 2.0 websites, even though the social networking sites and tools hold tremendous academic and social benefits for students and organizations in this place libraries and information centres. It has been observed that social networking sites and Web 2.0 tools have been found to be very useful to professionals, students and lecturers in the developed world. Conversely, the use of these ICT tools is not prominent in the developing world, including in Africa and Nigeria. Much of the existing academic research on Facebook has focused on identity presentation and privacy concerns (Haythornthwaite, 2005). He further argued that considering the amount of information Facebook participants provide about themselves, the relatively open nature of the information, and the lack of privacy controls enacted by the users.

One of the most prominent problems hindering the use of Web 2.0 is non-availability of proper learning and training environment in the usage and then implementation of these applications in some Nigerian higher institutions libraries (Aharony, 2008). Like all human institutions, networks can work for good or ill and lecturers and Management of higher institution of learning are swift to conclude that students accomplish less academic work because of time spent using social networks and web 2.0 tools perhaps to the detriment of overall academic activities. It would appear that the use by students of social networking and Web 2.0 in higher institutions is, in reality, an excuse for them not to study or, to get prepared for examinations elsewhere.

Methodology

The research design adopted for the study is descriptive survey of correlational type. As contained in the data obtained at the admissions offices of the two colleges, the study population comprised all registered students of both National Diploma (ND) and Higher National Diploma (HND) of Federal College of Forestry, Jericho, Ibadan and Federal College of Animal Health and Production, Moor-Plantation, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. According to the 2015 record of Federal College of Forestry, Jericho, Ibadan there are of 562 students, while in Federal College of Animal Health and Production, Moor- Plantation Ibadan, the total number is 1000 students respectively. Double stage sampling technique was used for the study. Four departments with highest number of students in both institutions were purposively selected; this is to ensure high representation that will be close to the population of the study. In Federal College of Forestry, 114 respondents were selected from the departments of: Agric Technology, Forestry Technology, Agric Extension and Management and Horticultural Technology. While in Federal College of Animal health and Production, 169 respondents were selected from the departments of: Animal Health and Production Technology, Statistics, Science Laboratory Technology, and Animal Health. A sampling fraction of 25 % was used to select the sample size for each of the departments, giving a total of 283. Gay and Airasen (2003) stated that one thumb rule for determining an appropriate sample size for descriptive research is that it should consist of at least 10 – 20 % of population under study. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, the population is large enough and 25% is considered adequate as a true representation of the population.

Table 1: Sample size of the study

FEDERAL COLLEGE OF FORESTRY			FEDERAL COLLEGE OF ANIMAL HEALTH AND PRODUCTION		
DEPARTMENTS	POPULATION	SAMPLE	DEPARTMENTS	POPULATION	SAMPLE
Agric technology	125	31	Animal health & production tech.	324	81
Forestry tech.	126	31	Science lab tech.	113	28
Agric extension	108	27	Statistics	127	32
Horticulture Tech.	98	25	Animal health	110	28

Total	457	114		674	169
--------------	------------	------------	--	------------	------------

Data collection instrument

The research collection instrument was a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire was in four sections: A, B, C and D. Section A focused on demographic data of the respondents. Section B contains items that measure the information literacy skills of the respondents as adapted from Ali1, et al, (2010) “Information literacy skills of Engineering students” and Beutelspacher (2013) “Testing information literacy for all ages”. The response format was the use of the Likert scale of Strongly Agree =4, Agree =3, Disagree =2 and Strongly Disagree =1.

Section C was on computer self-efficacy scale with a total number of eleven (11) questions adapted from previous related studies on computer self-efficacy by Sam, Othman, and Nordin (2005), and Hage (2005). Section D was on use of Web 2.0 technologies. It detailed the purpose of use of web 2.0 technologies which comprises of these activities: examination preparation, Assignment completion, Group discussion, Project writing, Research, Continuous assessment and Preparation with response scale (4=Very Regularly Use, 3=Regularly Use, 2=Sometimes Use and 1=Never Use); Frequency of use of web 2.0 technologies which comprises of these activities: examination preparation, Assignment completion, Group discussion, Project writing, Research, Continuous assessment and Preparation with response scale (5=Daily, 4=Weekly, 3=Monthly, 2=Occasionally and 1=Never); Perceived usefulness scale with a total number of thirteen (13) questions adapted from Davis (1989) “Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology”; Perceived ease of use scale with a total number of fourteen (14) questions adapted from Davis (1989) “Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology”; and Barriers to the use of web 2.0 technologies with eight (8) likely barriers.

The internal consistency test compares two different versions of the same instrument, to ensure that there is a correlation and that they measure the same thing. To test the internal consistency of the instrument, Cronbach-Alpha reliability method will be used during the pilot study which will involve 30 students outside the main departments selected for study. The researchers administered the questionnaire on the respondents. The essence of the self-administration of the instrument was to avoid unnecessary mistakes and to explain difficult areas in the questionnaire whenever the need arises. The researchers visited the selected departments in

the chosen institutions and the filled questionnaires were collected back immediately by the researcher while the ones that were correctly filled were considered suitable for data analysis. The data analysis method used was descriptive statistical measures such as percentages and frequency distribution which show the questionnaire response rate. The Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) was used for the analysis. Descriptive statistics such as percentages mean and standard deviation were used to provide answers to the research questions. Pearson correlation was used to analyse hypotheses 1-4 and multiple regression for five.

Questionnaire administration and return rate

Table 2: Questionnaire administration and return rate

FEDERAL COLLEGE OF FORESTRY (FCF)			FEDERAL COLLEGE OF ANIMAL HEALTH AND PRODUCTION (FCAHP)		
DEPARTMENTS	Distribution	Return	DEPARTMEN TS	Distribution	Return
Agric technology	31	31	Animal health & production tech.	81	76
Forestry Tech.	31	29	Science lab tech.	28	26
Agric Extension	27	26	Statistics	32	29
Horticulture Tech.	25	25	Animal health	28	28
Total	114	111		169	159

A total number of two hundred and eighty three (283) copies of the questionnaire were administered to respondents in both monotechnics (Federal College of Forestry (FCF), and Federal College of Animal Health and Production (FCAHP). One hundred and fourteen (114) copies were administered at Federal College of Forestry, out of which one hundred and eleven (111) copies were duly filled and returned giving a response rate of 97.4%. One hundred and sixty nine copies (169) copies were administered to the respondents at Federal College of Animal

Health and Production as one hundred and fifty nine copies (159) were duly filled and returned giving 94.1% response rate.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Demographic characteristics of respondents

Table 3: Demographic characteristics of respondents

Level of study	Federal College of Forestry (FCF)								Federal College of Animal Health and Production (FCAHP)							
	Agric Tech		Forestry Tech		Agric Extension		Horticulture Tech		Animal health & production Tech		Science lab tech		Statistics		Animal health	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
HND II	5	16.1	4	13.8	5	19.2	4	16.0	8	10.5	3	11.5	4	13.8	5	17.9
HND I	15	48.4	13	44.8	10	38.5	9	36.0	47	61.8	14	53.8	14	48.3	11	39.3
ND II	5	16.1	4	13.8	5	19.2	5	20.0	9	11.8	4	15.4	5	17.2	5	17.9
ND I	6	19.4	8	27.6	6	23.1	7	28.0	12	15.8	5	19.2	6	20.7	7	25.0
Age																
35-39yrs	-	-	2	6.9			2	8.0	5	6.6	2	7.7	2	6.9	4	14.3
30-34yrs	4	12.9	4	13.8	6	23.1	3	12.0	5	6.6	2	7.7	-	-	2	7.1
25-29yrs	8	25.8	5	17.2	8	30.8	5	20.0	9	11.8	3	11.5	4	13.8	6	21.4
21-24yrs	12	38.7	9	31.0	6	23.1	8	32.0	46	60.5	14	53.8	17	58.6	10	35.7
16-20yrs	7	22.6	9	31.0	6	23.1	7	28.0	11	14.5	5	19.2	6	20.7	6	21.4
Gender																
Female	18	58.1	16	55.2	14	53.8	13	52.0	54	71.1	18	69.2	21	72.4	13	46.4
Male	13	41.9	13	44.8	12	46.2	12	48.0	22	28.9	8	30.8	8	27.6	15	53.6
Marital Status																
Married	5	16.1	3	10.3	4	15.4	4	16.0	6	7.9	2	7.7	2	6.9	4	14.3
Single	26	83.9	26	89.7	22	84.6	21	84.0	70	92.1	24	92.3	27	93.1	24	85.7
Religion																
ATR	2	6.5	3	10.3	3	11.5	2	8.0	2	2.6	1	3.8	-	-	1	3.6
Islam	6	19.4	5	17.2	5	19.2	6	24.0	9	11.8	3	11.5	5	17.2	7	25.0
Christianity	23	74.2	21	72.4	18	69.2	17	68.0	65	85.5	22	84.6	24	82.8	20	71.4

Personal monthly allowance																
15,000-19,999	2	6.5	3	10.3	2	7.7	2	8.0	8	10.5	3	11.5	4	13.8	6	21.4
10,000-14,999	18	58.1	17	58.6	12	46.2	14	56.0	54	71.1	17	65.4	21	72.4	16	57.1
5,000-9,999	7	22.6	5	17.2	9	34.6	4	16.0	11	14.5	4	15.4	1	3.4	5	17.9
<5,000	4	12.9	4	13.8	3	11.5	5	20.0	3	3.9	2	7.7	3	10.3	1	3.6
Place of Residence																
Off campus	24	77.4	23	79.3	19	73.1	18	72.0	62	81.6	21	80.8	22	75.9	17	60.7
Hostels Schools	7	22.6	6	20.7	7	26.9	7	28.0	14	18.4	5	19.2	7	24.1	11	39.3
N	31		29		26		25		76		26		29		28	

Descriptive statistics of frequencies and percentages were used for the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Table 3 reveals the level of study of the respondents and most of the respondents (47) in Federal College of Forestry (FCF) and (86) in Federal College of Animal Health and Production (FCAHP) were in HND I. Very few respondents (19) in FCF and (23) in FCAHP were in ND I. On age distributions,(35) in FCF and (87) in FCAHP were between 21-24 years category, while (29) in FCF, (28) in FCAHP were between 16-20 years category. Only (4) respondents in FCF and (13) in FCAHP were between ages 35-39 years .Findings revealed that there were more females than males in both monotechnics. Table 4.2 shows that there were 61(55.0%) female respondents in FCF and 106(66.7%) in FCAHP. The analysis indicated a high rate of single students in both monotechnics with response rate 95(85.6%) in FCF and 145(91.2%) in FCAHP. There were more Christians than Muslims, and African Traditional Religion in both monotechnics with response rate 79(71.2%) in FCF and 131(82.4%) in FCAHP. In addition, most of the respondents in both monotechnics (61) in FCF and (108) in FCAHP had personal monthly allowances ranges between ₦10,000-14,999. Only (16) in FCF and (9) in FCAHP had monthly allowance of less than ₦5,000. This means that the respondents were averagely rich financially. Finally, table 4.2 shows that majority of the respondents in both monotechnics lived off campus with response rate (84) in FCF and (122) in FCAHP.

Answers to research questions

Research question one: What are information literacy skills of students in two monotechnics in Oyo State Nigeria?

Table 4.a: Information literacy skills of students in Federal College of Forestry (FCF)

S/ N	Statements: I	Agric Tech								Forestry Tech							
		SA		A		D		SD		SA		A		D		SD	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	understand that accurate and complete information is the basis for intelligent decision making	6	19.4	21	67.7	3	9.7	1	3.2	4	13.8	17	58.6	5	17.2	3	10.3
2	know how to locate needed information on Web 2.0 technologies	20	64.5	3	9.7	6	19.4	2	6.5	18	62.1	4	13.8	5	17.2	2	6.9
3	can formulate appropriate questions on Web 2.0 technologies based on my information needs	3	9.7	23	74.2	4	12.9	1	3.2	3	10.3	20	69.0	3	10.3	3	10.3
4	can recognize potential sources of information on Web 2.0 technologies			5	16.1	24	77.4	2	6.5	1	3.4	3	10.3	22	75.9	3	10.3
5	know the structure of the World Wide Web (www)	4	12.9	22	71.0	4	12.9	1	3.2	5	17.2	19	65.5	3	10.3	2	6.9
6	have the capacity to understand a research topic by using Web 2.0 technologies	23	74.2	4	12.9	4	12.9			2	6.9	21	72.4	2	6.9	4	13.8
7	can identify key concepts and terms on Web 2.0 technologies	4	12.9	19	61.3	3	9.7	5	16.1	6	20.7	17	58.6	3	10.3	3	10.3
8	am familiar with the different types of search engines	21	67.7	4	12.9	4	12.9	2	6.5	15	51.7	6	20.7	3	10.3	5	17.2
9	know how to expand and refine search to access and retrieve needed information from Web 2.0 technologies	2	6.5	25	80.6	3	9.7	1	3.2	2	6.9	22	75.9	1	3.4	4	13.8
10	can develop successful search strategies on Web 2.0 technologies	5	16.1	21	67.7	1	3.2	4	12.9	4	13.8	18	62.1	1	3.4	6	20.7
11	can evaluate information on Web 2.0	2	6.5	25	80.6	1	3.2	3	9.7	4	13.8	17	58.6	4	13.8	4	13.8

	technologies no matter what the source				6							6		8		8	
12	can organize information for practical application on Web 2.0 technologies	20	64.5	2	6.5	3	9.7	6	19.4	16	55.2	5	17.2	3	10.3	5	17.2
13	can cite information sources from Web 2.0 technologies correctly	4	12.9	2	6.5	24	77.4	1	3.2	2	6.9	4	13.8	17	58.6	6	20.7
14	can summarize the content of a document on Web 2.0 technologies	3	9.7	24	77.4	2	6.5	2	6.5	3	10.3	19	65.5	3	10.3	4	13.8
15	can integrate new information into an existing body of knowledge on Web 2.0 technologies			3	9.7	25	80.6	3	9.7			1	3.4	24	82.8	4	13.8
16	can use information in critical thinking and problem solving	3	9.7	1	3.2	22	71.0	5	16.1	1	3.4	2	6.9	19	65.5	7	24.1
17	understand how to use Web 2.0 technologies to search for needed information	21	67.7			5	16.1	5	16.1	18	62.1	2	6.9	4	13.8	5	17.2
18	can use a thesaurus to get preferred vocabulary for a particular database on Web 2.0 technologies	22	71.0	22	71.0	4	12.9	4	12.9	5	17.2	12	41.4	7	24.1	5	17.2
19	know when to refer to an encyclopedia	2	6.5	22	71.0	3	9.7	4	12.9	5	17.2	16	55.2	3	10.3	5	17.2
20	can use the web effectively (web 2.0 services)	3	9.7	3	9.7	20	64.5	5	16.1	3	10.3	5	17.2	15	51.7	6	20.7
21	can generate information for other users (podcast wiki etc.)	23	74.2	3	9.7	2	6.5	3	9.7	15	51.7	3	10.3	6	20.7	5	17.2
22	can generate information from Web 2.0 technologies for different audiences	6	19.4	2	6.5	19	61.3	4	12.9	6	20.7	3	10.3	14	48.3	6	20.7
23	can find tags to index videos, photos etc.	20	64.5	4	12.9	3	9.7	4	12.9	16	55.2	4	13.8	4	13.8	5	17.2
24	can save my privacy online	4	12.9	21	67.7	2	6.5	4	12.9	4	13.8	17	58.6	3	10.3	5	17.2
25	am familiar with copyright law to guide against plagiarism	3	9.7	22	71.0	3	9.7	3	9.7	5	17.2	15	51.7	5	17.2	4	13.8

Table 4.b: Information literacy skills of students in Federal College of Forestry (FCF) (Cont'd)

S/ N	Statements: I	Agric Olfnoisnetxe								Horticulture Tech							
		SA		A		D		SD		SA		A		D		SD	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	understand that accurate and complete information is the basis for intelligent decision making	7	26.9	16	61.5	2	7.7	1	3.8	4	16.0	13	52.0	4	16.0	4	16.0
2	know how to locate needed information on Web 2.0 technologies	16	61.5	3	11.5	5	19.2	2	7.7	15	60.0	3	12.0	4	16.0	3	12.0
3	can formulate appropriate questions on Web 2.0 technologies based on my information needs	4	15.4	18	69.2	3	11.5	1	3.8	3	12.0	17	68.0	4	16.0	1	4.0
4	can recognize potential sources of information on Web 2.0 technologies	5	19.2			19	73.1	2	7.7	1	4.0	3	12.0	17	68.0	4	16.0
5	know the structure of the World Wide Web (www)	6	23.1	15	57.7	4	15.4	1	3.8	3	12.0	18	72.0	3	12.0	1	4.0
6	have the capacity to understand a research topic by using Web 2.0 technologies	18	69.2			5	19.2	3	11.5	1	4.0	19	76.0	2	8.0	3	12.0
7	can identify key concepts and terms on Web 2.0 technologies	3	11.5	14	53.8	4	15.4	5	19.2	4	16.0	13	52.0	4	16.0	4	16.0
8	am familiar with the different types of search engines	14	53.8	4	15.4	5	19.2	3	11.5	15	60.0	4	16.0	4	16.0	2	8.0
9	know how to expand and refine search to access and retrieve needed information from Web 2.0 technologies	2	7.7	22	84.6	1	3.8	1	3.8	2	8.0	17	68.0	3	12.0	3	12.0
10	can develop successful search strategies on Web 2.0 technologies	4	15.4	16	61.5	1	3.8	5	19.2	3	12.0	15	60.0	3	12.0	4	16.0
11	can evaluate information on Web 2.0 technologies no matter what the source	2	7.7	20	76.9	1	3.8	3	11.5	3	12.0	17	68.0	3	12.0	2	8.0
12	can organize information for practical application on Web 2.0 technologies	15	57.7	3	11.5	3	11.5	5	19.2	15	60.0	4	16.0	2	8.0	4	16.0

13	can cite information sources from Web 2.0 technologies correctly	4	15.4	3	11.5	18	69.2	1	3.8	2	8.0	4	16.0	15	60.0	4	16.0
14	can summarize the content of a document on Web 2.0 technologies	3	11.5	19	73.1	2	7.7	2	7.7	2	8.0	18	72.0	2	8.0	3	12.0
15	can integrate new information into an existing body of knowledge on Web 2.0 technologies			2	7.7	21	80.8	3	11.5	1	4.0	4	16.0	18	72.0	2	8.0
16	can use information in critical thinking and problem solving	2	7.7	2	7.7	17	65.4	5	19.2	2	8.0	3	12.0	14	56.0	6	24.0
17	understand how to use Web 2.0 technologies to search for needed information	16	61.5			5	19.2	5	19.2	13	52.0	2	8.0	4	16.0	6	24.0
18	can use a thesaurus to get preferred vocabulary for a particular database on Web 2.0 technologies	2	7.7	16	61.5	4	15.4	4	15.4	1	4.0	14	56.0	3	12.0	7	28.0
19	know when to refer to an encyclopedia	3	11.5	17	65.4	2	7.7	4	15.4	2	8.0	13	52.0	3	12.0	7	28.0
20	can use the web effectively (web 2.0 services)	3	11.5	3	11.5	17	65.4	3	11.5	3	12.0	2	8.0	16	64.0	4	16.0
21	can generate information for other users (podcast wiki etc.)	19	73.1	3	11.5	2	7.7	2	7.7	13	52.0	4	16.0	5	20.0	3	12.0
22	can generate information from Web 2.0 technologies for different audiences	7	26.9	2	7.7	13	50.0	4	15.4	2	8.0	4	16.0	10	40.0	9	36.0
23	can find tags to index videos, photos etc.	17	65.4	4	15.4	2	7.7	3	11.5	13	52.0	6	24.0	3	12.0	3	12.0
24	can save my privacy online	3	11.5	17	65.4	2	7.7	4	15.4	3	12.0	18	72.0	2	8.0	2	8.0
25	am familiar with copyright law to guide against plagiarism	3	11.5	18	69.2	2	7.7	3	11.5	2	8.0	17	68.0	4	16.0	2	8.0

Table 4.c: Information literacy skills of the students in FCAHP.

S/		Animal health & production Tech	Science lab tech
----	--	--	-------------------------

N	Statements: I	SA		A		D		SD		SA		A		D		SD	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	understand that accurate and complete information is the basis for intelligent decision making	8	10.5	51	67.1	11	14.5	6	7.9	3	11.5	15	57.7	5	19.2	3	11.5
2	know how to locate needed information on Web 2.0 technologies	57	75.0	8	10.5	8	10.5	3	3.9	19	73.1	3	11.5	3	11.5	1	3.8
3	can formulate appropriate questions on Web 2.0 technologies based on my information needs	5	6.6	71	93.4							24	92.3			2	7.7
4	can recognize potential sources of information on Web 2.0 technologies	3	3.9	6	7.9	62	81.6	5	6.6	1	3.8	2	7.7	20	76.9	3	11.5
5	know the structure of the World Wide Web (www)	7	9.2	66	86.8	3	3.9			3	11.5	22	84.6	1	3.8		
6	have the capacity to understand a research topic by using Web 2.0 technologies			59	77.6	6	7.9	11	14.5			20	76.9	2	7.7	4	15.4
7	can identify key concepts and terms on Web 2.0 technologies	10	13.2	55	72.4	5	6.6	6	7.9	4	15.4	18	69.2	2	7.7	2	7.7
8	am familiar with the different types of search engines	61	80.3	10	13.2	3	3.9	2	2.6	20	76.9	4	15.4	1	3.8	1	3.8
9	know how to expand and refine search to access and retrieve needed information from Web 2.0 technologies	6	7.9	64	84.2	3	3.9	3	3.9	3	11.5	21	80.8	1	3.8	1	3.8
10	can develop successful search strategies on Web 2.0 technologies	8	10.5	60	78.9	8	10.5			3	11.5	20	76.9			3	11.5
11	can evaluate information on Web 2.0 technologies no matter what the source	9	11.8	57	75.0	5	6.6	5	6.6	5	19.2	17	65.4	2	7.7	2	7.7
12	can organize information for practical application on Web 2.0 technologies	62	81.6	5	6.6	3	3.9	6	7.9	20	76.9	3	11.5	1	3.8	2	7.7
13	can cite information sources from Web 2.0 technologies correctly	6	7.9	4	5.3	55	72.4	11	14.5	2	7.7	2	7.7	16	61.5	6	23.1
14	can summarize the content of a	3	3.9	70	92.3	3	3.9			1	3.8	23	88.5			2	7.7

	document on Web 2.0 technologies				1								5				
15	can integrate new information into an existing body of knowledge on Web 2.0 technologies			3	3.9	70	92.1	3	3.9			1	3.8	24	92. 3	1	3.8
16	can use information in critical thinking and problem solving	3	3.9	2	2.6	63	82.9	8	10. 5	1	3.8	1	3.8	21	80. 8	3	11. 5
17	understand how to use Web 2.0 technologies to search for needed Olfnoitamrofni	56	73.7			9	11.8	11	14. 5	19	73.1			3	11. 5	4	15. 4
18	can use a thesaurus to get preferred vocabulary for a particular database on Web 2.0 technologies	7	9.2	53	69. 7	8	10.5	8	10. 5	3	11.5	16	61. 5	4	15. 4	3	11. 5
19	know when to refer to an encyclopedia	7	9.2	50	65. 8	7	9.2	12	15. 8	3	11.5	15	57. 7	3	11. 5	5	19. 2
20	can use the web effectively (web 2.0 services)	8	10.5	7	9.2	49	64.5	12	15. 8	3	11.5	3	11. 5	15	57. 7	5	19. 2
21	can generate information for other users (podcast wiki etc.)	46	60.5	5	6.6	13	17.1	12	15. 8	12	46.2	2	7.7	6	23. 1	6	23. 1
22	can generate information from Web 2.0 technologies for different audiences	10	13.2	52	68. 4	3	3.9	11	14. 5	4	15.4	1	3.8	17	65. 4	4	15. 4
23	can find tags to index videos, photos etc.	49	64.5	8	10. 5	8	10.5	11	14. 5	16	61.5	3	11. 5	3	11. 5	4	15. 4
24	can save my privacy online	8	10.5	53	69. 7	6	7.9	9	11. 8	3	11.5	18	69. 2	2	7.7	3	11. 5
25	am familiar with copyright law to guide against plagiarism	8	10.5	46	60. 5	11	14.5	11	14. 5	3	11.5	14	53. 8	5	19. 2	4	15. 4

Table 4.d: Information literacy skills of the students in FCAHP. (Cont'd)

S/ N	Statements: I	Olfscitsitats								Animal health							
		SA		A		D		SD		SA		A		D		SD	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	understand that accurate and complete information is the basis for intelligent decision making	1	3.4	16	55.2	7	24.1	5	17.2	4	14.3	12	42.9	8	28.6	4	14.3
2	know how to locate needed information on Web 2.0 technologies	21	72.4	2	6.9	4	13.8	2	6.9	15	53.6	5	17.9	6	21.4	2	7.1
3	can formulate appropriate questions on Web 2.0 technologies based on my information needs	4	13.8	21	72.4	2	6.9	2	6.9	3	10.7	25	89.3				
4	can recognize potential sources of information on Web 2.0 technologies	2	6.9	2	6.9	22	75.9	3	10.3	3	10.7	4	14.3	19	67.9	2	7.1
5	know the structure of the World Wide Web (www)	1	3.4	27	93.1	1	3.4			3	10.7	23	82.1	2	7.1		
6	have the capacity to understand a research topic by using Web 2.0 technologies	23	79.3			6	20.7			17	60.7			2	7.1	9	32.1
7	can identify key concepts and terms on Web 2.0 technologies	5	17.2	23	79.3	1	3.4			8	28.6	15	53.6	3	10.7	2	7.1
8	am familiar with the different types of search engines	25	86.2	4	13.8					19	67.9	7	25.0	1	3.6	1	3.6
9	know how to expand and refine search to access and retrieve needed information from Web 2.0 technologies	4	13.8	21	72.4	2	6.9	2	6.9	3	10.7	19	67.9	3	10.7	3	10.7
10	can develop successful search strategies on Web 2.0 technologies	4	13.8	23	79.3			2	6.9	6	21.4	17	60.7			5	17.9
11	can evaluate information on Web 2.0 technologies no matter what the source	7	24.1	18	62.1	2	6.9	2	6.9	4	14.3	17	60.7	4	14.3	3	10.7
12	can organize information for practical application on Web 2.0 technologies	23	79.3	3	10.3	1	3.4	2	6.9	20	71.4	2	7.1	2	7.1	4	14.3

13	can cite information sources from Web 2.0 technologies correctly	1	3.4	1	3.4	19	65.5	8	27.6	3	10.7	2	7.1	17	60.7	6	21.4
14	can summarize the content of a document on Web 2.0 technologies	1	3.4	25	86.2			3	10.3	2	7.1	25	89.3			1	3.6
15	can integrate new information into an existing body of knowledge on Web 2.0 technologies	2	6.9	26	89.7	1	3.4					2	7.1	24	85.7	2	7.1
16	can use information in critical thinking and problem solving	1	3.4			25	86.2	3	10.3	2	7.1	1	3.6	19	67.9	6	21.4
17	understand how to use Web 2.0 technologies to search for needed information	22	75.9			22	75.9	4	13.8	14	50.0			6	21.4	8	28.6
18	can use a thesaurus to get preferred vocabulary for a particular database on Web 2.0 technologies	2	6.9	18	62.1	5	17.2	4	13.8	5	17.9	12	42.9	7	25.0	4	14.3
19	know when to refer to an encyclopedia	3	10.3	17	58.6	3	10.3	6	20.7	5	17.9	14	50.0	4	14.3	5	17.9
20	can use the web effectively (web 2.0 services)	3	10.3	2	6.9	18	62.1	6	20.7	6	21.4	6	21.4	11	39.3	5	17.9
21	can generate information for other users (podcast wiki etc.)	12	41.4	3	10.3	6	20.7	8	27.6	13	46.4	3	10.7	6	21.4	6	21.4
22	can generate information from Web 2.0 technologies for different audiences	2	6.9	1	3.4	22	75.9	4	13.8	4	14.3	1	3.6	15	53.6	8	28.6
23	can find tags to index videos, photos etc.	21	72.4	3	10.3	2	6.9	3	10.3	15	53.6	6	21.4	3	10.7	4	14.3
24	can save my privacy online	2	6.9	20	69.0	3	10.3	4	13.8	3	10.7	17	60.7	4	14.3	4	14.3
25	am familiar with copyright law to guide against plagiarism	3	10.3	16	55.2	7	24.1	3	10.3	3	10.7	11	39.3	8	28.6	6	21.4

Table 4 presents information on information literacy skills of the students. Table 4.a & b presents the response rate on information literacy skills of students in Federal College of Forestry (FCF), while table 4.c & d presents the response rate on information literacy skills of students in Federal College of Animal Health and Production (FCAHP). The scales for measuring the information literacy skills of students were; strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D), and strongly disagree (SD). But for the purpose of analyzing the results, the measuring scales were modified into agree and disagree. Thus strongly agree and agree were merged to become agree, while strongly disagree and disagree were merged to become disagree.

Findings from table 4.a, 4.b, 4.c, and 4.d revealed that most of the respondents 88(92.3%) in FCF and 110(69.2%) in FCAHP affirmed that they understand that accurate and complete information is the basis for intelligent decision making. Similarly, 82(73.9%) respondents in FCF and 130(81.6%) in FCAHP indicated that they knew how to locate needed information on Web 2.0 technologies. In the same way, 80(72.1%) in FCF and 138(86.8%) in FCAHP affirmed that they can identify key concepts and terms on Web 2.0 technologies. However, 93(83.8%) in FCF and 136(85.5%) in FCAHP opposed that they can recognize potential sources of information on Web 2.0 technologies. In the same way, 86(77.5%) in FCF and 138(86.8%) in FCAHP opposed that they can cite information sources from Web 2.0 technologies correctly. Therefore, it could be concluded that the respondents had skills in using Web 2.0 technologies to search and locate needed information as well as summarising the content of a document on Web 2.0 technologies.

Research question two: What are the purposes for which Web 2.0 technologies are used by students in the monotecnics in Oyo State Nigeria?

Table 5a: Purpose of use of Web 2.0 technologies by the students in FCF

S/N	Purpose	Agric Tech								Forestry Tech							
		VRU		RU		SU		NU		VRU		RU		SU		NU	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Examination Preparation	5	16.1	2	6.5	4	12.9	20	64.5	5	17.2	4	13.8	3	10.3	17	58.6
2	Assignment Completion	2	6.5	2	6.5	24	77.4	3	9.7	3	10.3	5	17.2	18	62.1	3	10.3
3	Group Discussion	2	6.5	4	12.9	3	9.7	22	71.0	4	13.8	3	10.3	2	6.9	20	69.0
4	Project writing	20	64.5	3	9.7	4	12.9	4	12.9	16	55.2	4	13.8	4	13.8	5	17.2
5	Personal Development	6	19.4	19	61.3	3	9.7	3	9.7	5	17.2	15	51.7	5	17.2	5	17.2
6	Research	4	12.9	19	61.3	4	12.9	4	12.9	7	24.1	13	44.8	4	13.8	5	17.2
7	Continuous Assessment	1	3.2	3	9.7	5	16.1	22	71.0	4	13.8	4	13.8	6	20.7	15	51.7
8	Class Note Preparation	5	16.1	2	6.5	21	67.7	3	9.7	2	6.9	4	13.8	14	48.3	5	17.2

Table 5b: Purpose of use of Web 2.0 technologies by students in FCF (Cont'd)

S/N	Purpose	Agric Extension								Horticulture Tech							
		VRU		RU		SU		NU		VRU		RU		SU		NU	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Examination Preparation	5	19.2	2	7.7	3	11.5	16	61.5	3	12.0	2	8.0	3	12.0	17	68.0
2	Assignment Completion	3	11.5	2	7.7	18	69.2	3	11.5	1	4.0	2	8.0	1	76.0	3	12.0

														9			
3	Group Discussion	2	7.7	3	11.5	4	15.4	17	65.4	2	8.0	2	8.0	3	12.0	18	72.0
4	Project writing	16	61.5	3	11.5	3	11.5	4	15.4	16	64.0	3	12.0	3	12.0	3	12.0
5	Personal Development	6	23.1	15	57.7	2	7.7	3	11.5	4	16.0	16	64.0	2	8.0	3	12.0
6	Research	4	15.4	14	53.8	4	15.4	4	15.4	4	16.0	14	56.0	4	16.0	3	12.0
7	Continuous Assessment	1	3.8	4	15.4	4	15.4	17	65.4	2	8.0	1	4.0	5	20.0	17	68.0
8	Class Note Preparation	4	15.4	4	15.4	2	7.7	16	61.5	4	16.0	2	8.0	2	8.0	17	68.0

Table 5c: Purpose of use of Web 2.0 technologies by students in FCAHP

S/N	Purpose	Animal health & production Tech								Science lab tech							
		VRU		RU		SU		NU		VRU		RU		SU		NU	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Examination preparation	8	10.5	8	10.5	9	11.8	51	67.1	3	11.5	4	15.4	4	15.4	15	57.7
2	Assignment completion	6	7.9	3	3.9	57	75.0	10	13.2	2	7.7	1	3.8	18	69.2	5	19.2
3	Group discussion	9	11.8	8	10.5	6	7.9	53	69.7	3	11.5	3	11.5	2	7.7	18	69.2
4	Project writing	8	10.5	50	65.8	9	11.8	9	11.8	15	57.7	4	15.4	4	15.4	3	11.5
5	Personal development	8	10.5	53	69.7	6	7.9	9	11.8	3	11.5	17	65.4	2	7.7	4	15.4
6	Research	13	17.1	46	60.5	9	11.8	8	10.5	6	23.1	13	50.0	4	15.4	3	11.5
7	Continuous Assessment	5	6.6	8	10.5	12	15.8	51	67.1	3	11.5	3	11.5	5	19.2	15	57.7
8	Class Note Preparation	5	6.6	6	7.9	48	63.2	8	10.5	2	7.7	2	7.7	15	57.7	4	15.4

Table 5d: Purpose of use of Web 2.0 technologies by the students in FCAHP (Cont'd)

S/N	Purpose	Statistics								Animal health							
		VRU		RU		SU		NU		VRU		RU		SU		NU	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Examination Preparation	4	13.8	4	13.8	4	13.8	17	58.6	4	14.3	18	64.3	3	10.7	3	10.7
2	Assignment	2	6.9	-	-	22	75.9	5	17.2	2	7.1	1	3.6	20	71.4	5	17.9

	Completion																
3	Group discussion	3	10.3	20	69.0	3	10.3	3	10.3	3	10.7	15	53.6	5	17.9	5	17.9
4	Project writing	3	10.3	15	51.7	6	20.7	5	17.2	4	14.3	15	53.6	5	17.9	4	14.3
5	Personal development	1	3.4	19	65.5	3	10.3	6	20.7	3	10.7	17	60.7	4	14.3	4	14.3
6	Research	10	34.5	14	48.3	4	13.8	1	3.4	10	35.7	12	42.9	3	10.7	3	10.7
7	Continuous Assessment	4	13.8	2	6.9	6	20.7	17	58.6	2	7.1	3	10.7	6	21.4	17	60.7
8	Class Note Preparation	4	13.8	2	6.9	5	17.2	18	62.1	5	17.9	14	50.0	3	10.7	6	21.4

Table 5 presents information on purpose of use of Web 2.0 technologies by students in the monotechnics in Oyo State Nigeria. The table was divided into four i.e. table 5a, and table 5b, respectively. Table 5 a & b presents the response rate on purpose of use of Web 2.0 technologies by students in Federal College of Forestry (FCF), while table 5 c & d presents the response rate on purpose of use of Web 2.0 technologies by students in Federal College of Animal Health and Production (FCAHP). The scales for measuring the purpose of use of Web 2.0 technologies by students were; very regularly use (VRU), regularly use (RU), sometimes use (SU), and never use (NU). Results showed that most of the respondents indicated they regularly used Web 2.0 technologies for: Personal development 65(58.6%) in FCF (Table 4.5a and b) and 106(66.7%) in FCAHP (Table 4.5c and d), research 60(54.1%) in FCF (Table 4.5a and b) and 85(53.5%) in FCAHP (Table 4.5c and d). While 68(61.3%) in FCF regularly used Web 2.0 technologies for project writing (Table 4.5a and b), 95(57.8%) in FCAHP very regularly used Web 2.0 technologies for project writing (Table 5c and d).

Research question three: What is the frequency of use of Web 2.0 technologies by students in the monotronics?

Table 6a: Frequency of use of Web 2.0 technologies by the students in FCF

S/ N	Web 2.0 Technologies	Agric Tech										Forestry Tech									
		Daily		Weekly		Monthly		Occasionally		Never		Daily		Weekly		Monthly		Occasionally		Never	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Blogs	18	58.1	4	12.9	5	16.1	1	3.2	3	9.7	14	48.3	3	10.3	4	13.8	4	13.8	4	13.8
2	Facebook	4	12.9	20	64.5	4	12.9	2	6.5	1	3.2	2	6.9	15	51.7	5	17.2	3	10.3	4	13.8
3	YouTube	3	9.7	21	67.7	3	9.7	2	6.5	2	6.5	4	13.8	17	58.6	3	10.3	2	6.9	3	10.3
4	LinkedIn	3	9.7	22	71.0	1	3.2	3	9.7	2	6.5	4	13.8	14	48.3	3	10.3	4	13.8	4	13.8
5	Twitter	4	12.9	3	9.7	19	61.3	2	6.5	3	9.7	5	17.2	3	10.3	14	48.3	3	10.3	4	13.8
6	MySpace	4	12.9	2	6.5	1	3.2	3	9.7	21	67.7	4	13.8	2	6.9	2	6.9	4	13.8	17	58.6
7	Instant message	2	6.5	5	16.1	21	67.7	1	3.2	2	6.5	2	6.9	3	10.3	16	55.2	4	13.8	4	13.8
8	Document showing	22	71.0	4	12.9	2	6.5	2	6.5	1	3.2	16	55.2	2	6.9	3	10.3	3	10.3	5	17.2

1	Blogs	14	53.8	5	19.2	4	15.4	1	3.8	2	7.7	15	60.0	2	8.0	5	20.0	2	8.0	1	4.0
2	Facebook	4	15.4	14	53.8	4	15.4	2	7.7	2	7.7	2	8.0	15	60.0	3	12.0	2	8.0	3	12.0
3	YouTube	2	7.7	16	61.5	4	15.4	2	7.7	2	7.7	3	12.0	17	68.0	2	8.0	2	8.0	1	4.0
4	LinkedIn	2	7.7	17	65.4	1	3.8	4	15.4	2	7.7	3	12.0	16	64.0	3	12.0	1	4.0	2	8.0
5	Twitter	2	7.7	3	11.5	16	61.5	2	7.7	3	11.5	2	8.0	3	12.0	16	64.0	1	4.0	3	12.0
6	MySpace	3	11.5	2	7.7	1	3.8	3	11.5	17	65.4	3	12.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	2	8.0	18	72.0
7	Instant message	2	7.7	4	15.4	18	69.2	1	3.8	1	3.8	1	4.0	2	8.0	18	72.0	2	8.0	2	8.0
8	Document showing	16	61.5	4	15.4	3	11.5	2	7.7	1	3.8	18	72.0	2	8.0	2	8.0	1	4.0	2	8.0
9	Wikis	3	11.5	2	7.7			15	57.7	6	23.1	1	4.0	2	8.0	2	8.0	17	68.0	3	12.0
10	Micro blogs	5	19.2	14	53.8	2	7.7	2	7.7	3	11.5	2	8.0	15	60.0	3	12.0	3	12.0	2	8.0
11	RSS feeds	5	19.2	3	11.5					18	69.2	2	8.0	2	8.0	1	4.0	2	8.0	18	72.0
12	Social bookmarking	2	7.7			2	7.7	18	69.2	4	15.4	2	8.0	1	4.0	3	12.0	16	64.0	3	12.0
13	Forums newsgroups	19	73.1	1	3.8	3	11.5	1	3.8	2	7.7	19	76.0	2	8.0	2	8.0	1	4.0	1	4.0
14	Online video	16	61.5	4	15.4	1	3.8	3	11.5	2	7.7	14	56.0	3	12.0	2	8.0	3	12.0	3	12.0

15	Photo sharing	4	15.4	3	11.5	2	7.7	1	3.8	16	61.5	3	12.0	2	8.0	1	4.0	2	8.0	17	68.0
16	Virtual Worlds	3	11.5	3	11.5			2	7.7	18	69.2	2	8.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	3	12.0	18	72.0

Table 6c: Frequency of use of Web 2.0 technologies by the students in FCAHP

S/ N	Web 2.0 Technologies	Animal health & production Tech										Science lab tech									
		Daily		Weekly		Monthly		Occasionally		Never		Daily		Weekly		Monthly		Occasionally		Never	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Blogs	49	64.5	9	11.8	5	6.6	7	9.2	6	7.9	16	61.5	3	11.5	2	7.7	3	11.5	2	7.7
2	Facebook	51	67.1	6	7.9	5	6.6	6	7.9	8	10.5	2	7.7	15	57.7	2	7.7	2	7.7	5	19.2
3	YouTube	8	10.5	48	63.2	9	11.8	5	6.6	6	7.9	3	11.5	14	53.8	4	15.4	2	7.7	3	11.5
4	LinkedIn	5	6.6	49	64.5	9	11.8	8	10.5	5	6.6	3	11.5	14	53.8	4	15.4	3	11.5	2	7.7
5	Twitter	11	14.5	6	7.9	42	55.3	9	11.8	8	10.5	5	19.2	3	11.5	12	46.2	3	11.5	3	11.5
6	MySpace	8	10.5	3	3.9	3	3.9	11	14.5	51	67.1	4	15.4	1	3.8	1	3.8	5	19.2	15	57.7
7	Instant	5	6.6	9	11.8	48	63.2	8	10.5	6	7.9	2	7.7	3	11.5	14	53.8	4	15.4	3	11.5

	message				8		2		5					5		8		4		5	
8	Document showing	49	64.5	6	7.9	8	10.5	5	6.6	8	10.5	14	53.8	2	7.7	4	15.4	2	7.7	4	15.4
9	Wikis	6	7.9	10	13.2	5	6.6	46	60.5	9	11.8	2	7.7	4	15.4	3	11.5	14	53.8	3	11.5
10	Micro blogs	6	7.9	45	59.2	11	14.5	8	10.5	6	7.9	2	7.7	14	53.8	5	19.2	3	11.5	2	7.7
11	RSS feeds	9	11.8	8	10.5	5	6.6	5	6.6	49	64.5	3	11.5	4	15.4	3	11.5	2	7.7	14	53.8
12	Social bookmarking	6	7.9	8	10.5	8	10.5	48	63.2	6	7.9	2	7.7	4	15.4	4	15.4	14	53.8	2	7.7
13	Forums newsgroups	51	67.1	8	10.5	5	6.6	6	7.9	6	7.9	16	61.5	4	15.4	2	7.7	2	7.7	2	7.7
14	Online video	52	68.4	6	7.9	5	6.6	5	6.6	8	10.5	15	57.7	2	7.7	3	11.5	2	7.7	4	15.4
15	Photo sharing	49	64.5	6	7.9	8	10.5	5	6.6	8	10.5	15	57.7	4	15.4	2	7.7	3	11.5	2	7.7
16	Virtual Worlds	5	6.6	6	7.9	5	6.6	9	11.8	51	67.1	2	7.7	2	7.7	3	11.5	4	15.4	15	57.7

Table 6d: Frequency of use of Web 2.0 technologies by students in FCAHP (Cont'd)

S/ N	Web 2.0 Technologies	Statistics										Animal health									
		Daily		Weekly		Monthly		Occasionally		Never		Daily		Weekly		Monthly		Occasionally		Never	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Blogs	21	72.4	2	6.9	1	3.4	3	10.3	2	6.9	15	53.6	4	14.3	2	7.1	5	17.9	2	7.1
2	Facebook	3	10.3	17	58.6	2	6.9	1	3.4	6	20.7	17	60.7	4	14.3	2	7.1	2	7.1	3	10.7
3	YouTube	4	13.8	16	55.2	4	13.8	1	3.4	4	13.8	7	25.0	13	46.4	3	10.7	3	10.7	2	7.1
4	LinkedIn	4	13.8	16	55.2	5	17.2	2	6.9	2	6.9	2	7.1	16	57.1	5	17.9	3	10.7	2	7.1
5	Twitter	6	20.7	3	10.3	14	48.3	3	10.3	3	10.3	4	14.3	2	7.1	11	39.3	5	17.9	6	21.4
6	MySpace	5	17.2	1	3.4	1	3.4	5	17.2	17	58.6	4	14.3	1	3.6	1	3.6	5	17.9	17	60.7
7	Instant message	2	6.9	4	13.8	14	48.3	5	17.2	4	13.8	3	10.7	6	21.4	14	50.0	3	10.7	2	7.1
8	Document showing	16	55.2	2	6.9	4	13.8	2	6.9	5	17.2	16	57.1	4	14.3	3	10.7	2	7.1	3	10.7
9	Wikis	3	10.3	4	13.8	4	13.8	17	58.6	1	3.4	3	10.3	6	21.4	2	7.1	14	50.0	3	10.7

			3		8		8		6				7		4				0		
10	Micro blogs	1	3.4	16	55.2	6	20.7	3	10.3	3	10.3	3	10.7	13	46.4	6	21.4	3	10.7	3	10.7
11	RSS feeds	2	6.9	6	20.7	4	13.8	2	6.9	15	51.7	4	14.3	4	14.3	2	7.1	4	14.3	14	50.0
12	Social bookmarking	4	13.8	5	17.2	4	13.8	14	48.3	2	6.9	5	17.9	5	17.9	3	10.7	12	42.9	3	10.7
13	Forums newsgroups	19	65.5	5	17.2			3	10.3	2	6.9	16	57.1	3	10.7	2	7.1	4	14.3	3	10.7
14	Online video	17	58.6	3	10.3	4	13.8	1	3.4	4	13.8	17	60.7	4	14.3	2	7.1	2	7.1	3	10.7
15	Photo sharing	19	65.5	2	6.9	3	10.3	1	3.4	4	13.8	14	50.0	4	14.3	3	10.7	2	7.1	5	17.9
16	Virtual Worlds	2	6.9	1	3.4	4	13.8	6	20.7	16	55.2	2	7.1	3	10.7	2	7.1	5	17.9	16	57.1

Table 6 presents information on frequency of use of Web 2.0 technologies by students in the monotechnics. The table was divided into four i.e. Table 6a, Table 6b, Table 6c and Table 6d respectively. Tables 6a & b presents the response rate on frequency of use of Web 2.0 technologies by students in Federal College of Forestry (FCF), while table 6c & d presents the response rate on frequency of use of Web 2.0 technologies by students in Federal College of Animal Health and Production (FCAHP). The scales for measuring the frequency of use of Web 2.0 technologies by students were; daily, weekly, monthly, occasionally and never.

From the observation of results in tables 6a, 6b, 6c and 6d , findings revealed that respondents used Blogs on a daily basis with the response rate 61(55.0%) in FCF (Table 6a and b) and 101(63.5%) in FCAHP (Table 6c and d). Similarly, Facebook was used daily with the response rate 64(57.7%) in FCF (Table 6a and b) and 100(62.9%) in FCAHP (Table 4.6c and d). In addition, document showing was used daily with the response rate 72(64.9%) in FCF (Table 6a and b) and 95(59.8%) in FCAHP (Table 4.6c and d). Respondents also used Forums newsgroups on a daily basis with the response rate 78(70.3%) in FCF (Table 6a and b) and 102(64.2%) in FCAHP (Table 6c and d). In the same way, online video was used daily with the response rate 65(58.6%) in FCF (Table 6a and b) and 101(63.5%) in FCAHP (Table 6a and b). YouTube was used weekly with the response rate (71 or 64.0%) in FCF (Table 6a and b) and 91(57.2%) in FCAHP (Table 6c and d). Similarly, LinkedIn was used weekly 69(62.2%) in FCF (Table 6a and b) and 95(59.8%) in FCAHP (Table 6c and d). However, respondents indicated that they never used MySpace with response rate 73(65.8%) in FCF (Table 6a and b) and 100(62.9%) in FCAHP.

Research question seven: What are the challenges to the use of Web 2.0 technologies by students in monotronics in Oyo State Nigeria?

Table 7a: Challenges to the use of Web 2.0 technologies by the students in FCF

S/ N	Challenges	Agric Tech								Forestry Tech							
		SA		A		D		SD		SA		A		D		SD	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Slow internet network	5	16.1	18	58.1	5	16.1	3	9.7	5	17.2	14	48.3	5	17.2	5	17.2
2	Financial constraints	20	64.5	4	12.9	5	16.1	2	6.5	12	41.4	5	17.2	6	20.7	6	20.7
3	Erratic power supply	19	61.3	3	9.7	6	19.4	3	9.7	10	34.5	4	13.8	10	34.5	5	17.2
4	Lack of ICT skills	4	12.9	5	16.1	20	64.5	2	6.5	5	17.2	6	20.7	12	41.4	6	20.7
5	Lack of Information retrieval skills	21	67.7	4	12.9	3	9.7	3	9.7	13	44.8	3	10.3	5	17.2	8	27.6
6	Lack of Information Literacy skills	1	3.2	21	67.7	5	16.1	4	12.9	4	13.8	14	48.3	5	17.2	6	20.7
7	Computer phobia	3	9.7	4	12.9	13	41.9	11	35.5	3	10.3	5	17.2	17	58.6	4	13.8
8	Lack of awareness of new innovation	4	12.9	3	9.7	6	19.4	18	58.1	4	13.8	6	20.7	4	13.8	15	51.7

Table 7b: Challenges to the use of Web 2.0 technologies by the students in FCF (Cont'd)

S/ N	Challenges	Agric Extension								Horticulture Tech							
		SA		A		D		SD		SA		A		D		SD	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Slow internet Olfkrowten	4	15.4	12	46.2	6	23.1	4	15.4	3	12.0	15	60.0	4	16.0	3	12.0
2	Financial constraints	14	53.8	5	19.2	5	19.2	2	7.7	16	64.0	4	16.0	3	12.0	2	8.0
3	Erratic power supply	12	46.2	4	15.4	7	26.9	3	11.5	12	48.0	4	16.0	6	24.0	3	12.0
4	Lack of ICT skills	4	15.4	5	19.2	15	57.7	2	7.7	4	16.0	4	16.0	15	60.0	2	8.0
5	Lack of Information retrieval skills	17	65.4	4	15.4	2	7.7	3	11.5	17	68.0	3	12.0	2	8.0	3	12.0
6	Lack of Information Literacy skills	1	3.8	17	65.4	4	15.4	4	15.4	3	12.0	14	56.0	4	16.0	4	16.0
7	Computer phobia	3	11.5	2	7.7	17	65.4	4	15.4	2	8.0	3	12.0	16	64.0	4	16.0
8	Lack of awareness of new innovation	4	15.4	4	15.4	3	11.5	15	57.7	3	12.0	4	16.0	4	16.0	14	56.0

Table 7c: Challenges to the use of Web 2.0 technologies by the students in FCAHP

S/ N	Challenges	Animal health & production Tech								Science lab tech							
		SA		A		D		SD		SA		A		D		SD	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Slow internet network	11	14.5	45	59.2	12	15.8	8	10.5	4	15.4	13	50.0	5	19.2	4	15.4
2	Financial constraints	51	67.1	9	11.8	8	10.5	8	10.5	16	61.5	4	15.4	3	11.5	3	11.5
3	Erratic power supply	44	57.9	6	7.9	18	23.7	8	10.5	12	46.2	3	11.5	8	30.8	3	11.5
4	Lack of ICT skills	8	10.5	9	11.8	51	67.1	8	10.5	4	15.4	4	15.4	15	57.7	3	11.5
5	Lack of Information	51	67.1	3	3.9	8	10.5	14	18.4	15	57.7	1	3.8	4	15.4	6	23.1

	retrieval skills																
6	Lack of Information Literacy skills	8	10.5	49	64.5	11	14.5	8	10.5	4	15.4	14	53.8	5	19.2	3	11.5
7	Computer phobia	6	7.9	8	10.5	59	77.6	3	3.9	3	11.5	3	11.5	19	73.1	1	3.8
8	Lack of awareness of new innovation	9	11.8	13	17.1	5	6.6	49	64.5	4	15.4	6	23.1	2	7.7	14	53.8

Table 7d: Challenges to the use of Web 2.0 technologies by students in FCAHP

S/ N	Challenges	Statistics								Animal health							
		SA		A		D		SD		SA		A		D		SD	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Slow internet network	5	17.2	16	55.2	4	13.8	4	13.8	7	25.0	14	50.0	4	14.3	3	10.7
2	Financial constraints	18	62.1	5	17.2	3	10.3	3	10.3	16	57.1	3	10.7	4	14.3	5	17.9
3	Erratic power supply	14	48.3	5	17.2	7	24.1	3	10.3	10	35.7	4	14.3	10	35.7	4	14.3
4	Lack of ICT skills	5	17.2	5	17.2	16	55.2	3	10.3	4	14.3	4	14.3	15	53.6	5	17.9
5	Lack of Information retrieval skills	15	51.7	1	3.4	6	20.7	7	24.1	14	50.0	2	7.1	5	17.9	7	25.0
6	Lack of Information Literacy skills	5	17.2	15	51.7	5	17.2	4	13.8	5	17.9	14	50.0	5	17.9	4	14.3
7	Computer phobia	3	10.3	3	10.3	19	65.5	4	13.8	2	7.1	5	17.9	19	67.9	2	7.1
8	Lack of awareness of new innovation	6	20.7	6	20.7	3	10.3	14	48.3	5	17.9	7	25.0	4	14.3	12	42.9

Table 7 presents respondents' opinion on barriers to the use of Web 2.0 technologies by students in monotecnics in Oyo State Nigeria. The table was divided into four i.e. table 7a, table 7b, table 7c and table 7d respectively. Table 7 a & b presents the response rate on barriers to the use of Web 2.0 technologies by students in Federal College of Forestry (FCF), while table 7 c & d presents the response rate on barriers to the use of Web 2.0 technologies by students in Federal College of Animal Health and Production (FCAHP). The scales for measuring the barriers to the use of Web 2.0 technologies were; strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D), and strongly disagree (SD). But for the purpose of analysing the results, the measuring scales were modified into agree and disagree. Thus strongly agree and agree were merged to become agree, while strongly disagree and disagree were merged to become disagree.

Findings revealed that indicated slow internet network with response rate 76(68.5%) in FCF and 115(97.5%) in FCAHP; erratic power supply with response rate 68(61.3%) in FCF and 98(61.6%) in FCAHP; and lack of information literacy skills with response rate 75(67.6%) in FCF and 114(71.7%) in FCAHP. However, the least challenges indicated by the respondents include lack of ICT skills (37 or 33.3%) in FCF and 43(27.0%) in FCAHP. In the same way, 25(22.5%) in FCF and 33(20.8%) in FCAHP indicated computer phobia.

Research hypothesis

This section reports the results of the testing of null hypotheses formulated to guide the study. The hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance.

Table 8: Relationship between information literacy skills and use of Web 2.0 technologies by the students

Name Institution	Variable list	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	r	Df	Sig. (P)	Remark
Federal College of Forestry (FCF)	Information literacy skills	53.72	4.551	111	.259**	110	.006	Sig.
	Use of Web 2.0	56.28	5.117					

	technologies							
Federal College of Animal Health and Production (FCAHP)	Information literacy skills	55.67	3.671	159	.167*	158	.036	Sig.
	Use of Web 2.0 technologies	56.59	4.886					

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between information literacy skills and use of Web 2.0 technologies.

To establish the relationship between information literacy skills and use of Web 2.0 technologies by students of both monotechnics, the Pearson’s correlation coefficient was conducted. Table 8 revealed that in FCF, there was a significant positive correlation between information literacy skills and use of Web 2.0 technologies by the respondents ($r = .259^{**}$; $df = 110$; $p < 0.05$). Table 8 revealed that in FCAHP, there was a significant positive correlation between information literacy skills and use of Web 2.0 technologies by the respondents ($r = .167^*$; $df = 158$; $p < 0.05$). Meaning that as there is improvement in the students’ information literacy skills, there is increase in the use of Web 2.0 technologies. Therefore Ho1 is rejected.

Discussion of findings

Findings revealed that respondents in both monotechnics affirmed that they understand that accurate and complete information is the basis for intelligent decision making. Similarly, the students of both monotechnics knew how to locate needed information on Web 2.0 technologies. And in addition, the students can identify key concepts and terms on Web 2.0 technologies. Therefore, it could be concluded that the respondents had skills in using Web 2.0 technologies to search and locate needed information as well as summarizing the content of a document on Web 2.0 technologies. This negates Kennedy (2008) who observed that students appear to be conversant with technology, but they do not always have sophisticated skills in either searching for or evaluating resources. Head and Eisenberg (2009) also pointed out that current ‘Generation

Y' students are said to be optimistic about the benefits of technology, but have reported that they feel overwhelmed by the choice of resources and that they cannot find their way around them, and have widely varying levels of ability at critical thinking. However, the findings of this study is in line with UNESCO (2006) which maintained that generally it is agreed that information literacy is about recognising that in an information society we are presented with a multitude of choices of information sources and that navigating these sources and their content in order to maximize the benefit of the information conveyed therein is a literacy in itself as important as reading and numeracy.

Results of the findings showed that most of the respondents in both monotronics regularly used Web 2.0 technologies for personal development, research and project writing. This is in line with Weller and Dalziel (2007) who maintained that Web 2.0 technologies are widely used in the workplace and by faculty members. Therefore, an important and relevant instructional goal for educators preparing students for their professions is to help students learn to use these technologies for lifelong learning, project write up, teamwork, conducting research, collaboration, document and idea sharing, inquiry, and so on.

Findings revealed that respondents used the following Web 2.0 technologies on a daily basis: blogs, Facebook, document showing, Forums newsgroups, and online video. While YouTube, LinkedIn, among others were used weekly. This is in line with Yoo and Huang, 2011) who maintained that students already use a variety of Web 2.0 applications on a daily basis, although they may not know how to use them efficiently for gaining new knowledge or developing new skills. Educators in higher education interested in using Web 2.0 applications also need empirical evidences to help them integrate Web 2.0 applications in their instructional environments. However Tyagi (2012) had earlier concluded that blogs, RSS (Really Simple Syndication) social bookmarking and photo sharing with high degree of educational value, are not yet popular among the academic communities.

Findings revealed that the main barriers to the use of Web 2.0 technologies by students in both monotronics include: slow internet network, erratic power supply, and lack of information literacy skills. This negates Franklin and Harmelen (2007) who pointed out that there are many unresolved problems and issues in its use in universities such as: Intellectual Property Right for material created and modified by university members and external contributors; appropriate pedagogies for use with Web 2.0 and equally which pedagogic approaches are enhanced by the

use of Web 2.0; how to assess material that may be collectively created and that is often open to ongoing change; the choice of types of systems for institutional use; how to rollout Web 2.0 services across a university; whether it is best to host the services within the university or make use of externally hosted services elsewhere; integration with institutional systems; accessibility; visibility and privacy; data ownership; control over content; longevity of data; data preservation; information literacy; and staff and student training.

References

- Abdullah L., Azhan H.N., Saman Y.M., Mahamad N.M., and MohdW.A.. (2013) The Use of Web 2.0 in e-learning: Evidence from a Public University in Malaysia. *International conference for e-learning & distance education*. August 23-27.
- Abulibdeh E.S. and Hassan S.S. (2011) E-learning Interactions, Information Technology Self-Efficacy and Student Achievement at the University of Sharjah UAE. *Australasian Journal of Education Technology*, 27 .6: 22-29.
- Aharony, N. (2008) Web 2.0 in U.S. LIS Schools: Are They Missing the Boat? *Ariadne*, 54. Retrieved May 15, 2017 from <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue54/aharony/>
- Ajjan and Hartshorne, R. (2008) Investigating Faculty Decisions to adopt Web 2.0 Technologies: Theory and Empirical Tests. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 11.2: 71–80.
- Ennew, A. Fernandez-Young (2006) Weapons of Mass Instruction? The rhetoric and reality of online learning. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 24.2:148 - 157.
- Franklin, T. and Harmelen, M. V. (2007) Web 2.0 for Content for Learning and Teaching in Higher Institutions Freedom. Yale, Yale University Press. Retrieved June 14, 2017 from http://www.benkler.org/wealth_of_networks/index.php/Main_Page
- Godwin, P. (2009) Information Literacy and Web 2.0: Is it Just Hype?" *Electronic Library and Information Systems* 43.3: 264-274
- Haythornthwaite, C. (2005). Social Networks and Internet Connectivity Effects. *Information, Communication, & Society*, 8.2: 125-147.
- Hendrix, J.C. (2011) Checking Out the Future: Perspectives from the Library Community on Information Technology and 21st-Century Librarians. *American Library Association*. Retrieved April 15, 2017 from www.ala.org
- Ilogho, J.E. and Nkiko, C. (2014) Information Literacy Search Skills of Students in Five Selected Private Universities in Ogun State, Nigeria: A Survey. *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal). Paper 1040. Retrieved August 25, 2017 from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1040>
- Ivanitskaya, L.V. Hanisko, K.A. Garrison, J.A. and Janson, S.J. (2012) Developing Health Information Literacy: A Need Analysis from the Perspective of Paraprofessional Health Students. *Journal Medical Library Association* 100. 4: 277-283. Retrieved May 12, 2017 from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3484940/>
- Jucevičienė, P. and Valinevičienė, G. (2010) A Conceptual Model of Social Networking in Higher Education. *Electronics and Electrical Engineering – Kaunas: Technologija*, 6.102: 55–58.
- Kennedy, G.E. (2008) First Year Students' Experiences with Technology: Are They Really Digital Natives? *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*. 24.1: 108-122.
- Koltay, T. (2010) The Web 2.0 Contradiction: Commercial and Library Use. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 12.2: 1-5.
- Kumar, P. (2010) Information Literacy Survey of Faculty and Students of Mathematics at Asthal Bohar, Rohtak, Kurukshetra University. An Unpublished MPhil Dissertation, Kurukshetra.
- Lemke, C., Coughlin, E., Garcia, L., Reifsneider, D., and Baas, J. (2009) Leadership for Web 2.0 in Education: Promise and Reality. Culver City, CA: Metiri Group. Commissioned by CoSN through support from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.

- Retrieved May 13, 2017 from <http://www.cosn.org/Portals/7/docs/Web%202.0/CoSN%20Report%20042809Final%20wcover.Pdf>
- National Board for Technical Education (NABTEB) (2014) Guidelines and Procedures for the Establishment of Private Technical and Technological Institutions in Nigeria. *NABTE Publication* 4-8
- Nazir A. B. and Shabir, A. G. (2015) E-resources: Use and Search Strategies Adopted by Users of Dr Y.S. Parmar University of Horticulture and Forestry. *Collection Building*. 35. 1:16-21. <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/CB-08-2015-0015>
- Rainie, L. (2010) How Libraries Can Survive in the New Media Ecosystem. An International Conference held at Barcelona and Madrid, Spain. 19 May 2010 and 21 May 2010.
- Redecker, C. (2009) Study on the Impact of Web 2.0 Innovations on Education and Training in Europe. Retrieved June 22, 2017 from <https://europa.eu/Publications/pub.cfm?id=2059>
- Stanley, G. (2006) Podcasting: Audio on the Internet comes of age. *TESL-EJ*, 9.4. Retrieved June 4, 2017 from <http://www-writing.berkeley.edu/TESL-EJ/ej36/int.html>
- Tyagi, S. (2012) Adoption of Web 2.0 Technology in Higher Education: A Case Study of Universities in National Capital Region, India. *International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology (IJEDICT)*, 8. 2: 28-43
- UNESCO. 2006. Alexandria Proclamation on Information Literacy and Lifelong Learning. Retrieved May 25, 2017 from http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/ev.phpURL_ID=20891&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201
- Weller, M. and Dalziel, J. (2007) Information Literacy in the Digital Age. Proceedings of the 2nd International LAMS Conference, March 12-15.
- Yoo S. J. and Huang W.H. (2011) Comparison of web 2.0 technology acceptance level based on cultural differences. *Educational Technology & Society*, 14.4: 241–252.

