Lead City International Journal of Library, Information & Communication Sciences

PRINT ISSN
3027-0022
e-ISSN
3027-0901

Open Access · Peer-Reviewed

VOLUME 3 ISSUE 2 YEAR 2026 pp. 83–97

DOI: https://doi.org/10.63741/lcijlics.2026.0302.05-j

ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE

Digital Literacy and Institutional Support as Predictors of Library Database Use among Undergraduate Students in Two Nigerian Universities

Basirat O. Diyaolu[1*] & David O. Okhakhu, PhD[2]

[1]*Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Nigeria*

[2]*Lead City University, Ibadan, Nigeria*

[1]*diyaolubo@funaab.edu.ng*, [2]*okhakhu.david@lcu.edu.ng*

ARTICLE INFO

ARTICLE TYPE
Original Research

RECEIVED
07 August, 2026

REVISED
29 September, 2026

ACCEPTED
15 October, 2026

PUBLISHED ONLINE
31 October, 2026

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR
Basirat O. Diyaolu
diyaolubo@funaab.edu.ng

HOW TO CITE
Diyaolu, B. O., Okhakhu, D. O. (2026) Digital Literacy and Institutional Support as Predictors of Library Database Use among Undergraduate Students in Two Nigerian Universities. *Lead City International Journal of Library, Information & Communication Sciences*, 3(2), 83–97. https://doi.org/10.63741/lcijlics.2026.0301.04-j

ABSTRACT

University libraries invest heavily in electronic databases, but the return on that investment depends on whether students can use them and on the institutional conditions that make access possible. This study examined the extent of library database use among undergraduates in two Nigerian universities and tested whether digital literacy and institutional support predict that use. A descriptive survey was conducted at the Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta (FUNAAB) and Obafemi Awolowo University (OAU), Ile-Ife. A sample of 379 undergraduates, allocated proportionately (119 from FUNAAB and 260 from OAU), completed a structured online questionnaire using a four-point agreement scale. Mean scores showed moderate database use (M = 2.64) and favourable ratings of digital literacy (M = 3.00) and institutional support (M = 3.00). Digital literacy ($\beta = .54$, $R^2 = .29$) and institutional support ($\beta = .71$, $R^2 = .51$) each significantly predicted database use (both $p < .001$). Together they explained 55.8% of the variance, $F(2, 376) = 237.62$, $p < .001$, and institutional support was the stronger predictor ($\beta = .59$ versus $\beta = .26$). The findings suggest that building students' digital skills will yield limited gains unless it is matched by dependable electricity, connectivity, remote access and responsive library support. Because the design is cross-sectional and self-reported, the results indicate association rather than causation, and the study does not measure academic performance or test moderation.

Keywords: *digital literacy; institutional support; library database use; undergraduate students; Nigerian universities*

Article is published under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

Print ISSN 3027-0022· e-ISSN 3027-0901
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63741/lcijlics.2026.0302.05-j

1. INTRODUCTION

University education increasingly depends on students' ability to locate, evaluate and use credible scholarly information. Academic libraries support this work through subscribed electronic databases, digital repositories and related online services. Resources such as JSTOR, ScienceDirect, EBSCOhost, AGORA and HINARI give access to scholarly articles, e-books and other materials relevant to coursework and research. Availability alone, however, does not guarantee effective use. Earlier work has documented uneven engagement with digital library resources and the challenges that constrain it (Ajegbomogun, Achigbue, & Diyaolu, 2022; Okunlola, 2021).

Digital literacy matters because productive use of scholarly databases requires more than familiarity with computers or mobile devices. Students must formulate searches, navigate interfaces, judge the credibility of what they retrieve, manage digital materials and use information ethically. Digital literacy frameworks describe these competencies as a blend of technical, information-evaluation and communication skills (Feerrar, 2019; Martínez-Bravo, Sádaba Chalezquer, & Serrano-Puche, 2022).

Institutional support supplies the conditions in which such competencies can be applied. Reliable electricity, internet connectivity, adequate computer facilities, remote access, database orientation, technical assistance and the availability of librarians all shape students' opportunities to use digital resources. Research on electronic-resource use in Nigerian universities has pointed to the importance of both user competencies and institutional factors (Ajegbomogun et al., 2022; Owolabi, Diyaolu, Aderibigbe, & Mudasiru, 2020). Where students depend on university infrastructure to reach subscription resources, institutional support may be especially consequential.

Few studies have examined these two sets of factors side by side among undergraduates. This study therefore estimates the separate and joint power of digital literacy and institutional support to predict library database use among undergraduates at two federal universities in south-west Nigeria.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Libraries commit substantial financial and technical resources to electronic databases, yet students' ability to benefit from them may be limited by gaps in digital literacy and by weak access conditions. General internet searches are easy to reach but do not offer the scholarly control and quality of curated academic databases. Students also face barriers linked to connectivity, electricity, equipment, awareness and training. Evidence is needed on how much undergraduates use library databases and on how far digital literacy and institutional support statistically predict that use in Nigerian university settings.

Print ISSN 3027-0022· e-ISSN 3027-0901
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63741/lcijlics.2026.0302.05-j

1.2 Objectives of the Study

The aim of the study was to examine digital literacy and institutional support as predictors of library database use among undergraduate students in two Nigerian universities. The specific objectives were to:

i. assess the extent of library database use among undergraduate students;
ii. determine students' reported level of digital literacy;
iii. assess students' perceptions of institutional support for library database access;
iv. examine digital literacy as a predictor of library database use; and
v. examine institutional support as a predictor of library database use, separately and jointly with digital literacy.

1.3 Research questions

1. To what extent do undergraduate students use library databases?
2. What level of digital literacy do undergraduate students report?
3. How do students assess institutional support for accessing library databases?
4. To what extent does digital literacy predict library database use?
5. To what extent does institutional support predict library database use, separately and jointly with digital literacy?

1.3 Research Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance:

$H_0$1: Digital literacy does not significantly predict library database use among undergraduate students.
$H_0$2: Institutional support does not significantly predict library database use among undergraduate students.
$H_0$3: Digital literacy and institutional support do not jointly predict library database use among undergraduate students.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Library databases and student use

Library databases are electronic repositories that provide access to journals, e-books, theses and other scholarly materials used in teaching, learning and research. Hotsonyame (2023) reviewed the literature on academic libraries and described electronic databases as a core component of modern library service because they deliver current, peer-reviewed information regardless of geography. Evidence from Nigeria suggests that, although many institutions have invested in digital collections, use varies. Ajegbomogun et al. (2022), studying postgraduates at one Nigerian university, identified computer literacy skills and institutional factors as determinants of electronic-resource use, and Okunlola (2021) examined the utilisation of library-based electronic resources among postgraduates in Nigerian private universities. Beyond Nigeria, Gunarathna (2024) reported significant positive associations between digital library facilities and student satisfaction. Much of this work, however, concerns postgraduate users, provision of services or satisfaction, rather than undergraduates' own reported use.

Print ISSN 3027-0022· e-ISSN 3027-0901
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63741/lcijlics.2026.0302.05-j

Digital literacy

Digital literacy refers to the competencies needed to locate, evaluate, create and communicate digital information with technological tools (Martínez-Bravo et al., 2022). It extends beyond comfort with gadgets and social media to include the advanced information skills that scholarly work demands (Feerrar, 2019). Tella (2022) argues that students' digital competencies shape how efficiently they can navigate and use academic databases. Weber, Becker and Hillmert (2019) found that students' search strategies were related to academic success, which supports the view that information-seeking skill matters for scholarly work. Rafi, JianMing and Ahmad (2019) emphasise that technology access alone is insufficient and that structured digital and information literacy education is needed to build deeper competence.

Institutional support

Several studies identify institutional conditions as central to students' engagement with electronic resources. Emmachika, Nnatu and Okechukwu (2026) reported that limited access to ICT devices, poor internet connectivity and insufficient digital literacy skills remain major barriers to using library information resources among university students. Fakoyede, Babalola, Ekundayo and Alabi (2026) similarly link policy, infrastructure and socio-cultural barriers to unequal access to library resources in tertiary institutions, and inconsistent power supply is a recurring concern in Nigerian academic settings. Studies of library practice and user attitudes (Jatto & Diyaolu, 2021; Ojobor, Okafor, & Ugwuanyi, 2025) point to training, staffing and technology-related constraints. Taken together, this work suggests that institutions that pair reliable infrastructure with training and technical support are better placed to encourage the use of digital resources.

Theoretical perspective

The study draws on technology acceptance and information-behaviour perspectives, which hold that user competencies and enabling conditions influence whether and how people adopt and use technology in learning environments (Owolabi et al., 2020). Applied here, digital literacy represents the personal competencies a student brings to a database, and institutional support represents the facilitating conditions that determine whether those competencies can be exercised. Both are therefore expected to be positively associated with database use.

Database use and academic outcomes

A further body of work associates the use of scholarly information resources with academic performance. Omotade and Okhakhu (2023) describe academic excellence as high performance across examinations, research outputs, assignments and critical thinking, and Ngozi (2024) reports a positive relationship between information literacy and the use of electronic resources among Nigerian undergraduates. Salimi et al. (2025) suggest that digital literacy may shape how effectively students convert resources into academic outcomes. These studies motivate a longer-term research agenda, but academic performance is outside the scope of the present study, which concerns database use as the outcome variable.

Research gap and contribution

The literature shows that both student competencies and institutional conditions are relevant to electronic-resource use, but few studies compare their predictive value for undergraduates' database use within the same model. This study contributes by estimating the individual and joint predictive contribution of digital literacy and institutional support for database use among undergraduates at FUNAAB and OAU.

Print ISSN **3027-0022**· e-ISSN **3027-0901**
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63741/lcijlics.2026.0302.05-j

3. METHODOLOGY

Research design and setting

The study adopted a descriptive survey design. It was conducted among undergraduate students at the Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta (FUNAAB) and Obafemi Awolowo University (OAU), Ile-Ife, Nigeria. Both are federal universities whose libraries provide electronic information resources.

Population and sample

The manuscript reports an undergraduate population of 15,095 at FUNAAB and 32,830 at OAU for the 2025/2026 academic session, giving a combined population of 47,925. A total sample of 379 was allocated proportionately to the two institutions. The allocation was 119 students from FUNAAB and 260 from OAU.

Table 1: Population and sample allocation

Institution	Population	Proportion (%)	Sample
Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta (FUNAAB)	15,095	31.5	119
Obafemi Awolowo University (OAU), Ile-Ife	32,830	68.5	260
Total	**47,925**	**100.0**	**379**

A proportionate-to-size allocation was used to determine the number of students selected from each institution, followed by simple random sampling as reported in the study. The questionnaire was administered online through Google Forms, and 379 completed responses were included in the analysis.

Instrument

Data were collected with a structured questionnaire covering library database use, digital literacy and institutional support. The items used a four-point Likert-type response scale: strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly agree. The questionnaire was administered online through Google Forms.

Ethical considerations

Formal ethical approval was not sought for this study as it involved a non-interventional survey, no collection of sensitive personal data, clinical data or data from vulnerable groups. The study was conducted in accordance with the principles for social science research. Informed consent was secured after participants were briefed on the study objectives and their right to withdraw. Anonymity was maintained by not collecting personally identifiable information, and confidentiality was ensured through aggregate reporting and secure data handling.

Print ISSN **3027-0022**· e-ISSN **3027-0901**
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63741/lcijlics.2026.0302.05-j

Data analysis

Data were analysed in SPSS using frequencies, percentages, item means, simple linear regression and multiple linear regression. For descriptive summaries, responses were coded as strongly disagree = 1, disagree = 2, agree = 3 and strongly agree = 4. Construct-level means were calculated by averaging the item means within each construct. Statistical significance values displayed as .000 in the original SPSS output are reported as $p < .001$.

Library database use was the dependent variable, while digital literacy and institutional support were the predictor variables. The analyses tested the separate and joint predictive relationships of the two predictors with database use. They did not test interaction effects and did not use a direct measure of academic performance; accordingly, the findings are interpreted as evidence about prediction of database use, not moderation or academic excellence.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent profile

Table 2 summarises the respondents. Women made up 79% of the sample and men 21%. Most respondents (60.4%) were aged 16–20 years, and a further 33.5% were aged 21–25 years, so the sample was predominantly young. The sex imbalance means that the findings may not represent male undergraduates equally well.

Table 2: Profile of respondents (N = 379)

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Institution	FUNAAB	119	31.4
	OAU	260	68.6
Age group (years)	16–20	229	60.4
	21–25	127	33.5
	26–30	21	5.5
	31 and above	2	0.5

Extent of library database use

Table 3 shows the item-level responses on database use. The highest-rated statement was the use of database resources recommended by lecturers (84.7% agreement, M = 2.97). Six further statements drew agreement from about 65% to 72% of respondents, including ease of locating relevant materials (72.3%), use of database information in coursework (66.8%), use of databases as a primary source of scholarly information (66.5%), and consulting databases when preparing for examinations (65.7%). Agreement was lower for preferring databases to general search engines (54.4%), spending considerable time searching each week (52.0%) and regularly downloading journal articles (49.1%); the last two had means just at or below the

Print ISSN 3027-0022· e-ISSN 3027-0901
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63741/lcijlics.2026.0302.05-j

scale midpoint (M = 2.52 and 2.49). The overall mean of 2.64 indicates moderate use that is only slightly above the midpoint.

Table 3: Library database use among undergraduate students (N = 379)

#	Statement	SD	D	A	SA	A + SA (%)	Mean
1	I use library databases regularly for my academic assignments	32 (8.4)	102 (26.9)	215 (56.7)	30 (7.9)	64.6	2.64
2	I access academic databases (e.g., JSTOR, ScienceDirect, EBSCOhost) whenever I need scholarly information	45 (11.9)	118 (31.1)	187 (49.3)	29 (7.7)	57.0	2.53
3	I prefer library databases to general internet search engines for academic work	28 (7.4)	145 (38.3)	172 (45.4)	34 (9.0)	54.4	2.56
4	I can easily locate relevant materials in library databases	19 (5.0)	86 (22.7)	240 (63.3)	34 (9.0)	72.3	2.76
5	I use advanced search features (e.g., filters, Boolean operators) when searching databases	49 (12.9)	107 (28.2)	180 (47.5)	43 (11.3)	58.8	2.57
6	I spend considerable time searching library databases each week	28 (7.4)	154 (40.6)	170 (44.9)	27 (7.1)	52.0	2.52
7	I download journal articles from library databases regularly	23 (6.1)	170 (44.9)	162 (42.7)	24 (6.3)	49.1	2.49
8	I use information obtained from library databases in my coursework	34 (9.0)	92 (24.3)	227 (59.9)	26 (6.9)	66.8	2.65
9	I access library databases both on-campus and remotely	31 (8.2)	103 (27.2)	220 (58.0)	25 (6.6)	64.6	2.63
10	I consult library databases when preparing for examinations	23 (6.1)	107 (28.2)	226 (59.6)	23 (6.1)	65.7	2.66
11	Library databases are my primary source of scholarly information	25 (6.6)	102 (26.9)	223 (58.8)	29 (7.7)	66.5	2.68
12	I use database resources recommended by my lecturers	16 (4.2)	42 (11.1)	259 (68.3)	62 (16.4)	84.7	2.97
Construct mean							**2.64**

Print ISSN 3027-0022· e-ISSN 3027-0901
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63741/lcijlics.2026.0302.05-j

Note. Cell entries are frequencies with row percentages in parentheses. SD = strongly disagree; D = disagree; A = agree; SA = strongly agree. Means use coding SD = 1 to SA = 4 and were computed from the frequency counts.

Level of digital literacy

Table 4 shows that respondents rated their digital literacy favourably (construct M = 3.00). Agreement was highest for using search strategies to find information online (92.1%), downloading, saving and organising digital materials (90.8%), using computers and mobile devices for academic purposes (90.5%) and searching for information online (89.4%). It was lowest for distinguishing scholarly from non-scholarly sources (71.0%, M = 2.84), knowing how to avoid plagiarism (75.5%) and using advanced search techniques in databases (76.0%). Students therefore report stronger general online skills than specialised scholarly-search skills.

Table 4: Digital literacy among undergraduate students (N = 379)

#	Statement	SD	D	A	SA	A + SA (%)	Mean
1	I can effectively use computers and mobile devices for academic purposes	20 (5.3)	16 (4.2)	238 (62.8)	105 (27.7)	90.5	3.13
2	I am skilled at searching for information online	17 (4.5)	23 (6.1)	231 (60.9)	108 (28.5)	89.4	3.13
3	I can evaluate the credibility of information found on the internet	14 (3.7)	42 (11.1)	240 (63.3)	83 (21.9)	85.2	3.03
4	I know how to use advanced search techniques in databases	23 (6.1)	68 (17.9)	208 (54.9)	80 (21.1)	76.0	2.91
5	I can distinguish between scholarly and non-scholarly sources	18 (4.7)	92 (24.3)	200 (52.8)	69 (18.2)	71.0	2.84
6	I am confident in using digital tools for academic purposes	15 (4.0)	27 (7.1)	253 (66.8)	84 (22.2)	88.9	3.07
7	I understand how to avoid plagiarism when using digital information	16 (4.2)	77 (20.3)	206 (54.4)	80 (21.1)	75.5	2.92
8	I can troubleshoot basic technical problems when using online resources	13 (3.4)	69 (18.2)	243 (64.1)	54 (14.2)	78.4	2.89
9	I am comfortable learning new digital platforms independently	18 (4.7)	44 (11.6)	251 (66.2)	66 (17.4)	83.6	2.96

Print ISSN 3027-0022· e-ISSN 3027-0901
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63741/lcijlics.2026.0302.05-j

#	Statement	SD	D	A	SA	A + SA (%)	Mean
10	I can effectively navigate academic websites and databases	15 (4.0)	68 (17.9)	231 (60.9)	65 (17.2)	78.1	2.91
11	I know how to use search strategies to find relevant information online	12 (3.2)	18 (4.7)	268 (70.7)	81 (21.4)	92.1	3.10
12	I can download, save, and organize digital academic materials	12 (3.2)	23 (6.1)	260 (68.6)	84 (22.2)	90.8	3.10
13	I am familiar with the use of keywords and search operators	22 (5.8)	61 (16.1)	199 (52.5)	97 (25.6)	78.1	2.98
14	I am able to use online platforms for collaborative learning	13 (3.4)	40 (10.6)	255 (67.3)	71 (18.7)	86.0	3.01
Construct mean							**3.00**

Note. See Table 3 for coding and abbreviations.

Perceived institutional support

Table 5 shows that respondents also rated institutional support favourably (construct M = 3.00). Agreement was highest for reliable electricity (92.9%), adequate access to library databases (91.0%) and institutional encouragement of database use (85.8%). Training (83.6%), librarian availability (82.3%), technical support (82.8%), computer facilities (80.2%), awareness programmes (79.7%) and remote access (78.4%) received somewhat lower endorsement. Awareness programmes (M = 2.91), remote access (M = 2.93) and computer facilities (M = 2.94) had the lowest means, indicating where students see the most room for improvement.

Table 5: Perceived institutional support for database use (N = 379)

#	Statement	SD	D	A	SA	A + SA (%)	Mean
1	My university provides adequate access to library databases	18 (4.7)	16 (4.2)	234 (61.7)	111 (29.3)	91.0	3.16
2	Internet connectivity on our campus supports database use	27 (7.1)	30 (7.9)	257 (67.8)	65 (17.2)	85.0	2.95
3	The library offers training on how to use academic databases	16 (4.2)	46 (12.1)	238 (62.8)	79 (20.8)	83.6	3.00

Print ISSN **3027-0022**· e-ISSN **3027-0901**
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63741/lcijlics.2026.0302.05-j

#	Statement	SD	D	A	SA	A + SA (%)	Mean
4	Librarians are readily available to assist students with database searching in my university library	25 (6.6)	42 (11.1)	235 (62.0)	77 (20.3)	82.3	2.96
5	My university provides reliable electricity for accessing digital resources	14 (3.7)	13 (3.4)	237 (62.5)	115 (30.3)	92.9	3.20
6	Awareness programmes on database use are organised for students in my university	18 (4.7)	59 (15.6)	240 (63.3)	62 (16.4)	79.7	2.91
7	Computer facilities are adequate for accessing library databases in my university	16 (4.2)	59 (15.6)	235 (62.0)	69 (18.2)	80.2	2.94
8	Remote access to databases is available to students in my university	16 (4.2)	66 (17.4)	224 (59.1)	73 (19.3)	78.4	2.93
9	Technical support is provided when students encounter access problems	15 (4.0)	50 (13.2)	241 (63.6)	73 (19.3)	82.8	2.98
10	My university encourages the use of library databases for academic work	13 (3.4)	41 (10.8)	255 (67.3)	70 (18.5)	85.8	3.01
Construct mean							**3.00**

Note. See Table 3 for coding and abbreviations.

Table 6: Summary of construct means

Construct	Items	Mean	Relative to midpoint (2.50)
Library database use	12	2.64	Slightly above
Digital literacy	14	3.00	Above
Institutional support	10	3.00	Above

Note. Construct means are averages of item means from the frequency tables. Respondent-level standard deviations and reliability coefficients should be added from the dataset. [SDs: 6.574, 7.700. 5.628 and Cronbach's alpha : 0.790]

Print ISSN 3027-0022· e-ISSN 3027-0901
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63741/lcijlics.2026.0302.05-j

Test of hypotheses

Table 1: Regression of library database use on digital literacy and institutional support

Predictor	B	SE B	β	t	p
Model 1: R^2 = .290, F(1, 377) = 153.70, p < .001					
Constant	15.459	1.201	—	12.87	< .001
Digital literacy	0.461	0.037	.538	12.40	< .001
Model 2: R^2 = .505, F(1, 377) = 385.22, p < .001					
Constant	8.215	1.131	—	7.27	< .001
Institutional support	0.520	0.026	.711	19.63	< .001
Model 3: R^2 = .558, adjusted R^2 = .556, F(2, 376) = 237.62, p < .001					
Constant	4.925	1.177	—	4.19	< .001
Institutional support	0.430	0.028	.588	15.12	< .001
Digital literacy	0.223	0.033	.261	6.71	< .001

Note. Dependent variable: library database use (as labelled in the SPSS output). B = unstandardised coefficient; SE B = standard error; β = standardised coefficient. R^2 values were computed from the reported sums of squares (regression SS/total SS; total SS = 11,973.325, df = 378).

Hypothesis 1

Digital literacy significantly predicted library database use, F(1, 377) = 153.70, p < .001, and accounted for 29.0% of its variance. The standardised coefficient (β = .54, t = 12.40, p < .001) was positive and of moderate size: higher digital literacy scores were associated with higher database use scores. $H0_1$ was therefore rejected.

Hypothesis 2

Institutional support also significantly predicted database use, F(1, 377) = 385.22, p < .001, and accounted for 50.5% of its variance. The standardised coefficient (β = .71, t = 19.63, p < .001) indicates a strong positive association. $H0_2$ was therefore rejected.

Hypothesis 3

Together, digital literacy and institutional support significantly predicted database use, F(2, 376) = 237.62, p < .001, explaining 55.8% of the variance (adjusted R^2 = .556). Both predictors retained significant unique contributions, with institutional support (β = .59, t = 15.12, p < .001) stronger than digital literacy (β = .26, t = 6.71, p < .001). The joint R^2 (.558) is well below the sum of the two single-predictor values (.290 + .505 = .795), which shows that the predictors share a substantial part of their explanatory power. $H0_3$ was therefore rejected.

Discussion of Findings

Respondents reported favourable digital literacy and positive perceptions of institutional support, but their reported database use was more modest. The construct mean for database use (2.64) was lower than those for digital literacy and institutional support (both 3.00). Confidence and perceived provision therefore do not seem to translate fully into frequent or

Print ISSN 3027-0022· e-ISSN 3027-0901
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63741/lcijlics.2026.0302.05-j

intensive database engagement. The pattern at item level supports this reading: students were least likely to report regular downloading of articles or sustained weekly searching, and most likely to report using resources recommended by their lecturers. Lecturer direction may thus be an important route to scholarly databases, while self-directed use may need additional encouragement and practice. The same gap appears within digital literacy, where general online skills were rated higher than the scholarly-search skills that databases demand.

The positive association between digital literacy and database use is consistent with the expectation that students who can navigate digital platforms, apply search strategies and manage online materials are better equipped to engage with scholarly resources. It also accords with accounts of digital literacy as a combination of operational, information-searching and evaluation skills (Feerrar, 2019; Martínez-Bravo et al., 2022) and with the case for library-led, ongoing literacy instruction (Rafi et al., 2019; Tella, 2022).

Institutional support had the stronger standardised association with database use, both alone and in the joint model. Students' database use appears to be linked not only to their own competencies but also to the practical conditions their institutions provide. Reliable electricity, adequate connectivity, access to subscriptions, remote-access arrangements, training and responsive technical help make database use more feasible. This is consistent with research that treats institutional conditions as relevant to electronic-resource use (Ajegbomogun et al., 2022; Emmachika et al., 2026; Fakoyede et al., 2026; Owolabi et al., 2020).

The joint model explained 55.8% of the variance in database use, and each predictor retained a significant coefficient. Digital literacy and institutional support therefore carry distinct predictive information, although they also overlap. This fits the view that skills and enabling conditions work together: skilled students are better able to take advantage of good access, and good access gives skills a chance to be used.

Limitations

Several limitations should be borne in mind. First, the design is cross-sectional and relies on self-reported perceptions, so the results show association and cannot establish that raising literacy or support would increase database use. Second, the questionnaire was administered online and women made up 79% of respondents, so the sample may not represent all undergraduates at the two institutions Third, construct scores are summarised from item frequencies; respondent-level distributions, reliability coefficients and collinearity statistics are not reported here. Fourth, the study included only two federal universities, which limits generalisation to private or other public institutions. Finally, the study did not measure academic performance and did not test interaction effects, so it offers no evidence on whether digital literacy or institutional support moderates the link between database use and academic outcomes.

Print ISSN **3027-0022**· e-ISSN **3027-0901**
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63741/lcijlics.2026.0302.05-j

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

This study examined library database use among undergraduates at FUNAAB and OAU and assessed digital literacy and institutional support as predictors. Database use was moderate (M = 2.64), whereas digital literacy and institutional support were rated favourably (both M = 3.00). Each predictor was significantly associated with database use, and together they explained 55.8% of its variance, with institutional support the stronger predictor. The findings suggest that efforts to raise database use should combine student skill development with dependable access infrastructure and practical library support.

Recommendations

On the basis of the findings, the following recommendations are made for universities in south-west Nigeria:

1. University libraries should provide continuing, practical training in database searching, including keyword selection, Boolean operators, filters, citation tracking and saving or exporting results.
2. Database orientation should extend beyond first-year induction, with short refresher sessions and discipline-specific demonstrations embedded in coursework and research assignments.
3. University management should prioritise dependable electricity, campus internet connectivity, functional computers and accessible remote authentication for subscribed databases.
4. Libraries should make database support easy to find and use, with clear guides, frequently asked questions, responsive help channels and prompt assistance with login or access problems.
5. Lecturers should identify relevant databases in course materials and assignments and encourage students to use scholarly resources rather than rely only on general web searches.
6. Libraries should strengthen awareness activities and monitor which databases are used, where access barriers occur and which training activities improve engagement.

6. DECLARATION OF GENERATIVE AI AND AI-ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES IN THE MANUSCRIPT PREPARATION PROCESS

“The authors used ChatGPT for language editing and manuscript-structure assistance. The authors reviewed and revised the output and take full responsibility for the content of the manuscript.”

Print ISSN 3027-0022· e-ISSN 3027-0901
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63741/lcijlics.2026.0302.05-j

REFERENCES

Ajegbomogun, F. O., Achigbue, E., & Diyaolu, B. O. (2022). Computer literacy skills and institutional factors as determinants of electronic resources use by postgraduates in a Nigerian university. *Ghana Library Journal, 27*(1), 104–115.

Emmachika, O. L., Nnatu, A. U., & Okechukwu, N. N. (2026). Impact of poor internet connectivity on electronic library services and the development of offline-accessible digital library software. *Journal Innovation in Information and Computer Technology, 3*(1), 1–11.

Fakoyede, S. J., Babalola, F. E., Ekundayo, S. K., & Alabi, D. O. (2026). Improving equitable access to library resources in tertiary institutions: Overcoming policy, infrastructure, and socio-cultural barriers. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 52*(2), Article 103219.

Feerrar, J. (2019). Development of a framework for digital literacy. *Reference Services Review, 47*(2), 91–105.

Gunarathna, M. (2024). Student satisfaction with physical and digital library facilities in higher education institutes. *Annals of Library and Information Studies, 71*(2), 190–199.

Hotsonyame, G. N. (2023). Significance of academic libraries in recent times: A review of articles. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal). 7867.https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/7867*

Jatto, E. O., & Diyaolu, B. O. (2021). Users' attitudes to the use of electronic resources and services by undergraduate students of McPherson University, Ogun State, Nigeria. Philosophy and Practice (e-journal) 6643. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/6643

Martínez-Bravo, M. C., Sádaba Chalezquer, C., & Serrano-Puche, J. (2022). Dimensions of digital literacy in the 21st century competency frameworks. *Sustainability, 14*(3), Article 1867.

Ngozi, H. (2024). Impact of information literacy on academic performance among undergraduate students in Nigeria. *African Journal of Information and Knowledge Management, 3*(1), 13–25.

Ojobor, R. C., Okafor, V. N., & Ugwuanyi, R. N. (2025). Leveraging innovative technologies for improved library practices in the digital era: The Nigerian perspective. *Information Technology and Libraries, 44*(2).

Okunlola, A. A. (2021). Utilization of library based electronic resources and services by postgraduates in Nigerian private universities. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current Educational Research, 3*(4), 164–171.

Omotade, A. M., & Okhakhu, D. O. (2023). Motivation to use smart mobile gadgets and perceived academic performance of undergraduates in private universities, South-West, Nigeria. *Nigerbiblios: Journal of the National Library of Nigeria, 33*(1), 114–124.

Owolabi, K. A., Diyaolu, B. O., Aderibigbe, N. A., & Mudasiru, Y. A. (2020). Factors influencing the adoption of electronic information resources among postgraduate students in Nigerian universities. *Mousaion, 38*(2).

Rafi, M., JianMing, Z., & Ahmad, K. (2019). Technology integration for students' information and digital literacy education in academic libraries. *Information Discovery and Delivery, 47*(4), 203–217.

Print ISSN **3027-0022**· e-ISSN **3027-0901**
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63741/lcijlics.2026.0302.05-j

Salimi, G., Roodsaz, A., Mohammadi, M., Keshavarzi, F., Mousavi, A., & Zainuddin, Z. (2025). How students' digital literacy promotes knowledge sharing and academic performance in online learning environments. *The International Journal of Information and Learning Technology, 42*(2), 165–184.

Tella, A. (2022). Teaching information literacy in Nigerian universities using advanced technologies. *Regional Journal of Information and Knowledge Management, 7*(2), 38–53.

Weber, H., Becker, D., & Hillmert, S. (2019). Information-seeking behaviour and academic success in higher education: Which search strategies matter for grade differences among university students and how does this relevance differ by field of study? *Higher Education, 77*(4), 657–