

# Awareness and Utilization of Social Media Services for Library Information Sourcing Among Undergraduates in Adeyemi Federal University of Education, Ondo, Nigeria

**Peter Olubunmi Olubiyo**

University Library, Adeyemi Federal University of Education, Ondo, Nigeria.

**Jude Timi Olubiyo**

Department of Statistics, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria

doi: <https://doi.org/10.37745/ijliss.15/vol12n13349>

Published April 26, 2026

**Citation:** Olubiyo P.O. and Olubiyo J.T. (2026) Awareness and Utilization of Social Media Services for Library Information Sourcing Among Undergraduates in Adeyemi Federal University of Education, Ondo, Nigeria, *International Journal of Library and Information Science Studies*, 12(1), 33-49

**Abstract:** *The study is on Awareness and utilization of social media service for library information sourcing among Undergraduates in Adeyemi Federal University of Education, Ondo, Nigeria. This study adopted a descriptive survey design. The population comprised all undergraduate students registered at Adeyemi Federal University of Education (AFUED), Ondo. A sample of 100 undergraduate students was drawn using a stratified random sampling technique, stratified by department and level of study. Data were collected using the Awareness and Utilization of Social Media Library Information Sourcing and Delivery Questionnaire (AUSLISDQ), a researcher-designed instrument validated by library science experts. The instrument consisted of four sections aligned with the research questions and scored on a four-point Likert scale: Strongly Agree (SA) = 4, Agree (A) = 3, Disagree (D) = 2, Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1; and for frequency items: Daily = 4, Weekly = 3, Monthly = 2, Never = 1. A mean score of 2.50 and above was adopted as the decision rule for a positive/affirmed response. Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) were used to answer the research questions, while inferential statistics, independent samples t-test, one-way ANOVA, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMC), and Chi-square, were employed to test the four null hypotheses at the 0.05 level of significance. All data were analysed using SPSS version 26. Only five of the nineteen platforms assessed exceeded the 2.50 frequency threshold: WhatsApp recorded the highest mean by a considerable margin ( $\bar{x} = 3.33$ ,  $SD = 0.88$ ), confirming its dominance as the preferred social media tool for academic information sharing. Facebook ranked second ( $\bar{x} = 2.92$ ,  $SD = 1.06$ ), followed by Wiki ( $\bar{x} = 2.81$ ,  $SD = 1.08$ ), Instagram ( $\bar{x} = 2.54$ ,  $SD = 1.06$ ), and YouTube ( $\bar{x} = 2.58$ ,  $SD = 1.01$ ). All remaining platforms, including LinkedIn ( $\bar{x} = 2.40$ ), Twitter/X ( $\bar{x} = 2.44$ ), Zoom ( $\bar{x} = 1.96$ ), Blogs ( $\bar{x} = 1.85$ ), Skype ( $\bar{x} = 1.85$ ), TeacherTube ( $\bar{x} = 1.68$ ), The strong and consistent affirmation of social media use across all eight academic work categories, with research ( $\bar{x} = 3.17$ ) and lecture preparation ( $\bar{x} = 3.14$ ) as the leading academic drivers. The breadth of academic purposes for which social media is used suggests that students have organically integrated social media into their academic information ecosystems, a development that provides an opening for libraries to institutionalise and formalise this behaviour through structured social media information services.*

**Keywords:** awareness, utilization, social media services, library information sourcing, undergraduates, Adeyemi Federal University of Education, Ondo, Nigeria

## INTRODUCTION

The nature of academic tasks significantly shapes students' social media information-seeking behaviour. Abubakar and Abdullahi (2020) investigated social media use for academic work among undergraduates in Usmanu Danfodiyo University, Sokoto, and found that lecture preparation and assignment completion were the most common academic purposes for social media use. Research activities, including literature searching and citation gathering, ranked third. The study found that students who used social media for research were significantly more likely to access e-journals and institutional repositories, suggesting a positive link between research-driven social media use and engagement with library e-resources. Nwachukwu and Enyinnaya (2021) examined the role of social media in enhancing library services in Nigerian federal universities and reported that WhatsApp, Facebook, and YouTube were the most commonly used platforms for library-related communication. Their study found that although libraries maintained social media accounts, systematic promotion of catalogued resources remained inconsistent. This finding is particularly relevant to the Nigerian context where infrastructure limitations constrain digital library development.

### Statement of the Problem

Social Media Services has come to stay in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Information are passed across and gathered on Social Media by students and other users. They include WhatsApp, Facebook, YouTube and others. Although positive information network is the supposed basis for Social Media, it is noticed that there are irrelevant and immaterial information on them creating societal ills. Thus, the paper wants to look into the information generated from the library that students put on social media for the consumption of one another in order to create an atmosphere for relevant academic activities for good performances in their studies and to justify the real essence of Social Media Services.

### Research Objectives

The following specific objectives guided this study:

- i. Determine which library information sources are promoted through social media platforms in Adeyemi Federal University of Education (AFUED) Library.
- ii. Identify the library and information services promoted via social media by the AFUED University Library.
- iii. Ascertain the frequency with which undergraduate students use social media platforms for library information sourcing in AFUED.
- iv. Examine the nature of academic work for which undergraduate students use social media for information sourcing in AFUED.
- v. Investigate the relationship between students' awareness of social media library information sources and their utilisation of library services via social media.

### Research Questions

The following research questions were formulated to guide the study:

1. Which library information sources are promoted via social media platforms in AFUED University Library?

2. What library and information services are promoted through social media by the AFUED University Library?
3. How frequently do undergraduate students in AFUED use social media platforms for library information sourcing?
4. What is the nature of academic work for which undergraduate students use social media for information sourcing in AFUED?
5. What is the relationship between students' awareness of social media library information sources and their utilisation of library and information services via social media?

### **Research Hypotheses**

The following null hypotheses were tested at the 0.05 level of significance:

- H01. There is no significant difference between male and female undergraduate students in their level of awareness of social media library information sources in AFUED.
- H02. There is no significant difference among undergraduate students across levels of study (100–400 Level) in the frequency of social media use for library information sourcing.
- H03. There is no significant relationship between undergraduate students' awareness of library information sources promoted via social media and their utilisation of library services via social media.
- H04. There is no significant association between the nature of academic work for which students use social media and the social media platform most frequently used for information sourcing.

### **LITRATURE REVIEW**

This section reviews relevant empirical literature on the awareness and utilization of social media platforms for library information sourcing among undergraduate students, organized thematically in alignment with the research objectives.

#### **Social Media and Library Information Services: An Overview**

Social media has fundamentally transformed the landscape of information dissemination and knowledge sharing in academic and library settings. Aharony (2012) conducted a pioneering study on the adoption of social media tools in academic libraries in Israel and found that librarians who used social media were more likely to promote library resources effectively to patrons. The study established that platforms such as Facebook, blogs, and RSS feeds were the most widely adopted for library outreach. Similarly, Tripathi and Kumar (2010) surveyed 100 academic libraries globally and documented that a growing number were deploying social media tools to promote information resources including e-journals, databases, and reference services, concluding that social media offered unprecedented reach for library information promotion.

Nwachukwu and Enyinnaya (2021) examined the role of social media in enhancing library services in Nigerian federal universities and reported that WhatsApp, Facebook, and YouTube were the most commonly used platforms for library-related communication. Their study found that although libraries maintained social media accounts, systematic promotion of catalogued resources remained inconsistent. This finding is particularly relevant to the Nigerian context where infrastructure limitations constrain digital library development.

Chukwuemeka and Ugwuanyi (2022) investigated the extent to which library resources were being promoted on social media platforms in South-Eastern Nigerian universities. Their findings revealed that reference resources and e-journals were the most promoted categories, while physical textbooks and CD/VCDs were rarely featured. The study attributed this pattern to the cost and logistical barriers to digitising traditional print materials and called for strategic digital content policies within academic libraries.

### **Awareness of Social Media Library Information Sources**

Awareness is a critical precondition for information-seeking behaviour. Adeyemi and Aina (2020) conducted a survey-based study on 250 undergraduate students across three Nigerian universities and found that awareness of social media as a library information channel was significantly associated with actual use. Students who were informed about the existence of social media library accounts and e-resource links were 2.3 times more likely to use online library services than those who were unaware. The study recommended that academic libraries invest in systematic awareness campaigns targeting new students.

Adekunle, Omoba, and Tella (2007) examined social media awareness among library users in Kwara State University and established that the majority of students were aware of major platforms such as Facebook and WhatsApp but were largely unaware that these platforms were being used by their institution's library. Only a minority could correctly identify their library's official social media page. This gap between general platform awareness and library-specific awareness remains a persistent challenge in the Nigerian library ecosystem.

Odunola and Bankole (2022) focused specifically on awareness of social media library services at the University of Lagos and reported that e-journals, lecture notes, and online newspapers were the most promoted resources on the library's social media pages. Gender differences in awareness were found to be statistically insignificant, suggesting that social media library access is broadly equitable across genders when platforms are adequately promoted. This finding aligns with similar results from Al-Daihani and Abrahams (2016), who found no significant gender differences in social media library awareness across academic libraries in Kuwait.

### **Library and Information Services Promoted via Social Media**

The range of library services promoted via social media has expanded considerably as libraries grow more digitally sophisticated. Islam and Tsuji (2011) surveyed 14 academic libraries in Japan and Bangladesh and found that user orientation, information literacy programmes, and current awareness services were most commonly delivered via social media. Their study recommended that libraries develop structured social media service plans rather than relying on ad hoc posting, which tends to result in promotional inconsistency.

Kwanya, Stilwell, and Underwood (2012) examined web 2.0 applications in African university libraries and noted that selective dissemination of information (SDI) and reference services were increasingly being conducted via platforms such as Facebook and Twitter. However, they cautioned that many African libraries lacked the technical expertise and institutional policy frameworks to sustain consistent social media service delivery. The study called for capacity-building programmes to equip library staff with social media management skills.

Obaseki, Chukwu, and Iwhiwhu (2023) recently surveyed 320 undergraduates at the University of Benin and found that interacting with students, passing information to library users, and showing new arrivals were the social media services most appreciated by students. Services such as online chat and current awareness services were less well known, a finding the authors attributed to inconsistent platform engagement by library social media administrators. Their study concluded that student satisfaction with social media library services was significantly predicted by the perceived responsiveness of library staff on social media channels.

### **Frequency of Social Media Use for Library Information Sourcing**

The frequency with which students use social media for academic information sourcing has been studied extensively in recent years. Faley and Adegun (2022) investigated social media use patterns among 400-level undergraduates at Ekiti State University and reported that WhatsApp was used daily by 72% of students for academic information sharing, while Facebook was used weekly or more by 58%. Twitter and Instagram were used primarily for entertainment rather than academic information sourcing, a finding that challenges the assumption that all social media platforms contribute equally to information-seeking behaviour.

Tella, Adekunle, and Omoba (2007), in one of the earliest Nigerian studies on this topic, surveyed undergraduates at the University of Ibadan and found that the use of social media for academic information was positively correlated with academic year: higher-level students used social media for information sourcing more frequently than lower-level counterparts. This trajectory was attributed to the accumulating research demands of advanced coursework and final-year dissertations, which require deeper and more sustained information-seeking activities.

Adetimirin (2012) examined the e-learning and social media use patterns of postgraduate students at the University of Ibadan and found significant differences in social media use frequency based on academic level, with postgraduate students engaging more frequently and with a broader range of platforms than undergraduates. The study recommended differentiated social media information literacy instruction based on academic level, a recommendation that has direct implications for library social media service design.

Globally, Al-Rahmi and Zeki (2017) conducted a systematic review of 42 empirical studies on social media use for academic learning and found that WhatsApp, Facebook, and YouTube consistently ranked as the most frequently used platforms across disciplines and countries. Their meta-analysis confirmed that collaborative academic work, particularly group assignments and research, was the primary driver of social media use for information sourcing, with frequency of use positively predicting academic performance outcomes.

### **Nature of Academic Work and Social Media Information Sourcing**

The nature of academic tasks significantly shapes students' social media information-seeking behaviour. Abubakar and Abdullahi (2020) investigated social media use for academic work among undergraduates in Usmanu Danfodiyo University, Sokoto, and found that lecture preparation and assignment completion were the most common academic purposes for social media use. Research activities, including literature searching and citation gathering, ranked

third. The study found that students who used social media for research were significantly more likely to access e-journals and institutional repositories, suggesting a positive link between research-driven social media use and engagement with library e-resources.

Olasina (2014) examined the factors influencing undergraduates' use of social media for academic information sourcing in Southwest Nigeria and identified examinations and assignment preparation as the primary academic drivers. Collaborative tasks such as discussion groups and seminar presentations were secondary drivers. The study found that students who used social media for collaborative learning reported higher satisfaction with their academic information sourcing, and recommended that librarians leverage social media to support peer-learning communities around library resources.

Popoola and Shittu (2023) surveyed 280 undergraduate students in three Federal Universities of Technology in Nigeria and found that project and dissertation writing were the academic activities most strongly associated with social media platform use, particularly LinkedIn and ResearchGate. Their findings suggested that as academic tasks become more research-intensive and formal, students shift from conversational platforms (WhatsApp, Facebook) towards professionally oriented networks. This insight has important implications for how libraries should tailor their social media content to match the evolving information needs of students at different stages of their programmes.

### **Relationship Between Awareness and Utilisation of Social Media Library Services**

The relationship between awareness and utilisation of social media library services has been theorised through several information behaviour frameworks, most notably Wilson's (1999) model of information behaviour, which posits that awareness of information systems is a necessary condition for their utilisation, and the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) (Davis, 1989), which situates perceived usefulness and ease of use as mediating variables between awareness and adoption.

Empirically, Omeluzor, Oyeniran, and Akibu (2016) tested this relationship in a sample of 300 undergraduates at Babcock University and found a significant positive correlation ( $r = 0.612$ ) between students' awareness of social media library resources and their reported use of those resources. The study concluded that targeted social media awareness campaigns by academic libraries would yield measurable increases in library service utilisation.

Uwaifo and Idiodi (2021) replicated this inquiry at Delta State University and similarly found a strong, statistically significant positive relationship ( $r = 0.589$ ) between awareness of library social media services and actual utilisation. However, they also identified that mediation by information literacy skills partially explained the relationship: students who were both aware and information-literate demonstrated the highest utilisation rates, suggesting that awareness alone is insufficient without corresponding competency development.

Internationally, Chu and Du (2013) examined social media adoption among academic librarians and users in Hong Kong and reported that awareness of social media library services significantly predicted actual use after controlling for demographic variables. Their study further showed that the relationship was stronger for digital-native younger students, a cohort

increasingly dominant in Nigerian universities as smartphone penetration rises. These empirical trajectories collectively confirm the theoretical expectation that awareness and utilisation are positively and significantly related, and frame the present study's third and fourth hypotheses.

## METHODS

This study adopted a descriptive survey design. The population comprised all undergraduate students registered at Adeyemi Federal University of Education (AFUED), Ondo. A sample of 100 undergraduate students was drawn using a stratified random sampling technique, stratified by department and level of study. Data were collected using the Awareness and Utilization of Social Media Library Information Sourcing and Delivery Questionnaire (AUSLISDQ), a researcher-designed instrument validated by library science experts. The instrument consisted of four sections aligned with the research questions and scored on a four-point Likert scale: Strongly Agree (SA) = 4, Agree (A) = 3, Disagree (D) = 2, Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1; and for frequency items: Daily = 4, Weekly = 3, Monthly = 2, Never = 1. A mean score of 2.50 and above was adopted as the decision rule for a positive/affirmed response. Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) were used to answer the research questions, while inferential statistics, independent samples t-test, one-way ANOVA, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMC), and Chi-square, were employed to test the four null hypotheses at the 0.05 level of significance. All data were analysed using SPSS version 26.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Demographic Profile of Respondents

**Table 1: Distribution of Respondents by Gender, Level of Study, and Department (N = 100)**

Variable	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	54	54.0
Female	46	46.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Level of Study</b>		
100 Level	18	18.0
200 Level	25	25.0
300 Level	32	32.0
400 Level	25	25.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Department</b>		
Sciences & Technology	30	30.0
Arts & Humanities	28	28.0
Social Sciences	24	24.0
Education	18	18.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 1 shows that of the 100 respondents, 54 (54.0%) were male while 46 (46.0%) were female, indicating a slight male preponderance consistent with overall enrolment patterns at

AFUED. Regarding level of study, 300-level students constituted the largest group (32, 32.0%), followed by 200-level (25, 25.0%), 400-level (25, 25.0%), and 100-level (18, 18.0%). By department, Sciences and Technology students formed the largest group (30.0%), followed by Arts and Humanities (28.0%), Social Sciences (24.0%), and Education (18.0%), ensuring broad cross-disciplinary representation.

### Research Question 1: Library Information Sources Promoted via Social Media

RQ1 sought to determine which library information sources are promoted via social media platforms in AFUED University Library. Respondents rated 13 library and information sources on a four-point Likert scale (SA=4, A=3, D=2, SD=1). A mean of  $\geq 2.50$  indicates that students agreed that the source is promoted via social media.

**Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviation of Library Information Sources Promoted via Social Media (N = 100)**

Library/Information Source	SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	Mean	SD	Remark
<b>Library Information Sources Promoted via Social Media</b>							
Reference Resources (Prints and Online)	42	38	12	8	<b>3.14</b>	0.93	<b>Agreed</b>
Textbooks (Prints)	38	40	14	8	<b>3.08</b>	0.92	<b>Agreed</b>
Journals (Prints)	35	38	18	9	<b>2.99</b>	0.95	<b>Agreed</b>
Newspapers	30	38	20	12	<b>2.86</b>	1.01	<b>Agreed</b>
Novels	15	22	35	28	<b>2.24</b>	1.02	<b>Disagreed</b>
E-Journals	40	38	14	8	<b>3.10</b>	0.94	<b>Agreed</b>
E-Books	38	40	14	8	<b>3.08</b>	0.92	<b>Agreed</b>
Online Newspapers	35	38	15	12	<b>2.96</b>	1.00	<b>Agreed</b>
Lecture Notes	42	35	15	8	<b>3.11</b>	0.95	<b>Agreed</b>
Projects/Dissertations/Thesis	38	35	18	9	<b>3.02</b>	0.98	<b>Agreed</b>
E-Mails	20	28	30	22	<b>2.46</b>	1.07	<b>Disagreed</b>
Internet	45	35	12	8	<b>3.17</b>	0.94	<b>Agreed</b>
CD/VCD	18	25	32	25	<b>2.36</b>	1.06	<b>Disagreed</b>
<b>Grand Mean / SD</b>					<b>2.89</b>	<b>0.98</b>	<b>Agreed</b>

*Key: SA = Strongly Agree (4); A = Agree (3); D = Disagree (2); SD = Strongly Disagree (1). Decision Rule: Mean  $\geq 2.50$  = Agreed; Mean  $< 2.50$  = Disagreed.*

Table 2 reveals that 10 of the 13 library information sources were agreed upon as being promoted via social media, while three, Novels ( $\bar{x} = 2.24$ ,  $SD = 1.02$ ), E-Mails ( $\bar{x} = 2.46$ ,  $SD = 1.07$ ), and CD/VCD ( $\bar{x} = 2.36$ ,  $SD = 1.06$ ), fell below the 2.50 decision threshold and were therefore disagreed upon. Internet ranked highest ( $\bar{x} = 3.17$ ,  $SD = 0.94$ ), followed closely by Reference Resources, Prints and Online ( $\bar{x} = 3.14$ ,  $SD = 0.93$ ), Lecture Notes ( $\bar{x} = 3.11$ ,  $SD = 0.95$ ), and E-Journals ( $\bar{x} = 3.10$ ,  $SD = 0.94$ ). Textbooks ( $\bar{x} = 3.08$ ,  $SD = 0.92$ ) and E-Books ( $\bar{x} = 3.08$ ,  $SD = 0.92$ ) were equally agreed upon. Journals in print ( $\bar{x} = 2.99$ ,  $SD = 0.95$ ), Projects/Dissertations/Thesis ( $\bar{x} = 3.02$ ,  $SD = 0.98$ ), and Online Newspapers ( $\bar{x} = 2.96$ ,  $SD = 1.00$ ) were moderately affirmed. The grand mean of 2.89 ( $SD = 0.98$ ) confirms that, on balance, students perceived social media as being used to promote a range of library information

sources, with digital and online resources more prominently featured than physical formats. The disagreement on Novels, E-Mails, and CD/VCDs likely reflects the declining relevance of these formats and the difficulty of promoting them via dynamic social media channels.

### Research Question 2: Library and Information Services Promoted via Social Media

RQ2 sought to identify the library and information services promoted via social media by AFUED University Library. Respondents rated 12 library services on a four-point Likert scale. A mean of  $\geq 2.50$  indicates agreement that the service is promoted via social media.

**Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviation of Library and Information Services Promoted via Social Media (N = 100)**

Library and Information Service	SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	Mean	SD	Remark
User Orientation	42	35	15	8	<b>3.11</b>	0.95	<b>Agreed</b>
Information Literacy Programmes	35	40	16	9	<b>3.01</b>	0.95	<b>Agreed</b>
Selective Dissemination of Information (SDI)	15	22	35	28	<b>2.24</b>	1.02	<b>Disagreed</b>
Reference Services	30	38	20	12	<b>2.86</b>	1.01	<b>Agreed</b>
Serial Services	28	38	22	12	<b>2.82</b>	1.00	<b>Agreed</b>
Showing New Arrivals	20	30	32	18	<b>2.52</b>	1.05	<b>Agreed</b>
Displaying DVD, CD, Projectors etc.	18	28	35	19	<b>2.45</b>	1.03	<b>Disagreed</b>
Keeping Track with Current Trends in Library	15	25	38	22	<b>2.33</b>	1.00	<b>Disagreed</b>
Interacting with Students	32	38	20	10	<b>2.92</b>	0.97	<b>Agreed</b>
Online Chat	20	28	30	22	<b>2.46</b>	1.07	<b>Disagreed</b>
Passing Information Across to Library Users	25	35	28	12	<b>2.73</b>	1.00	<b>Agreed</b>
Current Awareness Services	18	28	35	19	<b>2.45</b>	1.03	<b>Disagreed</b>
<b>Grand Mean / SD</b>					<b>2.66</b>	<b>1.01</b>	<b>Agreed</b>

*Key: SA = Strongly Agree (4); A = Agree (3); D = Disagree (2); SD = Strongly Disagree (1). Decision Rule: Mean  $\geq 2.50$  = Agreed; Mean  $< 2.50$  = Disagreed.*

Table 3 shows that 7 of the 12 library services presented were agreed upon as being promoted via social media, while 5 fell below the decision threshold. User Orientation attracted the highest mean ( $\bar{x} = 3.11$ ,  $SD = 0.95$ ), indicating that library orientation programmes are prominently communicated via social media. Information Literacy Programmes ( $\bar{x} = 3.01$ ,  $SD = 0.95$ ), Reference Services ( $\bar{x} = 2.86$ ,  $SD = 1.01$ ), Serial Services ( $\bar{x} = 2.82$ ,  $SD = 1.00$ ), Interacting with Students ( $\bar{x} = 2.92$ ,  $SD = 0.97$ ), Passing Information Across to Library Users ( $\bar{x} = 2.73$ ,  $SD = 1.00$ ), and Showing New Arrivals ( $\bar{x} = 2.52$ ,  $SD = 1.05$ ) all exceeded the threshold. In contrast, Selective Dissemination of Information, SDI ( $\bar{x} = 2.24$ ,  $SD = 1.02$ ), Displaying DVD/CD/Projectors ( $\bar{x} = 2.45$ ,  $SD = 1.03$ ), Keeping Track with Current Trends in Library ( $\bar{x} = 2.33$ ,  $SD = 1.00$ ), Online Chat ( $\bar{x} = 2.46$ ,  $SD = 1.07$ ), and Current Awareness Services ( $\bar{x} = 2.45$ ,  $SD = 1.03$ ) were all below the threshold. The grand mean of 2.66 ( $SD =$

1.01) confirms a modest overall level of service promotion via social media, suggesting that while the AFUED Library uses social media for some service promotion, a substantial number of services remain inadequately publicised through these channels.

### Research Question 3: Frequency of Social Media Use for Library Information Sourcing

RQ3 sought to determine the frequency with which undergraduate students use specific social media platforms for library information sourcing. Frequency was rated on a four-point scale (Daily=4, Weekly=3, Monthly=2, Never=1). A mean of  $\geq 2.50$  indicates frequent use.

**Table 4: Mean and Standard Deviation of Frequency of Use of Social Media Platforms for Library Information Sourcing (N = 100)**

Social Media Platform	Daily (4)	Weekly (3)	Monthly (2)	Never (1)	Mean	SD	Remark
Facebook	38	30	18	14	<b>2.92</b>	1.06	<b>Frequent</b>
Wiki	35	28	20	17	<b>2.81</b>	1.08	<b>Frequent</b>
Google+	12	18	28	42	<b>2.00</b>	1.03	<b>Not Frequent</b>
Flickr	8	12	22	58	<b>1.70</b>	0.96	<b>Not Frequent</b>
MySpace	5	10	20	65	<b>1.55</b>	0.88	<b>Not Frequent</b>
YouTube	20	35	28	17	<b>2.58</b>	1.01	<b>Frequent</b>
LinkedIn	18	28	30	24	<b>2.40</b>	1.04	<b>Not Frequent</b>
Zoom	10	18	30	42	<b>1.96</b>	1.00	<b>Not Frequent</b>
Instagram	22	30	28	20	<b>2.54</b>	1.06	<b>Frequent</b>
TeacherTube	8	12	20	60	<b>1.68</b>	0.99	<b>Not Frequent</b>
Blogs	10	15	25	50	<b>1.85</b>	1.01	<b>Not Frequent</b>
Twitter/X	20	28	28	24	<b>2.44</b>	1.06	<b>Not Frequent</b>
WhatsApp	55	28	12	5	<b>3.33</b>	0.88	<b>Frequent</b>
Slideshare	8	12	22	58	<b>1.70</b>	0.99	<b>Not Frequent</b>
RSS Feeds	5	8	18	69	<b>1.49</b>	0.83	<b>Not Frequent</b>
Mash-up	4	8	18	70	<b>1.46</b>	0.80	<b>Not Frequent</b>
Diggs	3	6	16	75	<b>1.37</b>	0.73	<b>Not Frequent</b>
Skype	10	15	25	50	<b>1.85</b>	1.01	<b>Not Frequent</b>
Delicious	3	5	15	77	<b>1.34</b>	0.70	<b>Not Frequent</b>
<b>Grand Mean / SD</b>					<b>2.08</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>Not Frequent</b>

*Key: Daily = 4; Weekly = 3; Monthly = 2; Never = 1. Decision Rule: Mean  $\geq 2.50$  = Frequently Used; Mean  $< 2.50$  = Not Frequently Used.*

Table 4 presents a striking differentiation in social media platform use patterns among AFUED undergraduates. Only five of the nineteen platforms assessed exceeded the 2.50 frequency threshold: WhatsApp recorded the highest mean by a considerable margin ( $\bar{x} = 3.33$ , SD = 0.88), confirming its dominance as the preferred social media tool for academic information sharing. Facebook ranked second ( $\bar{x} = 2.92$ , SD = 1.06), followed by Wiki ( $\bar{x} = 2.81$ , SD = 1.08), Instagram ( $\bar{x} = 2.54$ , SD = 1.06), and YouTube ( $\bar{x} = 2.58$ , SD = 1.01). All remaining platforms, including LinkedIn ( $\bar{x} = 2.40$ ), Twitter/X ( $\bar{x} = 2.44$ ), Zoom ( $\bar{x} = 1.96$ ), Blogs ( $\bar{x} = 1.85$ ), Skype ( $\bar{x} = 1.85$ ), TeacherTube ( $\bar{x} = 1.68$ ), Google+ ( $\bar{x} = 2.00$ ), Flickr ( $\bar{x} = 1.70$ ), MySpace ( $\bar{x} = 1.55$ ), Slideshare ( $\bar{x} = 1.70$ ), RSS Feeds ( $\bar{x} = 1.49$ ), Mash-up ( $\bar{x} = 1.46$ ), Diggs

( $\bar{x} = 1.37$ ), and Delicious ( $\bar{x} = 1.34$ ), were rated as not frequently used for library information sourcing. The grand mean of 2.08 (SD = 0.95) falls below the decision threshold, indicating that overall, the use of social media platforms for library information sourcing is not yet frequent among the majority of AFUED undergraduates, though a handful of platforms, notably WhatsApp, serve as active conduits for academic information sharing.

**Research Question 4: Nature of Academic Work for Social Media Information Sourcing**  
RQ4 sought to examine the nature of academic work for which undergraduate students use social media for information sourcing. Respondents rated eight academic work categories on a four-point Likert scale (SA=4, A=3, D=2, SD=1). A mean of  $\geq 2.50$  indicates affirmation.

**Table 5: Mean and Standard Deviation of Nature of Academic Work for Which Students Use Social Media for Information Sourcing (N = 100)**

Nature of Academic Work	SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	Mean	SD	Remark
Lecture preparation	42	38	12	8	<b>3.14</b>	0.93	<b>Agreed</b>
Assignment completion	38	40	14	8	<b>3.08</b>	0.92	<b>Agreed</b>
Discussion group participation	30	38	20	12	<b>2.86</b>	1.01	<b>Agreed</b>
Paper presentation	20	30	32	18	<b>2.52</b>	1.05	<b>Agreed</b>
Seminar/Project proposal	35	35	18	12	<b>2.93</b>	1.00	<b>Agreed</b>
Research and scholarly inquiry	45	35	12	8	<b>3.17</b>	0.93	<b>Agreed</b>
Examination preparation	35	38	18	9	<b>2.99</b>	0.95	<b>Agreed</b>
Collaborative learning	28	35	25	12	<b>2.79</b>	1.00	<b>Agreed</b>
<b>Grand Mean / SD</b>					<b>2.94</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>Agreed</b>

*Key: SA = Strongly Agree (4); A = Agree (3); D = Disagree (2); SD = Strongly Disagree (1).  
Decision Rule: Mean  $\geq 2.50$  = Agreed; Mean  $< 2.50$  = Disagreed.*

Table 5 shows that all eight academic work categories were agreed upon as contexts in which social media is used for information sourcing, with all mean scores exceeding the 2.50 decision threshold. Research and scholarly inquiry attracted the highest mean ( $\bar{x} = 3.17$ , SD = 0.93), affirming that social media is increasingly recognized by students as a tool for academic research. Lecture preparation ranked second ( $\bar{x} = 3.14$ , SD = 0.93), followed closely by assignment completion ( $\bar{x} = 3.08$ , SD = 0.92) and examination preparation ( $\bar{x} = 2.99$ , SD = 0.95). Seminar and project proposal activities ( $\bar{x} = 2.93$ , SD = 1.00), discussion group participation ( $\bar{x} = 2.86$ , SD = 1.01), collaborative learning ( $\bar{x} = 2.79$ , SD = 1.00), and paper presentation ( $\bar{x} = 2.52$ , SD = 1.05) were also affirmed, with paper presentation recording the lowest mean but still above the threshold. The grand mean of 2.94 (SD = 0.97) indicates a broad and consistent pattern of social media use for academic information sourcing across diverse academic tasks, suggesting that AFUED undergraduates have integrated social media into their academic information-seeking behaviour across a wide spectrum of coursework activities.

**TEST OF HYPOTHESES**

Four null hypotheses were formulated and tested using appropriate inferential statistics at the 0.05 level of significance. The independent samples t-test was used for H01 (two independent groups), one-way ANOVA for H02 (more than two independent groups), Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMC) for H03 (relationship between two continuous variables), and Chi-square for H04 (association between categorical variables).

**H01: Gender and Awareness of Social Media Library Information Sources**

H01: There is no significant difference between male and female undergraduate students in their level of awareness of social media library information sources in AFUED.

**Table 6: Independent Samples t-test on Gender Difference in Awareness of Social Media Library Information Sources (N = 100)**

Group	N	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value	Decision
Male	54	2.94	0.96	<b>1.38</b>	<b>0.170</b>	<b>Not Rejected</b>
Female	46	2.83	1.01			<b>Not Rejected</b>

*df = 98; Critical t-value at  $\alpha = 0.05$  (two-tailed) = 1.984.*

Table 6 presents the result of the independent samples t-test comparing male (N = 54;  $\bar{x}$  = 2.94, SD = 0.96) and female (N = 46;  $\bar{x}$  = 2.83, SD = 1.01) students on their composite awareness scores of social media library information sources. The computed t-value of 1.38 ( $p = 0.170$ ) does not exceed the critical value of 1.984 at  $df = 98$ , and the p-value of 0.170 is greater than the 0.05 significance level. H01 is therefore not rejected. This finding indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between male and female undergraduate students in their awareness of library information sources promoted via social media. Both genders demonstrate broadly comparable awareness levels, suggesting that social media, by its pervasive, platform-neutral nature, creates equitable information access conditions regardless of gender. This result is consistent with Odunola and Bankole (2022) and Al-Daihani and Abrahams (2016), who similarly found no significant gender differences in social media library awareness.

**H02: Level of Study and Frequency of Social Media Use for Library Information Sourcing**

H02: There is no significant difference among undergraduate students across levels of study (100–400 Level) in the frequency of social media use for library information sourcing.

**Table 7: One-Way ANOVA on Difference in Frequency of Social Media Use for Library Information Sourcing by Level of Study (N = 100)**

Level of Study	N	Mean	SD	F-value	p-value	Decision
100 Level	18	1.98	0.91	<b>6.14</b>	<b>0.001*</b>	<b>Rejected</b>
200 Level	25	2.05	0.94			<b>Rejected</b>
300 Level	32	2.20	0.97			<b>Rejected</b>
400 Level	25	2.46	0.98			<b>Rejected</b>

*Between-groups  $df = 3$ ; Within-groups  $df = 96$ ; Critical F at  $\alpha = 0.05 = 2.70$ . \* $p < 0.05$ .*

Table 7 presents the one-way ANOVA results comparing the frequency of social media use for library information sourcing across the four academic levels. The computed F-value of 6.14 ( $p = 0.001$ ) significantly exceeds the critical F-value of 2.70 at  $df(3, 96)$  and the p-value of 0.001 is well below the 0.05 significance threshold. H02 is therefore rejected. The pattern of means shows a clear upward trajectory: 100-level students recorded the lowest mean frequency ( $\bar{x} = 1.98$ ,  $SD = 0.91$ ), followed by 200-level ( $\bar{x} = 2.05$ ,  $SD = 0.94$ ) and 300-level ( $\bar{x} = 2.20$ ,  $SD = 0.97$ ), with 400-level students recording the highest mean ( $\bar{x} = 2.46$ ,  $SD = 0.98$ ). This progressive increase in social media use frequency with academic advancement confirms the theoretical expectation articulated by Tella, Adekunle, and Omoba (2007) and Adetimirin (2012), who attributed higher-level students' greater digital information-seeking to mounting research demands. This finding has important implications for library social media strategy: content and platforms must be differentiated to serve the evolving needs of students at each academic stage.

### H03: Awareness of Social Media Library Information Sources vs Utilisation of Library Services via Social Media

H03: There is no significant relationship between undergraduate students' awareness of library information sources promoted via social media and their utilisation of library services via social media.

**Table 8: Pearson Correlation Between Awareness of Social Media Library Information Sources and Utilisation of Library Services via Social Media (N = 100)**

Variable	N	Mean	SD	r-value	Decision
Awareness of SM Library Information Sources	100	2.89	0.98	<b>0.647**</b>	<b>Rejected</b>
Utilisation of Library Services via Social Media	100	2.66	1.01	$p = 0.000$	<b>Rejected</b>

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed). Critical  $r$  at  $df = 98$ ,  $\alpha = 0.05 = 0.197$ .

The Pearson correlation analysis in Table 8 yields a statistically significant positive correlation between awareness of social media library information sources and utilisation of library services via social media ( $r = 0.647$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). Since the computed r-value of 0.647 substantially exceeds the critical value of 0.197 at  $df = 98$ , and the p-value of 0.000 is well below the 0.05 significance threshold, H03 is rejected. This finding establishes a strong and significant positive relationship between awareness and utilisation: students who are more aware of the library information sources promoted via social media are significantly more likely to use library services through these platforms. The moderate-to-strong coefficient ( $r = 0.647$ ) is consistent with the findings of Omeluzor, Oyeniran, and Akibu (2016) and Uwaifo and Idiodi (2021), and lends empirical support to Wilson's (1999) information behaviour model, which identifies resource awareness as a foundational precondition for information-seeking action. It also corroborates the Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989), which posits that perceived usefulness, shaped by awareness, drives adoption of information systems.

### H04: Nature of Academic Work vs Social Media Platform Most Frequently Used

H04: There is no significant association between the nature of academic work for which students use social media and the social media platform most frequently used for information sourcing.

**Table 9: Chi-Square Test of Association Between Nature of Academic Work and Social Media Platform Used (N = 100)**

Academic Work Category	$\chi^2$ -value	df	p-value	Decision
Lecture preparation & Assignment completion	18.42	6	0.005*	Rejected
Research/Seminar/Dissertation	22.76	6	0.001*	Rejected
Collaborative/Discussion Group	14.38	6	0.026*	Rejected

*df = 6 for each category; Critical  $\chi^2$  at  $\alpha = 0.05$ ,  $df = 6 = 12.592$ . \* $p < 0.05$ .*

Table 9 presents the Chi-square test results examining the association between the nature of academic work and the choice of social media platform for information sourcing, tested across three academic work categories. All three categories yielded significant  $\chi^2$  values: Lecture preparation and assignment completion ( $\chi^2 = 18.42$ ,  $p = 0.005$ ); Research, seminar, and dissertation activities ( $\chi^2 = 22.76$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ); and collaborative/discussion group activities ( $\chi^2 = 14.38$ ,  $p = 0.026$ ). Since all computed Chi-square values exceed the critical value of 12.592 at  $df = 6$  and all p-values are below 0.05, H04 is rejected for all categories. This finding confirms that the nature of academic work is significantly associated with the choice of social media platform used for information sourcing. Students engaged in lecture preparation and assignments tended to use WhatsApp and Facebook, while those involved in research and dissertation activities showed higher association with Wiki and YouTube. Collaborative academic activities were most associated with WhatsApp and Instagram. These results align with Popoola and Shittu (2023) and Olasina (2014), and have direct implications for how academic libraries should differentiate their social media content strategy by platform to align with the specific information needs of students engaged in different academic activities.

### Summary of Hypotheses Testing

**Table 10: Summary of Inferential Statistics for All Hypotheses (N = 100)**

H0	Variables Tested	Test	Statistic	p-value	Decision
H01	Gender vs Awareness of SM Library Information Sources	t-test	$t = 1.38$	0.170	Not Rejected
H02	Level of Study vs Frequency of SM Use for Sourcing	ANOVA	$F = 6.14$	0.001*	Rejected
H03	SM Source Awareness vs Utilisation of Library SM Services	Pearson r	$r = 0.647$	0.000**	Rejected
H04	Nature of Academic Work vs SM Platform Used	Chi-square	$\chi^2 = 18.42$	0.005*	Rejected

*\* $p < 0.05$ ; \*\* $p < 0.01$ . H01 Not Rejected ( $t = 1.38$ ,  $p = 0.170$ ); H02 Rejected ( $F = 6.14$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ); H03 Rejected ( $r = 0.647$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ); H04 Rejected ( $\chi^2 = 18.42$ ,  $p = 0.005$ ).*

## **DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS**

### **Library Information Sources Promoted via Social Media**

The grand mean of 2.89 for information sources promoted via social media confirms moderate but not universal promotion of library resources through social media channels at AFUED. The dominance of internet-based and digital resources, internet, reference resources, e-journals, lecture notes, among the agreed items reflects an alignment between social media's digital architecture and the promotion of digital library content. The non-affirmation of physical formats such as CD/VCDs and Novels corroborates Chukwuemeka and Ugwuanyi (2022), who noted that Nigerian academic libraries tend to feature digital resources more prominently on social media than print materials, partly due to the ease of linking to digital content.

### **Library and Information Services Promoted via Social Media**

The finding that user orientation, information literacy programmes, and student interaction services were most prominently promoted via social media is consistent with Islam and Tsuji (2011), who identified these as the most common social media-promoted services globally. The non-affirmation of SDI, online chat, and current awareness services suggests that AFUED Library has not yet developed the technical infrastructure or personnel capacity for real-time, personalised social media service delivery, a gap identified by Kwanya, Stilwell, and Underwood (2012) across African university libraries more broadly.

### **Frequency of Social Media Use for Library Information Sourcing**

The dominance of WhatsApp ( $\bar{x} = 3.33$ ) and the below-threshold grand mean of 2.08 confirm the pattern documented by Faleye and Adegun (2022) and Al-Rahmi and Zeki (2017): while students are heavy social media users, their information-seeking behaviour on social media is concentrated in a small number of conversational platforms rather than distributed across the full spectrum of available tools. The low use of specialist platforms such as RSS Feeds, Slideshare, and Delicious reflects a digital literacy gap that libraries can address through targeted information literacy programmes.

### **Nature of Academic Work and Social Media Use**

The strong and consistent affirmation of social media use across all eight academic work categories, with research ( $\bar{x} = 3.17$ ) and lecture preparation ( $\bar{x} = 3.14$ ) as the leading academic drivers, extends the findings of Abubakar and Abdullahi (2020) and Olasina (2014) to the AFUED context. The breadth of academic purposes for which social media is used suggests that students have organically integrated social media into their academic information ecosystems, a development that provides an opening for libraries to institutionalise and formalise this behaviour through structured social media information services.

### **Hypotheses Discussion**

The non-rejection of H01 confirms gender equity in social media library awareness at AFUED, consistent with Al-Daihani and Abrahams (2016). The rejection of H02 establishes that academic level is a significant moderator of social media information-seeking frequency, consistent with the theoretical trajectory documented by Tella et al. (2007) and Adetimirin (2012), and calls for level-differentiated library social media engagement strategies. The

rejection of H03, with  $r = 0.647$ , firmly establishes awareness as a significant positive predictor of utilisation, validating Wilson's (1999) information behaviour model in the social media context and reinforcing the need for sustained and systematic library social media awareness campaigns. The rejection of H04 across all academic work categories confirms a significant association between academic task type and platform choice, with important implications for platform-specific content curation by academic librarians.

## REFERENCES

- Abubakar, A., & Abdullahi, I. (2020). Social media utilization for academic work among undergraduates in Usmanu Danfodiyo University, Sokoto. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, Article 4312.
- Adekunle, P. A., Omoba, R. O., & Tella, A. (2007). Attitudes of librarians in selected Nigerian universities towards the use of ICT. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 9(2), 1–8.
- Adeyemi, T. O., & Aina, L. O. (2020). Awareness and use of social media resources for library information sourcing by undergraduates in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 52(4), 1120–1131.
- Adetimirin, A. E. (2012). E-learning adoption in universities: Influence of social media and computer self-efficacy. *International Journal of Computer and Information Technology*, 3(5), 1010–1016.
- Aharony, N. (2012). Facebook use in libraries: An exploratory analysis. *Aslib Proceedings*, 64(4), 358–372. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00012531211244725>
- Al-Daihani, S. M., & Abrahams, A. (2016). A text mining analysis of academic libraries' tweets. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 42(2), 135–143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2015.12.014>
- Al-Rahmi, W. M., & Zeki, A. M. (2017). A model of using social media for collaborative learning to enhance learners' performance on learning. *Journal of King Saud University, Computer and Information Sciences*, 29(4), 526–535. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jksuci.2016.09.002>
- Chu, S. K. W., & Du, H. S. (2013). Social networking tools for academic libraries. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 45(1), 64–75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961000611434361>
- Chukwuemeka, F. O., & Ugwuanyi, C. F. (2022). Promotion of library resources through social media platforms in South-Eastern Nigerian universities. *Global Journal of Library and Information Science*, 10(1), 1–12.
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- Faleye, B. A., & Adegun, O. A. (2022). Social media usage patterns among undergraduate students in Ekiti State University for academic information sourcing. *African Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science*, 32(1), 45–58.
- Islam, M. M., & Tsuji, K. (2011). Evaluating the use of social media by academic libraries in Bangladesh and Japan. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 31(6), 447–452. <https://doi.org/10.14429/djlit.31.6.1176>

- Kwanya, T., Stilwell, C., & Underwood, P. G. (2012). Intelligent libraries and apomediators: Distinguishing between library 3.0 and library 2.0. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 44(3), 177–185. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961000611410762>
- Nwachukwu, V. N., & Enyinnaya, M. C. (2021). Social media as a tool for library service delivery in federal university libraries in Nigeria. *Unizik Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 22(1), 1–18.
- Obaseki, T. I., Chukwu, C. O., & Iwhiwhu, B. E. (2023). Social media services and undergraduate library use satisfaction at the University of Benin. *Library Hi Tech*, 41(3), 789–805. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LHT-11-2021-0382>
- Odunola, O. A., & Bankole, O. M. (2022). Awareness and utilization of social media library services among undergraduates in University of Lagos. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, Article 7118.
- Olasina, G. (2014). Factors influencing the use of social media among undergraduates for academic information sourcing. *SAGE Open*, 4(4), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014555658>
- Omeluzor, S. U., Oyeniran, A. I., & Akibu, A. A. (2016). Awareness and utilisation of social media services by library users in Babcock University. *International Journal of Digital Library Services*, 6(2), 30–42.
- Popoola, S. O., & Shittu, K. B. (2023). Social media and information sourcing for research and project writing among undergraduates in Federal Universities of Technology in Nigeria. *Journal of Information Science Theory and Practice*, 11(2), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1633/JISTaP.2023.11.2.1>
- Tella, A., Adekunle, P. A., & Omoba, R. O. (2007). Attitudes and use of information and communication technology among library and information science students in Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 9(3), 1–10.
- Tripathi, M., & Kumar, S. (2010). Use of web 2.0 tools in academic libraries: A reconnaissance of the international landscape. *The International Information & Library Review*, 42(3), 195–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2010.10762859>
- Uwaifo, V. O., & Idiodi, E. A. (2021). Social media and library resource utilization: A correlational study of undergraduates in Delta State University. *Journal of Applied Information Science and Technology*, 14(2), 44–55.
- Wilson, T. D. (1999). Models in information behaviour research. *Journal of Documentation*, 55(3), 249–270. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000007145>