Received: 27.01.2026| Accepted: 22.02.2026 |Published: 07.03.2026
Citations: Nzewi, A. N. (2026) The orientation of newly employed academic staff and students on the use of library in ai dispensation: the librarian perspective GAIJLIS Vol.1.1.2026 pp.8-16 https://globreshub.org/index.php/gaijlis
https://doi.org/10.7616/gaijlis.v1.i31

THE ORIENTATION OF NEWLY EMPLOYED ACADEMIC STAFF AND STUDENTS ON THE USE OF LIBRARY IN AI DISPENSATION: THE LIBRARIAN PERSPECTIVE

Adaeze Nwona NZEWI PhD (CLN)
Medical Librarian, College of Health Sciences and Technology.
Nnamdi Azikiwe University. Nnewi Campus

Abstract

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into academic libraries has transformed information services, necessitating a reorientation of how newly employed academic staff and students are introduced to library use. This study investigates the orientation process from the librarian's perspective in the AI dispensation. Guided by four objectives and four research questions, the study adopted a descriptive survey design involving 85 librarians from three federal universities in Nigeria. Findings indicate low overall readiness (mean=2.53), significant infrastructural and policy challenges, limited pedagogical strategies, and minimal assessment mechanisms for AI-infused orientation. The study concludes that without targeted interventions, AI-driven library orientation remains unattainable. Recommendations include AI policy development, infrastructure investment, pedagogical retraining, and creation of assessment frameworks.

Keywords: AI dispensation, library orientation, academic staff, students, librarian perspective, artificial intelligence, readiness and challenges

*Corresponding author(s) Adaeze Nwona NZEWI PhD (CLN) agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License

Introduction

The dawn of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the twenty-first century has precipitated unprecedented shifts across virtually every sector of human endeavour, and academic libraries are no exception. Once regarded primarily as repositories of physical collections, academic libraries have evolved into dynamic, technology-rich knowledge hubs in which AI-powered tools—including intelligent discovery systems, automated cataloguing platforms, AI-driven reference chatbots, predictive analytics dashboards, and generative AI research assistants—are rapidly becoming integral components of the information service delivery ecosystem (Adebayo & Okonkwo, 2023; Iroaganachi & Ilogho, 2022; Ocholla & Ocholla, 2020). This transformation, variously described as the 'AI dispensation' or 'Fourth Industrial Revolution era of library services,' demands a commensurate evolution in how academic libraries orient their users—particularly those who are new to the institution and therefore most in need of structured guidance on navigating an increasingly complex information environment (Adetoro, Ilesanmi, & Adekunle, 2021; Onuoha & Okorie, 2022).

Orientation programmes for newly employed academic staff and incoming students have long been recognised as a critical bridge between new users and the library's resources and services. Traditionally, such programmes introduced users to the library's physical layout, borrowing procedures, catalogue systems, and print or electronic databases (Ezeani & Igwesi, 2020; Ogunniyi & Adetoro, 2021). However, the emergence of AI has introduced an entirely new stratum of tools—tools that are not merely new interfaces for old resources but fundamentally different in their logic, their opacity,

their ethical implications, and their potential for both enabling and misleading research. Without deliberate orientation on how these AI systems work, what their limitations are, and how to use them ethically and critically, new academic staff and students are ill-equipped to leverage library resources effectively in the current environment (Eke, 2023; Ifijeh & Yusuf, 2020; Okeji, Onuoha, & Nwosu, 2021).

The librarian, as the professional architect of information literacy education and user orientation, occupies a uniquely consequential position in this juncture. Librarians are expected to not merely be aware of AI tools but to translate that awareness into pedagogically sound, contextually relevant orientation programmes that equip new users with the competencies necessary for responsible AI-assisted scholarship (Adegbore, 2022; Nwosu, Ugwu, & Okafor, 2023). Yet mounting evidence suggests that many academic librarians in Nigeria—particularly in the South-South geopolitical zone—are themselves under-equipped for this role, owing to insufficient professional development opportunities, inadequate institutional support, and the absence of formal policy frameworks mandating AI content in library orientation (Ezeani & Igwesi, 2020; Oguntuase & Ojo, 2022).

This study is therefore situated at the intersection of three urgent scholarly and professional conversations: the transformation of academic library services by AI, the evolution of library user orientation in higher education, and the professional readiness of Nigerian academic librarians to navigate and communicate this transformation. By privileging the librarian's perspective, the study acknowledges that librarians are not merely passive conduits of institutional change but active agents whose perceptions, competencies, and professional challenges fundamentally shape the quality of orientation that new academic staff and students receive.

The paper proceeds as follows: after presenting the statement of the problem, research questions, and objectives, it reviews the relevant literature organised by the study's objectives, describes the methodology, presents and analyses the findings, discusses the implications, and concludes with targeted recommendations for policy and practice.

Statement of the Problem

Despite the accelerating integration of AI tools into academic library services worldwide, library orientation programmes for newly employed academic staff and students in many Nigerian universities have remained largely static, continuing to reflect the print-era paradigm of introducing users to physical spaces, paper-based catalogues, and traditional electronic databases without adequately addressing the AI-driven dimension of contemporary library service (Ezeani & Igwesi, 2020; Ifijeh & Yusuf, 2020; Oguntuase & Ojo, 2022). This gap is not merely a matter of curricular lag; it has concrete consequences for research quality, academic integrity, information literacy outcomes, and the overall reputation of academic libraries as centres of scholarly support.

Newly employed academic staff, particularly those joining from institutions with limited library exposure or from industries where AI tools are used informally rather than rigorously, are frequently unaware of the AI-powered discovery systems, institutional repository platforms, AI plagiarism detection tools, and generative AI ethical guidelines that govern scholarly research at their new institution. Similarly, students—especially undergraduates encountering a university library for the first time—are increasingly prone to relying on generative AI tools such as large language models for research without understanding their epistemological limitations, their potential for hallucination, or the ethical boundaries around their use in academic work (Eke, 2023; Nwosu et al., 2023).

From the librarian's perspective, the challenge is compounded by structural and systemic factors: rapid AI evolution makes orientation content obsolete within months of development; many librarians lack formal training in AI literacy education; institutional policies rarely mandate AI content in orientation; and funding for orientation programme development is consistently inadequate (Adegbore, 2022; Iroaganachi & Ilogho, 2022; Okeji et al., 2021). The result is an orientation landscape that is simultaneously outdated in content, insufficiently resourced in delivery, and professionally unsupported in design.

While isolated studies have examined aspects of library orientation quality (Ogunniyi & Adetoro, 2021), information literacy instruction in the AI era (Adetoro et al., 2021; Eke, 2023), and AI adoption challenges in Nigerian libraries (Onuoha & Okorie, 2022), no study to the researchers' knowledge has specifically examined the extent to which AI-driven library tools are covered in orientation programmes for new academic staff and students, nor systematically documented the challenges librarians face in conducting such orientation, from their own professional vantage point. This study fills that gap.

Research Questions

1. What is the perceived readiness of librarians to orient newly employed academic staff and students on AI-powered library services?
2. What challenges do librarians face in designing and delivering AI-infused library orientation programs?
3. What pedagogical strategies do librarians employ to teach AI-based library tools to new users?
4. How do librarians assess the effectiveness of AI-infused orientation for newly employed academic staff and students?

Objectives of the Study

The study aims to:

1. Determine the perceived readiness of librarians to orient newly employed academic staff and students on AI-powered library services.

2. Identify the challenges librarians face in designing and delivering AI-infused library orientation programs.
3. Examine the pedagogical strategies librarians employ to teach AI-based library tools to new users.
4. Investigate how librarians assess the effectiveness of AI-infused orientation for newly employed academic staff and students.

5. Literature Review

Readiness for AI-Infused Library Orientation

Readiness for AI integration in academic libraries is a multidimensional construct comprising technological infrastructure, human skills, and organizational support (Kumar & Singh, 2025). The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) posits that perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness determine technology adoption among professionals (Davis, 1989, as cited in Park & Lee, 2024). Applied to librarians, this suggests that their readiness to orient others on AI tools depends on their own confidence and institutional backing.

Empirical studies show mixed results. Robinson and Oltmann (2024) found that librarians in North American universities who received formal AI training reported high readiness to conduct AI-focused orientation sessions. However, Nwosu and Eze (2025) reported that fewer than 30% of academic librarians in sub-Saharan Africa possessed basic AI competencies, and even fewer felt ready to teach AI concepts to users. Furthermore, orientation readiness includes not only technical skills but also the ability to explain AI ethics, algorithmic bias, data privacy, and proper attribution when using generative AI (Smith, 2026). From the librarian's perspective, readiness is also psychological: fear of being replaced by AI or anxiety about losing relevance can undermine proactive orientation efforts (Thompson & Carter, 2025).# Library orientation, historically understood as the structured introduction of new users to library facilities, collections, and services, has undergone a conceptual metamorphosis in the AI era. Whereas traditional orientation models focused on physical navigation, borrowing protocols, and database access (Ogunniyi & Adetoro, 2021), contemporary scholarship argues for an expanded orientation framework that explicitly incorporates AI literacy—the capacity to understand, evaluate, use, and critique AI-generated information and AI-powered library systems (Adegbore, 2022; Eke, 2023; Maguire, 2023). This expanded conception aligns with the Association of College and Research Libraries' (ACRL, 2016) Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education, which positions information creation as a process and authority as constructed and contextual—principles that acquire heightened significance when the 'author' of information is an AI system.

In the Nigerian university context, the discourse on library orientation has evolved alongside broader debates about the quality of information literacy instruction in higher education. Ezeani and Igwesi (2020) conducted a comprehensive assessment of library orientation practices across federal universities in South-East Nigeria and found that while all sampled institutions conducted some form of orientation for new students, the content was overwhelmingly focused on physical resources and OPAC systems, with no institution incorporating AI-specific content. Ifijeh and Yusuf (2020) similarly documented the absence of AI-related content in library orientation programmes across 24 Nigerian universities, attributing this gap to librarians' limited familiarity with AI tools and the absence of institutional policy mandates.

Internationally, academic libraries in developed countries have begun formalising AI-literacy orientation components. The British Library, several US research libraries, and the University of Melbourne library have developed orientation modules that introduce new users to AI-powered discovery tools, the ethics of AI use in research, the limitations of large language models, and the library's role as a trusted intermediary in an AI-saturated information environment (Maguire, 2023; Raju & Maboya, 2022). These international models provide instructive benchmarks for Nigerian library practice, even as scholars caution against the uncritical transplantation of Western library models into African educational contexts without contextual adaptation (Ocholla & Ocholla, 2020).

The concept of AI dispensation as used in this study draws from Eke's (2023) framework, which characterises the current period as one in which AI tools are not peripheral but constitutive of the information environment—meaning that any orientation programme that does not address AI is not merely incomplete but actively misleading in its representation of the information landscape new users are entering. This framing has direct implications for the design of orientation programmes and for the professional development obligations of academic librarians.

The librarian's role in user orientation has been theorised variously as educator, guide, advocate, and knowledge broker (Adebayo & Okonkwo, 2023; Onuoha & Okorie, 2022; Oguntuase & Ojo, 2022). In the AI era, a new dimension has been added: the librarian as AI critical mediator—a professional who not only connects users with AI-powered tools but equips them with the critical frameworks to evaluate AI outputs, identify AI-generated misinformation, and navigate the ethical dimensions of AI-assisted research (Adetoro et al., 2021; Nwosu et al., 2023).

For newly employed academic staff, who are expected to immediately engage in research, teaching, and scholarly publication, the library orientation experience has a disproportionately formative influence. Studies consistently show that academics' library use patterns are largely established within the first year of employment, making the quality of initial orientation a significant long-term determinant of library utilisation and research productivity (Adegbore, 2022; Okeji et al., 2021). Orientation that fails to address AI tools therefore not only leaves new academics under-resourced in the present but establishes patterns of

AI disengagement or naive AI use that persist throughout their careers.

For students, and particularly undergraduates encountering a university library for the first time, the orientation experience shapes both their competence in and attitude toward library use. Ogunniyi and Adetoro (2021) found that students who received comprehensive library orientation in their first semester maintained significantly higher library utilisation rates, better information literacy scores, and lower rates of academic plagiarism throughout their degree programmes, compared to those who received minimal orientation. In the AI era, this effect is amplified: students without AI-literacy orientation are more vulnerable to academic integrity violations involving generative AI, more likely to uncritically accept AI-generated misinformation, and less capable of leveraging AI tools productively for legitimate scholarly purposes (Eke, 2023; Maguire, 2023).

Librarians are recognised in the literature as the professional group best positioned to deliver this orientation, owing to their dual expertise in information organisation and user instruction (Iroaganachi & Ilogho, 2022; Raju & Maboya, 2022). However, this positioning comes with significant professional development obligations that many institutions have yet to honour. Onuoha and Okorie (2022) found that only 18% of academic librarians in a South-South Nigerian sample had received any formal professional development on AI tools within the preceding three years, while 64% reported feeling insufficiently prepared to include AI content in orientation programmes. These findings underscore the urgency of the professional capacity dimension of the challenge.

Challenges in Designing and Delivering AI-Infused Orientation

The literature identifies a multi-layered set of challenges that impede librarians from delivering effective AI-oriented library orientation. These challenges operate at the individual, institutional, and systemic levels and are particularly pronounced in the Nigerian higher education context (Adegbore, 2022; Ezeani & Igwesi, 2020; Ifijeh & Yusuf, 2020).

At the individual level, the most frequently cited challenge is the rapid pace of AI technological evolution, which consistently outpaces librarians' capacity to develop and update orientation content (Nwosu et al., 2023; Oguntuase & Ojo, 2022). Generative AI tools that did not exist two years ago—such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude—are now ubiquitous among students, yet most library orientation programmes were developed before these tools existed and have not been revised to address them. Adetoro et al. (2021) document a related challenge: many librarians hold the implicit assumption that AI tools are primarily the domain of computer science rather than library science, and therefore do not perceive AI orientation as part of their professional mandate.

At the institutional level, the primary challenges are inadequate ICT infrastructure, insufficient funding for orientation programme development, and the absence of formal policy mandates for AI-related orientation content (Ifijeh & Yusuf, 2020; Iroaganachi & Ilogho, 2022; Okeji et al., 2021). In many Nigerian universities, library orientation is treated as a peripheral activity that competes for resources and scheduling with more immediately visible institutional functions. The result, as Ezeani and Igwesi (2020) document, is that orientation programmes are often under-resourced, infrequently updated, and loosely supervised.

At the systemic level, scholars identify the absence of national professional standards for AI-inclusive library orientation, the limited integration of AI literacy into library science curricula in Nigerian universities, and the broader digital divide that affects internet connectivity and device availability in many institutions (Ocholla & Ocholla, 2020; Onuoha & Okorie, 2022). These systemic factors create an environment in which individual librarian effort and institutional investment, even where they exist, are insufficient to fully address the AI orientation gap.

User resistance constitutes an additional challenge documented across multiple studies. Newly employed academic staff, particularly those at senior levels, often express resistance to attending library orientation sessions, perceiving them as remedial or beneath their professional standing (Adebayo & Okonkwo, 2023; Ogunniyi & Adetoro, 2021). This resistance is compounded in the AI era by the assumption that familiarity with consumer AI tools (e.g., using ChatGPT for general queries) constitutes sufficient competence with AI-powered library systems—an assumption that librarians report as one of the most persistent misconceptions they encounter in orientation contexts (Nwosu et al., 2023).

The challenges confronting librarians are both structural and personal. Structurally, many academic libraries lack high-speed internet, reliable power, AI-capable software licenses, and dedicated AI workstations (Adebayo & Oyewole, 2023). Policy gaps are equally severe: few universities have formal AI guidelines governing library orientation, leading to ad hoc practices (Li & Ma, 2024). Personal challenges include technophobia among older librarians, lack of time to prepare AI content amidst heavy workloads, and difficulty simplifying complex AI concepts for non-technical audiences (Boateng & Quagraine, 2024).

Hernandez (2025) identified generational resistance as a significant barrier: while younger librarians may embrace AI, older colleagues sometimes resist both learning and teaching AI tools. Additionally, newly employed academic staff themselves may resist AI orientation if they perceive it as undermining traditional research methods (Ocholla & Shongwe, 2025). Students, conversely, may over-rely on AI without understanding its limitations, creating a different pedagogical challenge. Khalid and Farooq (2026) noted that digital divides exist not only between age groups but also across disciplines—humanities staff and students often require different

AI orientation approaches than their STEM counterparts.

Pedagogical Strategies for Teaching AI-Based Library Tools

Effective pedagogy for AI-infused library orientation moves beyond demonstration to active learning, scaffolding, and problem-based instruction (Thompson & Carter, 2025). Strategies reported in the literature include: (a) live simulations where users interact with AI chatbots to answer research queries; (b) comparative exercises showing differences between traditional database search and AI-powered semantic search; (c) ethical case studies discussing when and how to use generative AI like ChatGPT for literature reviews; (d) gamified tutorials with AI-driven feedback loops; and (e) peer-assisted learning where digitally fluent users mentor others (Huang et al., 2024).

Lund and Wang (2025) emphasized that librarians must act as "AI translators," bridging the gap between algorithmic functionality and user information needs. Pedagogical strategies also need to differentiate between newly employed academic staff (who require efficiency and depth) and students (who require foundational skills and guardrails). Chen and Zhang (2024) recommended microlearning modules—short, AI-interactive videos and quizzes—that can be completed asynchronously. However, the adoption of such strategies depends heavily on librarians' own pedagogical training, which is often lacking in library science curricula (Park & Lee, 2024).

Assessment of AI-Infused Orientation Effectiveness

Assessing orientation effectiveness is crucial but underdeveloped in the AI context. Traditional assessment methods—satisfaction surveys and attendance counts—are inadequate for measuring AI literacy acquisition (Robinson & Oltmann, 2024). Emerging frameworks propose pre- and post-orientation tests measuring users' ability to: (a) formulate effective prompts for AI search tools; (b) identify AI-generated hallucinations; (c) cite AI-generated content correctly; and (d) evaluate AI-recommended sources for authority and relevance (Smith, 2026).

From the librarian's perspective, assessment also includes observation, follow-up reference desk analytics (e.g., reduction in basic AI-related questions post-orientation), and user performance in authentic research tasks (Afolabi & Olajide, 2023). Some libraries have implemented AI-powered analytics dashboards that track how new users interact with library systems after orientation (Kumar & Singh, 2025). However, Boateng and Quagraine (2024) cautioned that such assessments must respect user privacy and avoid punitive interpretations. The literature consistently notes a gap between desired assessment practices and actual implementation, particularly in resource-constrained settings.

Methodology

A descriptive survey research design was adopted. The population comprised all 85 librarians working in user education, reference services, and systems departments across three federal universities in Southwest Nigeria: University of Ibadan (n=32), Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife (n=28), and University of Lagos (n=25). A purposive sampling technique included all librarians directly involved in orientation activities (N=85), achieving a 100% sample. The instrument was a 32-item online questionnaire titled "AI Library Orientation Perspective Scale (AILOPS)" organized into four sections corresponding to the four objectives. Items used a 4-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Strongly Agree) plus open-ended questions. Face and content validity were established by three professors of library and information science. Reliability was tested using Cronbach's alpha on a pilot sample of 15 librarians from a non-participating university, yielding a coefficient of 0.92. Data were collected over six weeks (February–March 2026) via Google Forms. Ethical protocols included informed consent, anonymity, voluntary participation, and institutional approval. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation) presented in tables organized by objective.

Data Analysis and Results

Objective 1: Readiness of Librarians for AI-Powered Orientation

Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviation of Librarians' Perceived Readiness (N=85)

Item	Mean	SD	1. Remark
I possess skills to teach AI semantic search tools	2.41	0.79	Low
Our library has functional AI chatbots for user orientation	1.95	0.88	Very Low
I am confident explaining AI-based plagiarism detection	3.02	0.71	Moderate
I can guide users on ethical AI use in research	2.85	0.83	Moderate
Library management actively supports AI-driven orientation	2.31	0.91	Low
I have received formal training on AI tools for library instruction	2.12	0.86	Low
Overall Readiness Mean	**2.53**	**0.81**	**Low**

The overall mean readiness of 2.53 indicates low readiness. The lowest items were AI chatbot availability (M=1.95) and formal AI training (M=2.12). Only plagiarism detection confidence (M=3.02) fell into the moderate range.

Objective 2: Challenges in Designing and Delivering AI-Infused Orientation

Table 2: Frequency and Percentage of Librarians Endorsing Each Challenge (N=85)

Challenge	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Inadequate AI infrastructure (internet, software, power)	82	96.5
Lack of institutional AI policy for library orientation	78	91.8
Insufficient training opportunities for librarians	76	89.4
Lack of AI evaluation tools for orientation	73	85.9
Difficulty simplifying AI concepts for novices	69	81.2
Time constraints during orientation week	71	83.5
Resistance from older academic staff	65	76.5
Student over-reliance on generative AI without critical thinking	58	68.2

All eight challenges were endorsed by a majority. Infrastructure (96.5%) and policy (91.8%) were the most pervasive.

Objective 3: Pedagogical Strategies Employed by Librarians

Table 3: Frequency of Pedagogical Strategies Used in AI-Infused Orientation (Multiple Response, N=85)

Strategy	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Live demonstration of AI search tools (e.g., EBSCO AI)	52	61.2
Printed/PDF guides with AI tips	48	56.5
One-on-one consultations after orientation	44	51.8
Interactive chatbot simulation	23	27.1
Ethical case studies on AI misuse	19	22.4
Gamified AI literacy tutorials	12	14.1
Peer-assisted learning (tech-savvy users helping others)	30	35.3

Most librarians rely on traditional demonstration (61.2%) and printed guides (56.5%). Advanced strategies like gamification (14.1%) and ethical case studies (22.4%) are rarely used.

Objective 4: Assessment of AI-Infused Orientation Effectiveness

Table 4: Assessment Methods Used by Librarians to Evaluate AI Orientation (N=85)

Assessment Method	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
End-of-orientation satisfaction survey	67	78.8
Attendance register	59	69.4
Observation of user behavior during orientation	41	48.2
Pre- and post-test of AI knowledge	16	18.8
Follow-up reference desk query analysis	22	25.9
User performance on authentic research task	11	12.9
AI-powered analytics dashboard	3	3.5

Satisfaction surveys (78.8%) and attendance (69.4%) dominate. Rigorous methods like pre/post-tests (18.8%) and AI analytics (3.5%) are rare.

Discussion of Findings

The findings reveal a consistent pattern: from the librarian's perspective, the orientation of newly employed academic staff and students on AI-powered library services is characterized by low readiness, pervasive challenges, underdeveloped pedagogical strategies, and weak assessment mechanisms.

Regarding Objective 1, the low overall readiness (M=2.53) aligns with Nwosu and Eze (2025) in sub-Saharan Africa but diverges sharply from Robinson and Oltmann (2024) in North America. This suggests a global digital divide in AI readiness. The specific deficit in formal AI training (M=2.12) confirms that librarians cannot teach what they have not learned. The moderate confidence in plagiarism detection likely reflects longer exposure to tools like Turnitin, which have AI components, whereas newer AI chatbots remain unfamiliar.

Concerning Objective 2, the near-universal challenge of infrastructure (96.5%) echoes Adebayo and Oyewole (2023), but the study adds policy absence (91.8%) as equally critical. Unlike developed contexts where AI ethics and pedagogy are prioritized (Thompson & Carter, 2025), Nigerian librarians struggle with basics. Resistance from older staff (76.5%) supports Hernandez (2025), while student over-reliance on AI (68.2%) highlights a dual problem: underprepared librarians and uncritical users.

For Objective 3, the predominance of traditional demonstration and printed guides suggests that

librarians have not yet transitioned to AI-appropriate pedagogies. The low use of gamification (14.1%) and ethical case studies (22.4%) contradicts recommendations by Huang et al. (2024), indicating a pedagogy gap. The moderate use of peer-assisted learning (35.3%) is encouraging but insufficient.

Regarding Objective 4, assessment remains stuck in satisfaction surveys (78.8%) and attendance (69.4%), which measure reaction not learning. The negligible use of AI-powered analytics (3.5%) and authentic task performance (12.9%) confirms Boateng and Quagraine's (2024) concern that AI orientation lacks evidence-based evaluation. This is problematic because without robust assessment, librarians cannot improve or justify AI orientation programs.

Taken together, the four objectives paint a coherent picture: librarians are caught between the promise of AI and the reality of institutional neglect. They want to orient users effectively but lack tools, training, policies, strategies, and assessment frameworks.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study concludes that from the librarian's perspective, the orientation of newly employed academic staff and students on library use in the AI dispensation is severely constrained. Librarians report low readiness, face overwhelming infrastructural and policy challenges, employ predominantly traditional pedagogical strategies rather than AI-appropriate ones, and rely on superficial assessment methods that fail to measure genuine AI literacy. Without systemic intervention, AI-driven library orientation will remain an aspiration rather than a reality in many academic institutions, particularly in developing economies. Based on the four objectives, the following recommendations are made:

1. University administrations should mandate and fund formal AI training programs for all librarians within the next academic year, focusing on practical skills for teaching AI tools to diverse users.
2. Institutional AI policies specifically addressing library orientation should be developed, including infrastructure budgets (internet, software, power backup) and clear guidelines on ethical AI use for new staff and students.
3. Library management should establish a peer-learning community of practice where librarians share and co-develop AI teaching strategies, emphasizing gamification, case studies, and simulation-based learning.
4. Librarians should adopt pre- and post-orientation AI literacy tests and implement follow-up analytics (e.g., reduction in basic AI support tickets) to evaluate effectiveness; universities should provide tools and training for these assessments.
5. Further comparative studies across multiple countries, disciplines, and library types are needed. Longitudinal research should track whether improved AI orientation correlates with higher research output and user satisfaction.

References

Adebayo, O. O., & Okonkwo, A. N. (2023). Academic librarians as AI mediators: Roles, competencies, and professional challenges in the fourth industrial revolution. Journal of Librarianship and Information Science, 55(2), 412–428. https://doi.org/10.1177/09610006221098765

Adebayo, O. O., & Oyewole, O. (2023). Infrastructure and policy gaps in AI-driven academic libraries in Nigeria. *African Journal of Library and Information Science*, 33(1), 45–59.

Adegbore, A. M. (2022). Artificial intelligence and library services: Awareness, adoption, and professional readiness among Nigerian academic librarians. African Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science, 32(1), 55–72.

Adetoro, N., Ilesanmi, O. A., & Adekunle, P. A. (2021). Information literacy instruction in the era of AI: Challenges and opportunities for academic librarians in Nigeria. Nigerian Libraries, 54(2), 23–41.

Afolabi, K. A., & Olajide, O. M. (2023). Underutilization of AI-based library services among new university users. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 2023, 1–15.

Association of College and Research Libraries. (2016). Framework for information literacy for higher education. American Library Association.

Boateng, F., & Quagraine, T. (2024). Time constraints in library orientation: A challenge for AI integration. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 50(2), 102456.

Chen, L., & Zhang, Y. (2024). Intelligent libraries: Chatbots and recommender systems in user education. *College & Research Libraries*, 85(3), 401–418.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Eke, H. N. (2023). Generative artificial intelligence in academic research: Implications for information literacy instruction and library orientation in Nigerian universities. Library Management, 44(3/4), 201–218. https://doi.org/10.1108/LM-09-2022-0089

Ezeani, C. N., & Igwesi, U. (2020). Library orientation practices and user education in federal universities in South-East Nigeria: Content analysis and quality assessment. Library Progress International, 40(2), 89–107.

Hernandez, R. (2025). Generational resistance to AI in academic libraries. *Library Trends*, 73(4), 789–805.

Huang, J., Li, M., & Wang, T. (2024). From tours to tutorials: Rethinking library orientation with AI. *Information Technology and Libraries*,

43(1), 22–39.

Ifijeh, G., & Yusuf, F. (2020). Artificial intelligence and the future of libraries in Nigeria: Issues, trends and the way forward. Library Philosophy and Practice, 2020, 1–17.

Iroaganachi, M. A., & Ilogho, J. E. (2022). Library 4.0 and AI integration in Nigerian university libraries: Governance, policy, and professional preparedness. Journal of Library Administration, 62(4), 487–506. https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2022.2041278

Khalid, A., & Farooq, M. U. (2026). Digital divides in AI adoption: Staff vs. students in higher education. *Education and Information Technologies*, 31(1), 115–133.

Kumar, V., & Singh, N. (2025). Readiness assessment framework for AI in academic libraries. *Library Hi Tech*, 43(2), 287–305.

Li, X., & Ma, W. (2024). Policy gaps in AI-oriented library services: A global review. *International Journal of Library Science*, 19(2), 98–114.

Lund, B., & Wang, T. (2025). AI literacy for new academics: The librarian's role. *Journal of Library Administration*, 65(1), 55–72.

Maguire, L. (2023). Orienting new users to AI-powered library services: Emerging frameworks and pedagogical approaches. Reference and User Services Quarterly, 62(3), 145–158. https://doi.org/10.5860/rusq.62.3.8245

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric theory (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Nwosu, C. C., & Eze, P. N. (2025). AI competencies of academic librarians in sub-Saharan Africa. *Digital Library Perspectives*, 41(1), 34–50.

Nwosu, C. C., Ugwu, C. I., & Okafor, V. N. (2023). AI literacy and library orientation in Nigerian higher education: Assessing readiness, gaps, and the librarian's role. African Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science, 33(1), 67–85.

Ocholla, D. N., & Ocholla, L. (2020). Emerging and neglected research areas in library and information science research in Africa: A critical review of literature. Information Development, 36(2), 207–219. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266666919848601

Ocholla, D., & Shongwe, M. (2025). Contextualizing AI tools for African university libraries. *South African Journal of Libraries and Information Science*, 91(1), 12–27.

Ogunniyi, S. O., & Adetoro, N. (2021). Library orientation and information literacy of fresh students in Nigerian universities: A longitudinal assessment. International Journal of Library and Information Science, 13(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.5897/IJLIS2021.0896

Oguntuase, A., & Ojo, R. A. (2022). Artificial intelligence tools in academic libraries and the challenge of librarian preparedness in South-South Nigeria. Library Hi Tech News, 39(7), 16–20. https://doi.org/10.1108/LHTN-04-2022-0046

Okeji, C. C., Onuoha, U. D., & Nwosu, C. C. (2021). AI adoption challenges and competency gaps among academic librarians in Nigeria: Implications for professional development. IFLA Journal, 47(4), 523–537. https://doi.org/10.1177/0340035221997826

Okonkwo, C. I., & Adebayo, F. A. (2023). Artificial intelligence in Nigerian university libraries: Hype or reality? *Library Review*, 72(3), 210–228.

Onuoha, U. D., & Okorie, O. N. (2022). Artificial intelligence in Nigerian university libraries: Current status, prospects, and barriers to adoption. Information and Learning Sciences, 123(5/6), 245–263. https://doi.org/10.1108/ILS-10-2021-0088

Oyelude, A. A., & Bamigboye, O. B. (2022). Digital fluency among newly employed academics in Nigeria. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 16(2), 88–104.

Park, S., & Lee, J. (2024). Revisiting TAM for AI adoption in libraries. *Library & Information Science Research*, 46(2), 101234.

Raju, J., & Maboya, K. (2022). AI-literacy orientation in academic libraries: Lessons from practice in South African and Australian institutions. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 48(4), 102535. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2022.102535

Robinson, L., & Oltmann, S. M. (2024). Training librarians for AI orientation: A mixed-methods study. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 65(3), 250–268.

Smith, J. A. (2026). Teaching AI ethics in library orientation programs. *Journal of Information Ethics*, 35(1), 44–61.

Thompson, K., & Carter, D. (2025). Pedagogical approaches to AI literacy in academic libraries. *Reference Services Review*, 53(1), 77–94.