



Bridging the Awareness-Adoption Gap: A Content Analysis of Institutionalised Social Media Use for Library Promotion in Nigerian Federal Universities

Sirajudeen Femi Bakrin 
Fountain University Osogbo, Nigeria.

Sunday Tunmibi 
University of Ibadan, Nigeria

Received: 22nd July 2025 - Revised: 5th May 2026 - Accepted: 20th May 2026

<https://doi.org/10.65861/glj.v31i2.6>

Abstract

Promoting library resources through digital marketing has become a key strategy in modern librarianship for increasing user patronage and awareness. However, awareness of social media's importance does not always translate into institutional adoption or the creation of dedicated digital marketing units. This study used digital content analysis to assess the institutional use of social media for library promotion in Nigeria, focusing on 51 federal university libraries. Data were collected from official YouTube, Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter accounts. Posts were analysed based on visibility, recency, followership, feedback, and relevance to library promotion. Findings revealed low institutional adoption of social media, a preference for Facebook, poor alignment of posts with library content, and low user engagement. The study recommends advocating institutional adoption of social media, creating dedicated promotion units, and providing librarian training. It also urges library schools to integrate social media into their curricula to enhance library visibility in a competitive information environment.

Keywords: Library Promotion, Digital Marketing and Promotion, Social Media, Nigerian university libraries.

Background

Librarianship and library service delivery are twin concepts that have benefited from the innovative potential of information and communication technology (ICT) in the present dispensation. The era of technological novelty in professional fields that does not preclude library information-sharing activities has revolutionised lifelong careers that complement the academic and non-academic delivery of information to potential users (Lee, 2021). The list seems endless, from cloud computing to Artificial Intelligence, library automation to library resources, big data to the Internet of Things. Despite these creative interventions, the literature continues to highlight the neglect with which the present generation of users treats information resources in academic libraries.

The world is presently dealing with a net generation (clients) who are primarily tech-savvy (often referred to as digital natives), visually oriented, and inclined towards learning styles that emphasise self-exploration and visual learning (Spiegel, 2021). Thus, ICT use in the library has the potential to satisfy its clients' relentless curiosity. ICT should therefore ensure that users are quickly aware of the available products in a given library, even at a distance.

Libraries strive to provide materials that meet the information needs of their esteemed clients, organising them appropriately to ensure discoverability during library users' searches. Often, when discoverability is addressed in traditional librarianship, librarians have the ardent patrons in mind. Meanwhile, several students and staff of the ivory towers rarely visit the

university libraries to utilise the available information resources. The role of awareness in engendering usage must be considered. It is, therefore, understandable why certain social science concepts are creeping into librarianship. Some of these concepts are inseparable: marketing and promotion. These words are sometimes used interchangeably, but they have distinct senses, with the former including the latter. Factually, promotion is a subset of marketing in the social sciences. While the central focus of marketing is to create attraction to a particular product or service and retain the customers so attracted, promotion is mainly concerned with creating awareness among potential customers to increase patronage (Pantage, 2013). Even though it is a non-profit-making institution, the libraries benefit significantly from raising clients' awareness of the valuable information resources and services offered by the university libraries, thereby increasing patronage. Beyond users' quest for higher visitation, marketing increases the library's image. It portrays the quality of services available within its reading hall and further upgrades the creativity of the professional librarians engaged in the task.

In recent times, marketers and promoters of products and services have leveraged the various social media platforms to expand their reach and make their offerings available to the public. The library and librarianship research communities have keyed into this trend to conceptualise how these platforms could be used to showcase the information resources and services in academic libraries. Therefore, the spotlight in marketing as a tool in librarianship is on library clientele and their satisfaction, as libraries are now user-centric rather than library-focused (Busari et al., 2015).

Promotion, a marketing concept, has become a strategy for generating user patronage and raising awareness of library information resources and the services that accompany them. We live in an era of multi-campus systems, distance learning, digital communication, and financial resource scarcity, which makes cost-cutting an unavoidable alternative. Academic libraries have devised various methods to actualise the Ranganathan laws that place users' satisfaction at the heart of libraries' focus (Cheong, 2015). In the face of the contemporary innovative incursion of technology into librarianship, studies have espoused the embrace of social media as a tool for promotional and marketing activities in academic libraries (Cheng et al., 2020; Kutu & Olajide, 2018; Bakare et al., 2018; Velasquez & Campbell-Meier, 2018;

Arumugam & Balasubramani, 2019; AlAwadhi & Al-Daihani, 2019; Ajayi et al., 2021; Uwandu & Osuji, 2022). This process becomes especially pertinent given the growing popularity of borderless libraries among library patrons. The studies cited above generally employed the survey method to examine the phenomenon. This method primarily approached the issue from the perspectives of librarians and users, without a corresponding assessment of the presence of academic libraries on social media to measure library visibility. Misleading answers, inability to comprehend the meaning of some new terms and concepts (Idahosa & Jack-Akhigbe, 2007), insufficient cooperation by respondents (Pozzo et al., 2019), and indescribable population of online survey (Andrade, 2020), which necessitated the suggestion of Einola and Alvesson (2021) for less frequent use of survey, is a motivation for this study to reinforce earlier studies from a different research methodological orientation. Beyond the above-mentioned deficiencies in the survey, content analysis enables a reliable and objective investigation of messages (Neuendorf, 2018), which is similar to the present study. Furthermore, being an unobtrusive, methodical and profoundly contextualised approach (Mustapha & Ebomoyi, 2019) makes it acceptable for this work.

Many of the studies mentioned above affirmed the use of social media tools by academic librarians for marketing and promotion in libraries, without making a clear distinction between librarians' individual activities and the libraries as corporate organisations. However, professional librarians in these academic libraries utilise these tools most often. Nevertheless, there are provisions for corporate organisations to possess official handles that will represent the institutions in any interface with the general public. Thus, the activities of individual employees cannot be taken as the official positions of the libraries. While Agyei and Ngulube (2022) noted that most academic libraries do not have budgets or departments solely dedicated to the promotion and marketing of library information resources and services, Ootobrise and Omagbon (2019) argued that Nigerian libraries have yet to key into institutional use of social media platforms for these promotional and marketing exercises. This assertion suggests a haphazard approach to promotional activities by heads of university libraries and other digitally active professionals in the library. Therefore, the primary goal of this study is to examine, through content analysis, the level of institutional use of social media by university libraries to market and

promote library services and products to the academic community and the general public.

Literature Review

The inability to market library information resources has led to underutilisation, as many academic library users are unaware of their availability. The poor reading culture among users cannot be divorced from inadequate awareness (Mwageni, 2021). Libraries and information professionals have an onerous responsibility to market their services to improve the quality of education (Panda, 2021). With the emergence of diverse sources and providers through which users could gather information, Lwehabura, Dulle, and Mulimila (2002) found that libraries risk losing existing and potential patrons if aggressive marketing and promotion are not pursued. Librarians must understand users' information needs and how people and information move from one place to another. Understanding this new dimension of library and information services will help policymakers develop the right plans and programs to ensure the most effective, long-lasting, and sustainable services (Pantage, 2013). Patil and Pradhan (2014) opined that academic libraries should establish a comprehensive promotion and marketing strategy and plan at the start of each academic calendar year. An effective promotion strategy is essential to helping users understand the library's products and services and the value they provide. Huzaifa and Sehar (2022) concluded that most patrons favoured marketing library and information products and services in Karachi's special libraries, noting that librarians were prepared to advertise their offerings.

Aside from the traditional outlets, social media and institutional websites have provided alternative forums for library promotion (Uwandu & Osuji, 2022). Academic libraries can therefore use digital media tools to promote services and resources (Yi, 2016). Promotion via social media can build networks for subsequent interaction between users and non-users to address information needs. Thus, awareness of academic library resources, services, new arrivals, events, and activities becomes accentuated (AlAwadhi & Al-Daihani, 2019). This position was further corroborated by Osinulu, Adekunmisi, Okewale, and Oyewusi (2018) and Kumar (2017), who agreed that digital marketing and promotion help create awareness and attract active and potential patrons by informing them of the multiple services a library provides. Ramos (2016) and Mutongi and Chiwanza (2016)

shared the same view, advocating that the Internet and social media are corporate institutions' most widely adopted platforms for connecting with, interacting with, discussing, collaborating with, and sharing information with users' communities. Sumadevi and Kumbar (2019) added a new dimension when they opined that social media indirectly increases user enrolment in library patronage, strengthens their fulfilment with the library services, and leads to better library promotion, especially in this competitive world where the Internet is seemingly pitted against the Library (Velasquez & Campbell-Meier, 2018). There are indications that social media is a potent tool for popularising particular books or information resources among library users (Chiovelli & Cameron, 2024). The trend of engagement with the new media makes most library users in academic institutions, students, and staff prominent social media users. Earlier, literature had uncovered the value of social media use for library promotion (Palmer, 2014). A similar study shows that library professionals across universities view social media as a future marketing tool for libraries. Therefore, libraries and librarians should use these platforms to promote and market their activities and resources (Bakare et al., 2018) and to do so through electronic devices (Mwageni, 2021).

Many academic librarians embraced the use of wikis, blogs, podcasting, media-sharing tools such as Flickr and YouTube, and social networking services such as Facebook and Twitter (Hinchliffe & Leon, 2011; Kho, 2011; Moulaison & Corrado, 2011; Yi, 2014). This adoption may be linked to their ability to reach a wider audience and generate publicity quickly. Hatti, Naikar, and Inamdar (2022) noted that publicity and advertising are crucial to properly implementing promotion strategies. Sahu and Naik (2019) found that academic librarians have taken YouTube, Pinterest, Facebook, and Twitter as institutional communication channels. Thus, librarians in public university libraries in Ogun State, Nigeria, use most social media tools to interface with the users while providing library services (Ajayi et al., 2021). Facebook has emerged as the leading social media platform librarians use to deliver library services and products to the 31-50 age group, with males as the largest social media users (Arumugam & Balasubramani, 2019).

AlAwadhi and Al-Daihani (2019) observed that academic librarians have a favourable impression of social media, even though most do not use social media platforms in their libraries. In research on social media use in South-South Nigerian universities, Otobrise and

Omagbon (2019) discovered that academic libraries must market library services and products digitally. Despite academic libraries' acceptance of promotion as a strategy, none of the libraries in Agyei and Ngulube's (2022) study had a department responsible for marketing library services. This absence explains why many librarians have adopted informal marketing strategies, such as social media, to promote their libraries' activities (Agyei & Ngulube, 2022).

Even though digital marketing and promoting library services are cost-effective, adequate tech know-how is needed to ensure their institutionalisation in libraries (Otohrise & Omagbon, 2019). Often, inadequate awareness and poor usability of technology have been identified as barriers to the adoption of modern technology in the Library (Nemati Anaraki & Babalhavaeji, 2013). Thus, at many times, proper awareness and attitude determine the level of preparation and commitment to adoption by end users (Madle et al., 2003). Beyond awareness, subjective norms (Soomro et al., 2024), which may stem from a tendency to avoid the bureaucracy associated with implementing official policies, could inhibit readiness to participate in the implementation process. A basis in awareness, which could subsequently influence attitude and attendant practice and adoption, is suggested by the positive correlation between librarians' information technology attitudes and their knowledge of modern technologies (Ramzan et al., 2021). Thus, the inability to institutionalise social media adoption could stem from an inability to fully realise the concept of the Knowledge-Aptitude-Practice model expounded by the foregoing scholars. Similarly, the lack of an adequate marketing plan and clarity of goals were noted to have remained the bane of utilising social media for library promotion (Ihejirika et al., 2020). Athukorala and Chiran Jayasundara (2025) argued further that social media's potential is hampered by inadequate institutionalised planning and insufficient staff training. This inadequacy has led to inconsistency in implementation and sustainability. Additionally, the library staff are reluctant and lack confidence in implementing the required changes (Kumar et al., 2024).

LinkedIn and Microsoft platforms, though, are considered professional and educational; they are less patronised, unlike YouTube, TikTok and WhatsApp, which were frequently used for communication (Orubebe et al., 2024). In contrast, university libraries have more Facebook followers than Twitter followers on average, even though many do not engage on either

platform (Wakahia & Owoche, 2024). Earlier studies found that Facebook and Twitter were the most frequently used social media platforms in academic libraries (Palmer, 2014). While Facebook was used by academic libraries in Australia to share information and showcase resources, Twitter was used to interact with users (Nguyen, 2023). A study of 23 research publications published between 2004 and 2022 found that Facebook has been effective in promoting library resources and services and eliciting client feedback (Kortas, 2024).

Positive feedback and high ratings on social media invariably attract more users (Khan et al., 2024). Thus, social media has the potential to assist in monitoring public opinion through feedback mechanisms (Latif et al., 2024), as it is regarded as a tool for institutional outreach and user engagement (Athukorala & Chiran Jayasundara, 2025). Ironically, despite the library's strong presence on social media, it is underused due to insufficient engagement, which may be linked to non-captivating content (Wakahia & Owoche, 2024). To sustain user engagement, some national libraries preferred posts focusing on rational content (Solak et al., 2024). Multimedia content, photos, and community event posts can increase user engagement and reactions. (Joo et al., 2020). Joo et al. (2018) also noted that posts with images, community news, and inspiring messages elicited more user engagement, while library events were frequently announced in posts, notably those released by the library. The quality of content, systems, and emotions is therefore a driver of users' satisfaction and intention to continue using library social media (Meng et al., 2024).

Research Methods

The study used digital content analysis to address the research questions that guided it. Digital content analysis is a research method used to identify the presence of specific words, themes, or concepts within a dataset of online quantitative or qualitative data. The sampling procedure followed a census method, indicating that the entire study population was captured in the data collection. All 51 federal university libraries in Nigeria were included in the study since enrolment in the federal arm of universities accounted for 65.08% in Nigeria in 2019 (National Universities Commission, 2019) and 68% in 2024 (This Day, 2024). The federal universities represent a convergence of the first and new generations of Nigerian universities. Data were then collected from the official YouTube, Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter

handles of the selected universities. While Facebook and YouTube were carefully chosen for their popularity as the most patronised social media apps (Statista, 2022), LinkedIn was chosen for its nature as a professional social network site where professionals meet to interact and exchange information, and Twitter qualifies as one of the preferred sites of the elites.

The coding process for the content analysis was carried out systematically using a structured coding sheet designed in line with the study's objectives. Individual posts from the official Facebook, YouTube, LinkedIn, and Twitter (X) pages of the selected university libraries constituted the unit of analysis. Each post was carefully examined and recorded, including relevant details such as platform, publication date, and content type. The coding scheme was developed around five key content categories: visibility, recency, followership, feedback, and relevance. Each of these variables was clearly defined to ensure consistency throughout the coding process. Visibility captured the presence of libraries across the selected platforms. This variable is intended to determine how present and active the libraries are on the various platforms beyond registration. Recency, on the other hand, assessed the timeliness, frequency, and up-to-dateness of posts. Followership was coded based on the number of subscribers or followers associated with each library's social media account, serving as an indicator of audience reach. Feedback focused on user engagement metrics such as likes, comments, shares, and views, reflecting the level of interaction with posted content. Relevance, on the other hand, was determined by evaluating how well each post aligned with the library's core services and functions. All posts were manually coded into predefined categories, and entries were cross-checked for accuracy and consistency. This rigorous approach ensured that the data generated were reliable and suitable for subsequent quantitative and qualitative analysis

Results

Visibility

This represents the official institutional availability of each of the fifty-one university libraries on the four chosen social media platforms.

Table 1: Visibility

	Library	Facebook	Twitter	LinkedIn	YouTube
1	Kashim Ibrahim Library	Yes	No	No	No
2	Bayero University Library Kano	No	No	No	No
3	Federal University Gashua Library	No	No	No	No
4	Federal University of Petroleum Resources Library	Yes	No	No	No
5	Albert Ilemobade Library	No	No	Yes	No
6	FUT Minna Library	Yes	Yes	No	No
7	FUTO library	Yes	No	No	No
8	Federal University Dutse Library	Yes	No	No	No
9	Federal University Dutsinma Library	Yes	No	No	No
10	Federal Library, University of Kashere	Yes	No	No	No
11	FULafia Library	Yes	Yes	No	No
12	FUL Library Lokoja	Yes	No	No	Yes
13	Federal University Library, Otuoke	Yes	No	No	No
14	National Open University of Nigeria Library	Yes	No	No	No
15	Nigeria Police Academy Library	No	No	No	No
16	Nigerian Defence Academy Library	No	No	No	No

17	Festus Aghagbo Nwako Library, Nnamdi Azikiwe University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
18	Hezekiah Oluwasanmi Library, Obafemi Awolowo University	Yes	No	No	No
19	University of Abuja Library	Yes	Yes	No	No
20	Nimbe Adedipe Library, FUNAAB	Yes	No	No	No
21	John Harris Library, University of Benin	Yes	No	No	No
22	University of Calabar Library	Yes	Yes	No	No
23	Kenneth Dike Library, University of Ibadan	Yes	Yes	No	No
24	University of Ilorin Library	Yes	No	No	No
25	University of Jos Library	Yes	No	No	No
26	University of Lagos Library	Yes	No	No	No
27	University of Maiduguri Library	Yes	Yes	No	No
28	University of Nigeria Library	Yes	No	No	Yes
29	Donald E. U. Ekong Library. Port	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
30	UniUyo Library	Yes	No	No	No
31	Admiralty University of Nigeria Library	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Total Number of Visible Libraries		26	9	3	4

From the table above, it is apparent that only 26 of the 51 federal university libraries are visible in the Facebook app. This figure represents 50.98% of the population, amounting to above average. Seven university libraries that subscribed to institutional use of Facebook are from the South-South and North-Central regions, followed by the South-West with four. At the same time, North-West and South-East recorded three each, and only two visible libraries came from the North-East. On Twitter, only nine university libraries – three in each of the South-South and North-Central zones, one each from the South-East, North-East, and South-West regions, but none from the North-West – have official handles, representing 17.64% of the total population. LinkedIn was patronised only by three (3) university libraries, representing 5.88% of the federal libraries. The South-East and South-West regions each had one representative. The fourth social media tool examined, YouTube, has four subscribing federal universities: two from the South-South and one from each of the North-Central and South-East zones. Thus, the four tools recorded 50.98%, 17.64%, 3.92%, and 7.84%, respectively.

Recency

As a promotional tool, social media can only play its expected role in marketing library information resources and services when engagement is sustained. Recency here refers to the recentness of the last post from the official handle of the particular library.

a. Table 2: Recency on Facebook

	Library	Facebook
1	Kashim Ibrahim Library	October 29, 2012
2	Federal University of Petroleum Resources Library	April 11, 2019
3	FUT Minna Library	October 14, 2021
4	FUTO library	June 26, 2023

5	Federal University Dutse Library	September 10, 2013
6	Federal University Dutsinma Library	January 22, 2019
7	Federal Library, University of Kashere	February 7, 2022
8	FULafia Library	July 6, 2023
9	FUL Library Lokoja	February 13, 2023
10	Federal University Library, Otuoke	November 28, 2022
11	National Open University of Nigeria Library	July 28, 2017
12	Festus Aghagbo Nwako Library, Nnamdi Azikiwe University	April 13, 2021
13	Hezekiah Oluwasanmi Library, Obafemi Awolowo University	February 27, 2015
14	University of Abuja Library	March 24, 2021
15	Nimbe Adedipe Library, FUNAAB	June 23, 2023
16	John Harris Library, University of Benin	January 4, 2023
17	University of Calabar Library	February 16, 2016
18	Kenneth Dike Library, University of Ibadan	November 30 2021
19	University of Ilorin Library	October 22, 2020
20	University of Jos Library	January 23, 2020
21	University of Lagos Library	No post ever
22	University of Maiduguri Library	February 5, 2022
23	University of Nigeria Library	July 28, 2019
24	Donald E. U. Ekong Library. Port	June 28, 2023
25	UniUyo Library	December 18, 2017
26	Admiralty University of Nigeria Library	June 22, 2023

b. Table 3: Recency on Twitter

	Library	Twitter
1	FUT Minna Library	October 26, 2022
2	FULafia Library	July 6, 2023
3	Festus Aghagbo Nwako Library, Nnamdi Azikiwe University	March 25, 2019
4	University of Abuja Library	March 9, 2021
5	University of Calabar Library	September 21, 2016
6	Kenneth Dike Library, University of Ibadan	January 23, 2023
7	University of Maiduguri Library	March 23, 2017
8	Donald E. U. Ekong Library. Port	July 11, 2023
9	Admiralty University of Nigeria Library	July 6, 2023

c. Table 4: Recency on LinkedIn

	Library	LinkedIn
1	Albert Ilemobade Library	No post
2	Festus Aghagbo Nwako Library, Nnamdi Azikiwe University	No post ever
3	Donald Ekong Library	July 16, 2023

d. Table 5: Recency on Youtube

	Library	YouTube
1	FUL Library Lokoja	May 15, 2019
2	University of Nigeria Library	February 24, 2022
3	Donald E. U. Ekong Library. Port	June 6, 2023
4	Admiralty University of Nigeria Library	March 22, 2023

The tables above portray the last time each of the few university libraries posted information: image, text, audio, or video on the four social media apps. On Facebook, 7 (26.92%) libraries out of the twenty-six visible ones were still active until 2023, while 3 (11.53%), 4 (15.38%), 2 (7.69%), 3 (11.53%), 2 (7.69%), 1 (3.84%), 1 (3.84%), 1 (3.84%), 1 (3.84%)

stopped being active since 2022, 2021, 2020, 2019, 2017, 2016, 2015, 2013 and 2012 respectively. One (1) library had no posts to determine its activity on the Blue app. Twitter recorded a fair portion of activity, with 4 (44.44%) out of the nine (9) active libraries posting information in different months in 2023. Three (3) of these four (4) libraries were still posted in July 2023, when these data were collated. The remaining five (5) libraries stopped posting on their Twitter handles in 2022, 2021, 2019, 2017, and 2016, respectively. LinkedIn, which recorded the lowest subscription by Nigerian federal university libraries, saw only 1 (33.33%) library at all active tweeting till July 16 2023, while the other two (2) had never posted any message. YouTube, which had only 4 libraries on board, saw 2 (50%) active in 2023, 1 (25%) in 2022, and 1 (25%) in 2019. Invariably, seven (7), four (4), one (1), and two (2) Nigerian federal university libraries had recent (2023) posts on their official Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, and YouTube accounts, respectively.

Followership

a. Table 6: Followership on Facebook

	Library	Facebook
1	Kashim Ibrahim Library	1.8k
2	Federal University of Petroleum Resources Library	2.4k
3	FUT Minna Library	2k
4	FUTO library	2.3k
5	Federal University Dutse Library	559
6	Federal University Dutsinma Library	10k
7	Federal Library, University of Kashere	2.5k
8	FULafia Library	3.3k
9	FUL Library Lokoja	4.3k
10	Federal University Library, Otuoke	1.2k
11	National Open University of Nigeria Library	182
12	Festus Aghagbo Nwako Library, Nnamdi Azikiwe University	38
13	Hezekiah Oluwasanmi Library, Obafemi Awolowo University	55
14	University of Abuja Library	521
15	Nimbe Adedipe Library, FUNAAB	2k

16	John Harris Library, University of Benin	3.6k
17	University of Calabar Library	3.9k
18	Kenneth Dike Library, University of Ibadan	5k
19	University of Ilorin Library	9.3k
20	University of Jos Library	2.7k
21	University of Lagos Library	4
22	University of Maiduguri Library	10k
23	University of Nigeria Library	483
24	Donald E. U. Ekong Library. Port	995
25	UniUyo Library	1.5k
26	Admiralty University of Nigeria Library	419

b. Table 7: Followership on Twitter

	Library	Twitter
1	FUT Minna Library	70
2	FULafia Library	873
3	UNIZIK Digitalibrary	208
4	UniAbuja Library	196
5	Unicallibrary	45
6	Kenneth Dike Library, University of Ibadan	267
7	Unimaidelibrary	9
8	Donald Ekong Library, UniPort	67
9	Admiralty University of Nigeria Library	32

c. Table 8: Followership on LinkedIn

	Library	LinkedIn
1	Albert Ilemobade Library	0
2	Festus Aghagbo Nwako Library, Nnamdi Azikiwe University	68
3	Donald Ekong Library	5

d. Table 9: Followership on Youtube

	Library	YouTube
1	FUL Library Lokoja	6
2	University of Nigeria Library	52
3	Uniport LibraryPort	3
4	ADUN Library	36

On the above tables, the University of Maiduguri, created in 1975, and Federal University Dutsinma, established in 2011, had the highest followership of over ten thousand (10k) each on Facebook. They were closely followed by the University of Ilorin Library, which attracted over nine thousand (9.3k) followers. Other university libraries range from four (the University of Lagos library) to 5,000 followers. On Twitter, Federal University Lafia (FULafia Library) had the highest figure of eight hundred and seventy-three (873) followers. At the same time, Ramat Library (Unimaidelibrary) recorded the lowest figure of nine (9), while the remaining seven libraries on Twitter had between thirty-two (32) and two hundred and sixty-seven (267) followers. The three libraries on LinkedIn had zero (0), sixty-eight (68), and five (5) followers, with Festus Aghagbo Nwako Library and Nnamdi Azikiwe University leading the pack. YouTube followership recorded by the subscribing four libraries had six (6), fifty-two (52), three (3), and thirty-six (36) subscribers on their YouTube channels.

Feedback

a. Table 10: Feedback on Facebook

	Library	Facebook
1	Kashim Ibrahim Library	1.7k
2	Federal University of Petroleum Resources Library	2.3k
3	FUT Minna Library	2k
4	FUTO library	2.3k
5	Federal University Dutse Library	553
6	Federal University Dutsinma Library	10k
7	Federal Library, University of Kashere	2.4k
8	FULafia Library	3.9k
9	FUL Library Lokoja	4.1k

10	Federal University Library, Otuoke	1.2k
11	National Open University of Nigeria Library	179
12	Festus Aghagbo Nwako Library, Nnamdi Azikiwe University	35
13	Hezekiah Oluwasanmi Library, Obafemi Awolowo University	52
14	University of Abuja Library	502
15	Nimbe Adedipe Library, FUNAAB	1.9k
16	John Harris Library, University of Benin	3.5k
17	University of Calabar Library	3.7k
18	Kenneth Dike Library, University of Ibadan	4.9k
19	University of Ilorin Library	9.2k
20	University of Jos Library	2.6k
21	University of Lagos Library	4
22	University of Maiduguri Library	9.9k
23	University of Nigeria Library	483
24	Donald E. U. Ekong Library. Port	989
25	UniUyo Library	1.5k
26	Admiralty University of Nigeria Library	387

b. Table 11: Feedback on Twitter

	Library	Twitter
1	FUT Minna Library	70
2	FULafia Library	873
3	UNIZIK Digitalibrary	208
4	UniAbuja Library	196
5	Unicallibrary	45
6	Kenneth Dike Library, University of Ibadan	267
7	Unimaidelibrary	9
8	Donald Ekong Library, UniPort	67
9	Admiralty University of Nigeria Library	32

c. Table 12: Feedback on LinkedIn

	Library	LinkedIn
1	Albert Ilemobade Library	0
2	Festus Aghagbo Nwako Library, Nnamdi Azikiwe University	68
3	Donald Ekong Library	5

d. Table 13: Feedback on YouTube

	Library	YouTube
1	FUL Library Lokoja	6
2	University of Nigeria Library	52
3	Uniport LibraryPort	3
4	ADUN Library	36

These tables show that the Federal University Dutsin-Ma Library recorded the highest volume of feedback (10k) on Facebook, followed by the University of Maiduguri Library (9.9k) and the University of Ilorin (9.2k). The FULafia Library Twitter handle received the highest feedback from viewers and followers among the nine (9) libraries that subscribed to the app. The highest feedback on LinkedIn came for Festus Aghagbo Nwako Library, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, which recorded sixty-eight (68) likes. The University of Nigeria Library led the other three (3) libraries on YouTube with fifty-two (52) likes.

Relevance of Posts to Promotion and Marketing of Library Resources and Services

1. Table on Relevance of Facebook Posts

S/N	Year	Library Related	University Related	General Information	Total
1	2023	62	1	4	67
2	2022	83	5	5	93
3	2021	65	24	2	91
4	2020	44	13	9	66
5	2019	75	17	9	101
		329	60	29	418

2. Table on Relevance of Twitter Posts

	Library	LR	UR	GIN	Total Tweets	Date of Joining
1	FUT Minna Library	124	1	2	127	August 2015
2	FULafia Library			7,502	7,502	March 2016
3	UNIZIK Digitalibrary	1,315			1,315	November 2011
4	UniAbuja Library	15	2	1	18	October 2016
5	Unicallibrary	2			2	Sept. 2016
6	Kenneth Dike Library, University of Ibadan			74.9k	74.9k	April 2011
7	Unimaidelibrary	5			5	February 2014
8	Donald Ekong Library, UniPort	10		141	151	January 2020
9	Admiralty University of Nigeria Library	33	2		35	March 2022

3. Table on Relevance of LinkedIn posts

	Library	LR	UR	GIN	Total Posts	Date of Joining
1	Albert Ilemobade	-	-	-	-	
2	Festus Aghagbo Nwako, Nnamdi Azikiwe University	-	-	-	-	2013
3	Donald Ekong, UniPort	15	9	6	30	February 2023

4. Table on Relevance of YouTube Posts

	Library	LR	UR	GIN	Total Videos	
1	FUL	4	2		6	May 2018
2	UN	24	2		26	Nov. 2015
3	UniPort	14	0		14	Feb. 2023
4	ADUN	12	3		15	May 2020

The above tables show the volumes of posts made by the concerned libraries and their relevance to promoting library resources, services, and activities. A total of 418 posts were published by these libraries on Facebook between 2019 and 2023. This endeavour shows an average of sixteen (16) posts per library within five years. Further analysis shows that only an average of three (3) posts were made in a whole year. Furthermore, 2019 witnessed the highest number of posts, with 101, followed by 2022, 2021, and 2023, recording 93, 91, and 67, respectively. The year 2020 recorded the lowest number of posts within that period. Out of 418 posts recorded, library-related posts (e-resources and databases, library orientation, book reading/literary day, staff development, library news) had the highest at 329 (78.70%) posts, followed by university-wide posts (admission, convocation and matriculation ceremonies) and general information/news posts outside the library and university activities at 60 (14.35%) and 29 (6.93%) accordingly. The nine (9) libraries on the Twitter app recorded 84k tweets altogether. One thousand five hundred and four (1504) tweets were relevant to library promotion, while five (5) were solely about the parent institutions of the concerned libraries. The most significant volumes were tweets about general news and happenings around. Kenneth Dike Library had the highest number of tweets, 74.9k, all devoted to general news. There is an indication that the account was created for that purpose, particularly because another handle existed with 21 tweets focused solely on library resources. Fulafia had the second-highest number of tweets at 7502, mainly on general news and information. UNIZIK Digital Library recorded the highest level of commitment

to promoting and marketing electronic copies of its scholars' research outputs. All 1315 posts had links to access these publications. Only the Donald Ekong Library had thirty (30) posts on LinkedIn – fifteen (15) on library-related affairs, nine (9) for university affairs, and six (6) on general news. The University of Nigeria Library led the parks in YouTube video posts, with 26 posts (42.62%) of all videos posted by the participating four libraries. It was followed by ADUN (15) and UniPort (14) accordingly. It should, however, be noted that except for seven (7) videos devoted to general activities of the parent universities, all other posts were about the library resources, services, and activities. On average, in its yearly performance, Uniport, which joined YouTube in 2023, performed well with fourteen (14) videos.

Discussion

The study depicts a fascinating account of the institutional visibility of federal university libraries in Nigeria via digital social media platforms. Beyond the superficial presentation of the performance, findings reveal strategic adoption, digital readiness and regional disparity among the libraries. The findings reflect an inspiring manifestation of commitment and repeated organisational constraints across the Nigerian university library system. Facebook adoption by 26 of 51 libraries represents above-average adoption and demonstrates its popularity within the academic community. Also, there was a studious scrutiny of regional and geopolitical representation, with South-South and North-Central leading the parks on Facebook and Twitter visibility. A breakdown of social media adoption across platforms reflects Facebook as

the leading platform, probably due to its community-based design. The general account, however, betrays a shockingly poor online presence even when the academic community ought to lead digital information dissemination. This result supports the assertion by Agyei and Ngulube (2022) that no special units handle the onerous task of marketing and promoting library services. AlAwadhi and Al-Daihani (2019) noted that libraries rarely use social media to promote their services. Similarly, the regional imbalances in a country that need national integration, and the underutilisation of LinkedIn, designed initially to engage scholarly audiences, professionals, and alumni of various institutions, are worrisome.

Again, the study provided insight not only into the level of engagement but also highlighted the consistent challenge of erratic communication, lack of digital continuity, and the incessant issue of inertia in university libraries, indicating the probable existence of institutional problems related to user engagement sustainability and digital literacy. The timelines of the last activities that reveal the libraries' operational vitality received the necessary attention. A precise quantitative breakdown showing Facebook as the leader, with seven libraries active until 2023, allows for trend analysis and provides a basis for comparative platform analysis. This result corroborates the position of Arumugam and Balasubramani (2019), indicating that Facebook is the leading platform for library promotion. The prolonged inactivity indicates a complete absence of institutional priority for new media communication. The inactivity may not be unconnected with the absence of documented account credentials, officially managed handover procedures and staff continuity occasioned by lack of succession plans. This challenge shows a consequential separation between digital potentiality and the institutional system.

The study also provides a statistical overview of followership metrics across four platforms. The University of Maiduguri and Federal University Dutsinma appeared as apparent leaders, each with over 10,000 Facebook followers. The University of Ilorin Library followed closely with 9,300 followers. These figures indicate relatively successful public outreach, showing that these libraries may have invested in consistent posting or already benefit from broader institutional visibility. Similarly, strong performance by an older University of Maiduguri and a newer Federal University Dutsinma suggests that library age or founding date is not the sole determinant of digital

engagement success. Besides Facebook, followership on other platforms is generally low. The frequency, relevance and values of content often attract and sustain followership. The study, however, did not show whether followership indicates actual engagement, such as likes, shares, comments, or the use of library resources.

The study also evaluates user engagement via feedback metrics, highlighting a few university libraries that have attained a relatively higher level of feedback, as evidenced at Federal University Dutsin-Ma, University of Maiduguri, and University of Ilorin. The result aligns with Wakahia and Owoche (2024), who reported a lack of reasonable engagement with social media platforms among library users. The cross-platform assessment is a sure path to comparative analysis, which showed high performance in Facebook and Twitter. While Federal University Dutsin-Ma leads the park on Facebook, FULafia Library was the clear leader on Twitter. However, the results did not indicate whether the feedback was organic or boosted, or which types of posts attracted the most feedback. Similarly, whether the reactions emanated from library users, staff, or random followers could not be verified. Also, it did not acknowledge click-throughs, comments, retweets, shares, and video views as engagement metrics.

The content posted across the institutional social media handles shows a mixed appreciation and utilisation of the platforms for marketing and promoting library resources and services. This result corroborates the assertion of Meng et al. (2024), who linked engagement to the relevance and appropriateness of posts. YouTube and Facebook received significant attention for library-related content, with 51 (88.5%) of the 61 posts on YouTube directly focused on library services and activities. Facebook showed strong alignment with the goal, with 329 (78.70%) of 418 posts directly relevant to library resources, activities, and services. Ironically, Twitter, a professional platform, performed at an average level in content relevance. This data shows an inconsistent approach to using social media handles in academic libraries. Though the posted content is mainly relevant to the library's interests, the weak cross-platform strategies and low content volume diminish the expected impact on the library audience and the general public. However, it should be noted that UNIZIK Digitalibrary demonstrated exemplary performance, with all 1315 of its tweets directly linked to scholarly communication and the promotion of

research results.

Conclusion

This study assesses the prominence of Nigerian university libraries on four social media platforms: Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, and YouTube. The work further evaluated the use of tools to promote and market the library's collection (print and electronic) and services in Nigerian federal universities. It affirms the discovery of some scholars (Otohrise & Omagbon, 2019) that libraries need to be more institutionally represented on these social media platforms. Many Nigerian federal university libraries lack institutional representation on social media, with LinkedIn being the most brutally hit. This situation portrays Nigerian academic libraries as incompatible with the new trend in global librarianship. Even though the libraries were poorly subscribed to all the studied social media apps, Facebook fared better, with a small number of average performers. It is often taken for granted that academic libraries are aware of the significance of social media in driving library services; this study has underscored the urgent need to intensify advocacy for the adoption of new technologies within the circles of information service-providing institutions.

Furthermore, the study found that most library posts are less coordinated in their focus on promoting and marketing university libraries' products, services, and activities to patrons and the broader public. The few university libraries that are deploying the tools need to have promotion and marketing as their goals. Therefore, Nigerian university libraries should create a separate unit to carry out this task and orient the handlers of their social media accounts on how to use these tools to achieve the desired objectives. In addition, there should be dedicated staff for posting information and updates from time to time. The absence of such a provision might have accounted for prolonged inactivity on the apps. The library should further define the items and content to be posted on the institutional social media handles, as these posts define the position and integrity of the parent institutions. Similarly, libraries must maintain proper records of the usernames and passwords for these apps to avoid the need to create multiple social media accounts upon the exit of designated library personnel. Finally, the library schools should reorganise the training curriculum to include the skills needed to use modern tools, such as social media platforms, to promote and market library services in this competitive global information market.

References

- Agyei, D. D., & Ngulube, P. (2022). Exploring strategies for marketing library products and services in University libraries in Ghana. *International Information & Library Review*, 55(2), 143–158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2022.2100217>
- Ajayi, K. D., Adenekan, F. N. & Bello, M. A. (2021). Awareness and Use of Social Media among Librarians in Public Universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal). 6593. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/6593>
- AlAwadhi, S., & Al-Daihani, S. M. (2019). Marketing academic library information services using social media. *Library Management*, 40(3/4), 228–239. <https://doi.org/10.1108/lm-12-2017-0132>
- Andrade C. (2020). The Limitations of Online Surveys. *Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine*, 42(6):575–576. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0253717620957496>
- Arumugam, J. & Balasubramani, R. (2019). Impact of Social Media Tools in Promoting the Library Services in Engineering Colleges in Tamil Nadu. *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal). 2936. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/2936>
- Athukorala, W., & Chiran Jayasundara, C. (2025). Social Media as a Digital Communication Tool for Academic Library Marketing: A Systematic Literature Review. *Language, Technology, and Social Media*, 3(1), 131–149. <https://doi.org/10.70211/ltsm.v3i1.164>
- Bakare, O. A., Yacob, H. & Umar, M. Y. 2018. Use of Social Media Platforms to Promote Library Services and Profitable Librarianship. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, 9(7), 324–334
- Cheng, W. W. H., Lam, E. T. H., & Chiu, D. K. (2020). Social media as a platform in academic library marketing: A comparative study. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 46(5), 102188.
- Cheong, C. F. (2015). The Five Rules of Engagement for librarians: Aux Ranganathan's laws of library science. In S. O'Connor (Ed.), *Library management in disruptive times: Skills and knowledge for an uncertain future* (pp. 37–49). Facet Publishing.
- Chiovelli, C., & Cameron, K. (2024). As seen on BookTok: exploring interactions between

- TikTok and public library collection development. *Contemporary Issues in Collection Management*.
- Einola, K., & Alvesson, M. (2021). Behind the Numbers: Questioning Questionnaires. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 30(1), 102–114. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492620938139>
- Hatti, S., Naikar, S. & Inamdar, S. A. (2022). Marketing of Library Products and Services: A Theoretical Analysis. *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal). 7376. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/7376>
- Hinchliffe, L.J., & Leon, R. 2011. Innovation as a framework for adopting Web 2.0 marketing approaches. In D. Gupta & R. Savard. (Eds.), *Marketing libraries in a Web 2.0 world* (pp. 58-65). Berlin: De Gruyter Saur.
- Huzaifa, H. M. & Sehar, N. E. 2022. Marketing of Library and Information Products and Services: Study of Special Libraries of Karachi. *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal). 7384. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/7384>
- Idahosa, S. A. & P.O. Jack-Akhigbe. (2007). The utility and limitations of the research questionnaire in survey research. *International Journal of Communication: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Communication Studies*, 6(1), 23-42
- Ihejirika, K. T., Goulding, A., & Calvert, P. (2020). Rethinking Academic Library Use of Social Media for Marketing: Management Strategies for Sustainable User Engagement. *Journal of Library Administration*, 61(1), 58–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2020.1845547>
- Joo, S., Choi, N., & Baek, T. H. (2018). Library marketing via social media: The relationships between Facebook content and user engagement in public libraries. *Online information review*, 42(6), 940–955.
- Joo, S., Lu, K., & Lee, T. (2020). Analysis of content topics, user engagement and library factors in public library social media based on text mining. *Online information review*, 44(1), 258–277.
- Khan, J. A., Ullah, T., Khan, A. A., Yasin, A., Akbar, M. A., & Aurangzeb, K. (2024). Can end-user feedback in social media be trusted for software evolution: Exploring and analysing fake reviews. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, 36(10), e7990.
- Kho, N. D. (2011). Social media in libraries: keys to deeper engagement. *Information Today*, 28(6), 1, 31–32.
- Kortas, W. (2024). Academic Library on Facebook: A Narrative Review of Scientific Literature Published Between 2004 and 2022. *Przegląd Biblioteczny*, 92(2), 252-265.
- Kumar, R. R. (2017). Marketing Electronic Information Resources (EIRs) in Academic Libraries: A Conceptual Study. *International Journal of Library and Information Studies*, 7(4), 18–30.
- Kumar, S., Chohda, N., & Gupta, R. (2024). Role of social media and library marketing in Indian universities, *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GKMC-02-2024-0065>
- Kutu, J. O., & Olajide, O. (2018). Marketing of information products and services in public libraries in South-West Nigeria. *International Journal of Library and Information Science*, 10(6), 54–61. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ijlis2017.0798>
- Latif, D., Rinawulandari, M. A. S., & Abd Kadir, S. (2024). Social media in shaping public opinion roles and impact: A systematic review. *Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication*, 40(2), 205–223.
- Lee, P. C. (2021). Technological innovation in libraries. *Library Hi Tech*, 39(2), 574–601.
- Lwehabura, M. J., Dulle, F. W., & Mulimila, R. T. (2002). Marketing library services in academic libraries: A tool for survival in the 21st century. *University of Dar es Salaam Library Journal*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.4314/udslj.v4i1.26598>
- Madle, G., Kostkova, P., Mani-Saada, J., & Weinberg, J. R. (2003, August). Evaluating the changes in knowledge and attitudes of digital library users. In *International Conference on Theory and Practice of Digital Libraries* (pp. 29–40). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Meng, Y., Lin, H., Gong, W., Guan, R. and Dong, L. (2024). An analysis of users' continuous use intention of academic Library social media using the WeChat public platform as an example, *The Electronic Library*, 42(1), 136–157. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EL-05-2023-0115>
- Moulaison, H.L., and Corrado, E.M. 2011. Staying free from 'corporate marketing machines' library policy for Web 2.0 tools. In D. Gupta & R. Savard. (Eds.), *Marketing libraries in a Web*

- 2.0 world (pp. 43-55). Berlin: De Gruyter Saur.
- Mustapha, A. I., & Ebomoyi, I. (2019). Methodological usefulness of content analysis in social science research. *African Research Review*, 13(1), 93-102.
- Mutongi, C. & Chiwanza, K. (2016). The use of differentiated strategy by Libraries to gain competitive advantage. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 18(7/2), 126–130.
- Mwageni, R. E. (2021). The Use of Digital Devices in Marketing Library Products in an Inclusively Engaged Academic Library. In *Information Resources Management Association (Ed.), Research anthology on collaboration, digital services, and resource management for the sustainability of libraries* (pp. 317-336). IGI Global.
- National Universities Commission. (2019). *Nigerian University System Statistical Digest*, 3, 545.
- Nemati Anaraki, L., & Babalhavaeji, F. (2013). Investigating the awareness and ability of medical students in using electronic resources of the integrated digital library portal of Iran: A comparative study. *The electronic library*, 31(1), 70–83.
- Neuendorf, K. A. (2018). Content analysis and thematic analysis. In P. Brough (Ed.), *Advanced research methods for applied psychology: Design, analysis and reporting* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315517971-21/content-analysis-thematic-analysis-kimberly-neuendorf>
- Nguyen, M. (2023). Use of Social Media by Academic Libraries in Australia: Review and a Case Study. *Journal of the Australian Library and Information Association*, 72(1), 75–99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24750158.2023.2168465>
- Orubebe, E. D., Okeke, O. C., Oladokun, B. D., & Uchendu, B. O. (2024). Usage of social media tools by Library and Information Science (LIS) students in Nigerian library schools. *International Journal of Knowledge Content Development & Technology*, 1-16
- Osinulu, L. F., Adekunmisi, S. R., Okewale, O. S., & Oyewusi, F. O. (2018). Marketing strategies used by librarians in state university Libraries. *University of Dar es Salaam Library Journal*, 13(2), 18–32.
- Otohrise, H.C. & Omagbon, A.B. (2019). Digital marketing of library, information and knowledge products and services among librarians in selected university libraries in South-South, Nigeria. *Journal of ICT Development, Applications and Research*, 1, 47 – 60
- Palmer, S. (2014). Characterising university library use of social media: a case study of Twitter and Facebook from Australia. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 40(6), 611–619.
- Panda, S. (2021). Marketing and promotional means of academic library products and services with reference to WEB 2.0 tools. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/9w86n>
- Pantage, J. T. (2013). Marketing of Library and information products and services. *Global Journal of Human Social Science, Linguistics & Education*, 13(1).
- Patil, S., & Pradhan, P. (2014). Library promotion practices and marketing of library services: A role of library professionals. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 133, 249–254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.191>
- Pozzo, M. I., Borgobello, A., & Pierella, M. P. (2019). Using questionnaires in research on universities: analysis of experiences from a situated perspective. *REIRE Revista d'Innovació i Recerca en Educació*, 12(2), 1–16. <http://doi.org/10.1344/reire2019.12.227010>
- Ramos, A. F. (2016). The web-based library: challenges and opportunities. *Investigaciones Bibliotecológicas*, 30(69), 11-14.
- Ramzan, M., Asif, M., & Ahmad, S. (2021). Librarians' attitudes towards application of information technology in academic libraries in Pakistan. *Information Research*, 26(1), 26–1.
- Sahu, S. & Naik, P. (2019). Use of Social Media in Library Services: A Best Practice at Binghamton University Library. 12th International CALIBER-2019 KIIT, Bhubaneswar, Odisha 28-30 November 2019 © INFLIBNET Centre, Gandhinagar, Gujarat
- Solak, B. B., Gazi, M. A., & Çalışkan, S. (2024). Social Media Use of National Libraries: A Content Analysis Specific to Instagram. *The International Information & Library Review*, 57(1), 10–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2024.2380641>
- Soomro, M. A., Arif, M., & Asim, M. (2024). Factors affecting social technologies driven knowledge sharing among Pakistani university librarians and its impact on library service

- innovation. Information Development, 02666669241286824.
- Spiegel, J. (2021). Prensky Revisited: Is the Term “Digital Native” Still Applicable to Today’s Learner?. *English Leadership Quarterly*, 44(2), 12-15.
- Statista 2022. Biggest social media platforms. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/272014/goba-social-networks-ranked-by-number-of-users/>
- Sumadevi, S., & Kumbar, M. (2019). Use of social media to promote library services in the digital age. *Social Media and Libraries*, (December), 225–238.
- Taiwo, B. I., Ayandare, A. I., & Olusola, L. S. 2015. Analytical approach to effective marketing of library and information products and services in academic libraries. *Journal of Library and Information Sciences*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.15640/jlis.v3n2a8>
- The State of University Education. (2024, January 28). This Day. <https://www.thisdaylive.com/index.php/2024/01/28/the-state-of-university-education/>
- Uwandu, L. I. & Osuji, C. E. (2022). Strategies Used by Librarians in Marketing Information Resources and Library Services in Federal University of Technology, Owerri and Imo State University, Owerri. *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal). 7336. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/7336>
- Velasquez, D.L. & Campbell-Meier, J. (2018). Marketing Practices in Australian Libraries: Is Promotion Enough?, *Journal of the Australian Library and Information Association*, 67(2), 116-130, <https://doi.org/10.1080/24750158.2018.1466429>.
- Wakahia, S. & Owoche, P. (2024). Application of Facebook and Twitter Media Communication Channels in University Libraries in Kenya. *Open Access Library Journal*, 11, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1111415>.
- Yi, Z. (2014). Australian academic librarians’ perceptions of effective Web 2.0 tools used to market services and resources. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 40(3/4), 220–227.
- Yi, Z. (2016). Effective techniques for the promotion of library services and resources. *Information Research*, 21(1), paper 702.

Corresponding Author

Sirajudeen Femi Bakrin
sf.bakrin@gmail.com

Author Contributions

Sirajudeen Femi BAKRIN

- Conceptualisation
- Data curation
- Formal analysis
- Methodology
- Writing - original draft

Sunday TUNMIBI

- Supervision
- Validation
- Writing - review & editing

Conflict of Interest

No conflict of interest was disclosed