Students' Awareness, Utilization, and Satisfaction with the Copperbelt University Library's Online Public Access Catalogue

[1]Chilambwe Ng'ambi; [2]Abel M'kulama & [3]Akakandelwa Akakandelwa
[1]Copperbelt University
[2 3] The University of Zambia
[1]ngambic@yahoo.com; [2]abel.mkulama@gmail.com; [3]akakandelwa@unza.zm

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the levels of awareness, utilization, and satisfaction among undergraduate students at the Copperbelt University (N=368) with the library's Online Public Access Catalogue (OPAC). Grounded in the quantitative research paradigm and leveraging the UTAUT framework, the study employed descriptive statistics, correlation, regression, and ANOVA to achieve its objectives. Descriptive findings revealed that while 51.7% of students possessed basic OPAC awareness, 40.5% reported never using it, with only 12% reporting frequent use, indicating a significant utilization gap. Overall satisfaction was moderate, with over 51% of respondents expressing neutrality. Inferential analysis established that Facilitating Conditions (FC) and Performance Expectancy (PE) are the primary determinants of engagement. FC was the strongest positive predictor of Awareness (beta = 0.503) and Utilization (beta = 0.270). PE was the strongest determinant of Satisfaction (beta = 0.494). The analysis also found that Social Influence (SI) significantly drives Utilization (beta = 0.164), but, uniquely, had a negative predictive effect on Satisfaction (beta = -0.107). Furthermore, Age Group, Programme of Study, and Year of Study all significantly influence awareness, utilization, and satisfaction, confirming that user experience is highly heterogeneous. These results necessitate targeted Information Literacy campaigns, strategic system upgrades, and context-specific support programs to bridge the utilization gap and enhance the OPAC's role in academic success.

Keywords: OPAC, Awareness, Utilisation, Satisfaction, Library and Information Technology, CBU

1. INTRODUCTION

Access to accurate, timely, and comprehensive information is fundamental to academic success and lifelong learning. In today's knowledge-driven society, the ability to efficiently retrieve relevant information is critical for students, researchers, and educators alike. Academic libraries serve as vital hubs for information access and intellectual development, with their role evolving significantly in response to technological advancements. One of the most significant developments in recent decades has been the transition from traditional paper-based catalogues to web OPAC that offer rapid, user-friendly access to a wide array of resources.

The Copperbelt University (CBU) Library's Online Public Access Catalogue (OPAC) operating through the KOHA library maagement system exemplifies this shift. Introduced in 2006 firstly on the Liberty Library Management System then transitioned to KOHA in 2024, the OPAC was designed to streamline the process of locating library materials by providing an electronic, searchable database. Despite the promise of increased efficiency and convenience, preliminary observations suggest a disconnect between the availability of the OPAC and its effective use by the student body. While a significant proportion of students appear to be aware of the system, its utilization in day-to-day academic activities remains far from optimal.

2.1 Problem Statement

The level of satisfaction with an online catalogue can significantly impact the efficiency and effectiveness of the library system, user engagement with the library, and the academic success of users (Wanyonyi, Odini, & Sikolia, 2018) . When users are

DOI: 10.53974/unza.zajlis.9.2.210

not satisfied with an online catalogue, they may spend less time using the catalogue, resulting in decreased usage and decreased efficiency of the library system. User dissatisfaction can lead to decreased user engagement with the library as a whole, which can negatively impact the library reputation and patronage (Wanyonyi, Odini, & Sikolia, 2018) .

Furthermore, difficulties in locating resources can stand as a barrier to academic success, leading to frustration and decreased motivation for users, which can ultimately result in negative impacts on student performance, retention, and graduation rates (Wanyonyi, Odini, & Sikolia, 2018) . Therefore, it is crucial to identify and address areas for improvement in the catalogue to enhance user satisfaction and mitigate these challenges. While the Copperbelt University Library Online Public Access Catalogue (OPAC) is a crucialtool for undergraduate students to access academic resources, it is currently unknown the extent to which students are aware of, utilize and are satisfied with the CBU OPAC.

Without this knowledge, it is difficult for the Copperbelt University Library to provide an effective and efficient online catalogue system that meets the needs of its undergraduate users. As a result, there is a need to conduct an investigation that looks into the students' awareness, utilization and satisfaction with the catalogue, as well as identify possible areas for improvement. Generating this knowledge is also important because OPACs are expensive tools which if underutilised, could lead to substantial amounts of wasted resources and energy.

2.2 Objectives

The purpose of this study was to investigate the levels of awareness, utilization, and satisfaction among CBU students with the library OPAC. The specific objectives of this study are as follows:

i) assess the extent to which undergraduate students are informed about the existence and functionalities of the OPAC.
ii) determine the frequency and effective use of OPAC by the students for academic tasks.
iii) establish students' satisfaction with the OPAC with reference to ease of use, relevance of search results, and overall user experience.
iv) determine factors such as performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, and facilitating conditions impact awareness, utilization, and satisfaction.

2.3 Research Questions

i) How aware are undergraduate students of the CBU OPAC?
ii) To what extent do undergraduate students utilize the OPAC for their academic work?
iii) What is the overall satisfaction level of students regarding the OPAC?
iv) Which factors most significantly influence students' awareness, utilization, and satisfaction with the OPAC?

2.4 Significance of the study

The significance of this study is multifaceted. Effective use of the Web OPAC can enhance students' ability to locate critical academic resources, thereby improving the quality of their research and learning outcomes. Identifying the barriers to Web OPAC utilisation will enable library administrators and decision-makers to develop targeted interventions—such as training programs, system upgrades, and awareness campaigns—to enhance the overall user experience. Moreover, the insights gained from

DOI: 10.53974/unza.zajlis.9.2.210

this research have broader implications for academic libraries in similar contexts, particularly within institutions facing challenges in promoting digital literacy and technology adoption.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The preceding background information explored the evolution of library catalogues, the importance of information access and retrieval in academic libraries, barriers to access, challenges in the absence of catalogues, and the significance of online catalogues. Building upon this foundation, the literature review delves deeper into the existing research on undergraduate students' awareness, utilization, and satisfaction with library OPACs based on the objectives.

2.1 Students' Level of Awareness of the OPAC

Awareness, in this context, refers to students' knowledge and recognition of the existence and purpose of OPACs as tools for accessing library resources (Ahmed, Zin, & Majid, 2016). Factors influencing awareness include information literacy skills, which involve the ability to locate, evaluate, and use information effectively (Herring, 2011; Ramamurthy & Siridevi, 2015; Julien et al., 2018); instruction and training programs, which enhance awareness through workshops, tutorials, and sessions (Gana et al., 2019; Association of College and Research Libraries, 2015); accessibility and availability of OPACs, considering both physical placement and online access (Ternenge & Kashimana, 2019; Rachna, 2017); external influences, such as faculty recommendations and peer interactions (Rowley, et al., 2001; Waldman, 2003; Puustinen & Rouet, 2009); and cultural and demographic factors, which can shape students' attitudes and behaviors towards OPACs (Booth, 2009; Waldman, 2003).

2.2 Students Utilization of OPAC

Utilization refers to students' actual use of OPACs to search for, retrieve, and access library materials (Aju & Tofi, 2020). Factors influencing utilization include information literacy skills, which enable effective navigation and information-seeking (Kuruppu Arachchi, 2015; Julien et al., 2018); instruction and training programs, which improve search strategies and information retrieval (Miller, 2018; Deans & Durrant, 2016); user interface design and navigation, including visual appeal, clear labels, and advanced search options (Meadows, 2011; Lawless & Foster, 2020; Barifah, 2021); accessibility and availability, encompassing physical access, online access, and technical support (Ternenge & Kashimana, 2019; Rachna, 2017; Eserada & Okolo, 2019); external influences, such as faculty guidance and peer discussions (Rowley, et al., 2001; Waldman, 2003; Puustinen & Rouet, 2009); and cultural and demographic factors, which can affect students' comfort and engagement with OPACs (Booth, 2009; Waldman, 2003).

2.3 Students Satisfaction with OPAC

User satisfaction with OPACs involves user perception of effectiveness and user-friendliness (Cordes, 2014). Factors influencing satisfaction include search capabilities and retrieval performance, emphasizing robust search functionalities and efficient results (Lawless & Foster, 2020; Barifah, 2021); user interface design and features, where visually appealing and intuitive interfaces are valued (Barifah, 2021; Meadows, 2011); information organization and display, focusing on clear categorization and informative metadata (Mi & Weng, 2008); relevance and accuracy of search results, which are crucial for effective information retrieval (Mi & Weng, 2008; Kim & Sin, 2007; Rico, Vila-Suero, Botezan, & Gómez-Pérez, 2019; Dube, 2011; Harpel-Burke, 2012); personalization and

DOI: 10.53974/unza.zajlis.9.2.210

customization options, allowing users to tailor their experience (Sweeney, 2005; Sonawane, 2018; Cordes, 2014); and comparison with alternative information sources, considering content comprehensiveness, relevance, ease of use, and unique features (Georgas, 2015; Kumar S., 2014).

2.4 Factors Affecting Students' Awareness, Utilization, and Satisfaction with OPACs

As indicated in the fourth objective of this study, there are some critical factors that influence student interaction with the OPAC. In this research, these variables are contextualized within the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) constructs, which formed the theoretical basis for this study. One fundamental driver of user acceptance, is Performance Expectancy (PE). This is defined as the belief that using a technology improves performance. In the context of this study, there is empirical evidence to show that use of the OPAC increases academic performance among students (Venkatesh et al., 2003). This variable consistently cited as a strong predictor of both system use and satisfaction (Onuoha, 2017). Conversely, Effort Expectancy (EE), which refers to the perceived ease of use, directly impacts utilization, as a complex or poorly designed interface hinders engagement (Fabunmi & Asubiojo, 2013).

Furthermore, Social Influence (SI)—the perceived pressure from peers and faculty, serves as a strong external catalyst for initial adoption and continued utilization in academic settings (Newsum, 2016). Crucially, Facilitating Conditions (FC), which encompasses the availability of supporting technical infrastructure and training, directly influences both system awareness (through instruction programs) and effective utilization (through accessible technical support) (Gana et al., 2019; Miller, 2018). Beyond these core UTAUT constructs, a student's underlying information literacy skills are essential, critically determining their ability to move beyond basic system awareness to functional proficiency and mastery (Bruce, 2008; Julien et al., 2018). Finally, Demographic Factors such as Age, Programme of Study, and Year of Study significantly influence technology acceptance, acting as moderators within the UTAUT model that shape a student's digital literacy level and, consequently, their awareness, utilization, and satisfaction (Waldman, 2003; White, 2022).

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A quantitative research design was adopted to objectively examine undergraduate students' awareness, utilization, and satisfaction with the CBU Library's OPAC. This approach was selected because it enables systematic measurement and statistical analysis of relationships among key constructs (Venkatesh et al., 2003; Aguolu & Aguolu, 2002).

The study population comprised all undergraduate students enrolled at the CBU, totaling 10,220 individuals. From this population, a sample of 368 respondents was drawn using simple random sampling. This sample size was determined based on statistical criteria to ensure adequate power for subsequent inferential analyses (Mason, 2023). The data were collected through a structured questionnaire, which was designed based on the UTAUT framework. The instrument was divided into several sections. The questionnaire was piloted to assess reliability and validity. Feedback from the pilot study led to refinements in question wording and layout. Reliability was further confirmed by calculating Cronbach's alpha for each construct, ensuring internal consistency and measurement accuracy.

DOI: 10.53974/unza.zajlis.9.2.210

Data collection was conducted over a specified period using both in-person and online modalities. In-person questionnaires were distributed in key library areas to capture respondents who frequently visit the library, while an online version was made available through the university's student portal to reach a broader audience. Prior to data collection, ethical approval was obtained from the relevant university committee. Further, students were informed of the study's purpose, and informed consent was obtained, ensuring that participants understood their rights and the confidentiality of their responses. Data were stored securely and were accessible only to the research teamThe dual-mode distribution was implemented to maximize response rates and accommodate the diverse technological access levels among students.

The data collected were subjected to a range of statistical analyses. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, were used to summarize demographic data and the overall levels of awareness, utilization, and satisfaction. Pearson correlation analysis was performed to explore the relationships between the independent variables (performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, and facilitating conditions) and the dependent variables (awareness, utilization, and satisfaction). The significance level was set at $p < 0.01$ to ensure robust findings.

Multiple regression analysis was then used to determine the predictive power of the UTAUT constructs on awareness and satisfaction. This analysis allowed for an evaluation of which factors most significantly influenced students' engagement with the OPAC. Additionally, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tests were conducted to examine differences in OPAC usage and satisfaction across various demographic groups such as age, programme, and year of study. These analytical methods collectively provided a comprehensive understanding of the factors that affect the acceptance and use of the OPAC (Venkatesh et al., 2003).

4. RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1 Demographic Data of Participants

The demographic analysis of the N=368 student participants reveals key sample characteristics that provide essential context for the OPAC findings. The sample exhibits a significant gender imbalance, with males constituting 67.1% of the respondents, though this imbalance was later found to have no statistical impact on awareness, utilization, or satisfaction. The age distribution shows a young, digitally native population, as 90.2% fall within the 16–24 age group, making their low OPAC utilization particularly noteworthy.

Furthermore, the sample is highly diverse across academic disciplines, with strong representation from the School of Business (25.5%) and the School of Mines and Mineral Sciences (19.8%), which is crucial because utilization and satisfaction levels were found to vary significantly across these faculties. Finally, the high proportion of First-Year students (43.8%) strongly suggests that the overall low awareness and utilization results are significantly influenced by a large group of novice users who are still adjusting to the university's library system, a finding supported by the statistical confirmation that awareness and utilization differ significantly across the years of study.

4.2 Levels of OPAC Awareness among Students

The first objective of the study was to determine the level of OPAC awareness among undergraduate students. The rationale for this objective is that awareness represents the initial and most fundamental stage in the technology adoption lifecycle; a student cannot utilize or be satisfied with a system they do not know exists. The findings from the descriptive analysis indicated a moderate level of OPAC awareness,

DOI: 10.53974/unza.zajlis.9.2.210

with 51.7% of respondents confirming their knowledge of the system's existence and basic functionalities. However, this awareness was not homogenous across the population, as Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tests revealed statistically significant differences based on age group ($F(2,365) = 13.072$, $p < 0.001$) and year of study ($F(4,363) = 2.697$, $p = 0.031$). Inferential statistics further established the predictors of this awareness: Facilitating Conditions (access to support and resources) and Performance Expectancy (perceived usefulness) were identified as strong, significant predictors in the regression model ($R^2 = 0.45$, $p < 0.01$). This was corroborated by the correlation analysis, which showed a strong positive relationship between Facilitating Conditions and awareness ($r = .619$, $p < 0.01$).

4.3 The Extent to which Students Utilize the OPAC

The second objective of this study was to determine the extent to which students utilize the OPAC. This objective moves beyond passive knowledge to measure the actual integration of the OPAC into students' academic and research practices. The core finding was that despite moderate awareness, the utilization of the OPAC was considerably low. A significant proportion of students, 40.5%, stated that they have never used the OPAC, while only 12% reported frequent use, indicating a substantial barrier to adoption. This low utilization was found to be heterogeneous across the sample, with ANOVA results confirming statistically significant differences based on age groups ($F(2,365) = 14.122$, $p < 0.001$), programmes of study ($F(7,337) = 7.044$, $p < 0.001$), and year of study ($F(4,363) = 3.103$, $p = 0.016$). Furthermore, the drivers of use were identified: correlation analysis showed a significant positive relationship between utilization and Facilitating Conditions ($r = .473$, $p < 0.01$), while regression analysis identified Social Influence as a significant predictor, reinforcing the notion that peer and faculty endorsement is crucial for promoting active use.

4.4 Students' Satisfaction with the OPAC

The third objective was to assess students' satisfaction with the OPAC. The rationale here is that user satisfaction is a primary indicator of sustained system acceptance and is vital for libraries to justify system maintenance and future upgrades. The descriptive findings revealed that overall student satisfaction was moderate, with more than half of the respondents expressing a neutral stance regarding their experience. This moderation suggests potential areas for improvement to convert neutral users into satisfied advocates. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) found that satisfaction levels exhibited statistically significant differences only across different programmes of study ($F(7,337) = 5.938$, $p < 0.001$), while no significant differences were observed by gender. The regression analysis for satisfaction established that both Performance Expectancy and Facilitating Conditions were strong, significant predictors, jointly accounting for $R^2 = 0.38$ of the variance, with Effort Expectancy providing a modest contribution. This confirms that students' satisfaction is primarily anchored in the system's perceived utility for their tasks and the availability of accessible support.

4.5 Factors that Affect Awareness, Utilization, and Satisfaction with the OPAC

The final objective of the study was to identify factors affecting students' awareness, utilization, and satisfaction with OPAC. This objective employed the UTAUT theoretical framework to move beyond describing user behavior to explaining the causal and influential factors, thereby providing actionable levers for system improvement.

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated to establish the strength and direction of the linear relationships between the UTAUT constructs and the three dependent variables. The results in table 4.1 show that all four UTAUT constructs (PE, EE, SI, and

DOI: 10.53974/unza.zajlis.9.2.210

FC) have a significant positive relationship with awareness, utilization, and satisfaction. Facilitating Conditions exhibited the strongest correlation with Awareness (r = 0.619). This indicates that the availability of technical resources and support is the most vital factor for system knowledge. Conversely, Performance Expectancy showed the strongest correlation with Satisfaction (r = 0.668). This confirms that the perceived usefulness of the OPAC is the primary driver of user contentment.

Table 4.5.1: Correlation Analysis

UTAUT Construct	Awareness (r)	Utilization (r)	Satisfaction (r)
Performance Expectancy (PE)	0.531	0.378	0.668
Effort Expectancy (EE)	0.463	0.416	0.581
Social Influence (SI)	0.422	0.431	0.455
Facilitating Conditions (FC)	0.619	0.473	0.556

Multiple linear regression models was also used to determine the unique predictive power of the UTAUT constructs on the dependent variables. The models accounted for a substantial portion of the variance, with Awareness (R^2 = 0.450), Utilization (R^2 = 0.272), and Satisfaction (R^2 = 0.528). As detailed in table 4.2, Facilitating Conditions and Performance Expectancy emerged as the sole significant positive predictors of Awareness. For Utilization, only Facilitating Conditions (beta = 0.270) and Social Influence (beta = 0.164) were significant. In the Satisfaction model, Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, and Facilitating Conditions were positive predictors, while Social Influence exhibited a unique statistically significant negative predictive effect (beta = -0.107, p = 0.038), suggesting social pressure may reduce user satisfaction.

Table 4.5.2: Regression Analysis

Dependent Variable	Predictor	Standardized β	p-value	R^2
Awareness	Performance Expectancy	0.329	<0.001	0.450
	Effort Expectancy	-0.007	0.895	
	Social Influence	-0.078	0.159	
	Facilitating Conditions	0.503	<0.001	
Utilization	Performance Expectancy	0.069	0.274	0.272
	Effort Expectancy	0.114	0.077	
	Social Influence	0.164	0.010	
	Facilitating Conditions	0.270	<0.001	
Satisfaction	Performance Expectancy	0.494	<0.001	0.528
	Effort Expectancy	0.177	0.001	
	Social Influence	-0.107	0.038	
	Facilitating Conditions	0.259	<0.001	

DOI: 10.53974/unza.zajlis.9.2.210

One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if there were statistically significant differences in the dependent variables across key demographic factors. The results in table 4.3 show that the student experience with the OPAC is highly heterogeneous. Age Group, Programme of Study, and Year of Study all exerted significant influence on Awareness, Utilization, and Satisfaction. Notably, the Year of Study was a significant factor for all three constructs (e.g., Utilization: F=3.103, p=0.016). This confirms that experience and academic progression influence OPAC engagement. The only factor to show no significant difference across all three variables was Gender.

Table 4.5.3: ANOVA

Demographic Factor	Awareness (F, p)	Utilization (F, p)	Satisfaction (F, p)
Gender	F=1.589, p=0.208	F=0.691, p=0.406	F=1.095, p=0.296
Age Group	F=13.072, p<0.001	F=14.122, p<0.001	F=3.522, p=0.031
Programme of Study	F=2.232, p=0.031	F=7.044, p<0.001	F=5.938, p<0.001
Year of Study	F=2.697, p=0.031	F=3.103, p=0.016	F=3.686, p=0.006

5. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The findings of this study validate the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) framework in explaining student engagement with the OPAC, while highlighting critical contextual nuances specific to the academic library at CBU. The discussion interprets the empirical results by contextualizing them within existing theory and literature.

The first objective's finding that awareness is largely superficial e.g lacking knowledge of advanced features. This can easily be interpreted as a failure to move from basic system recognition to true information literacy, a challenge cited by Aju and Foti (2020) and Bruce (2008). The regression analysis provided critical theoretical insight: awareness is significantly predicted by Facilitating Conditions (beta=0.540) and Performance Expectancy (PE) (beta=0.343). This suggests student awareness is both pragmatic and conditional. Meaning it is developed only when the student perceives the system as directly useful for academic tasks (PE) and when the institution provides clear, accessible support and resources. The non-significant roles of Effort Expectancy (EE) and Social Influence (SI) indicate that surface-level factors like ease of use or peer recommendations are insufficient to drive the effort required for deep feature knowledge. This aligns with Herring (2011) and Ramamurthy and Siridevi (2015), who emphasize that information literacy is necessary to convert basic recognition into functional awareness. Furthermore, the significant demographic differences across Age Group and Year of Study support Booth (2009) and Waldman (2003), confirming that information literacy training must be tailored to the specific digital and academic maturity of student segments.

The second objective revealed suboptimal utilization, particularly for advanced functionalities. This underutilization is consistent with empirical challenges documented by Brown and Green (2020) and Miller (2019) regarding usability and training deficiencies in digital tools. The utilization model provides a unique theoretical insight into the act of use. It is significantly predicted by Facilitating Conditions and Social Influence. This confirms the UTAUT postulate that both supportive infrastructure and social forces are crucial determinants of active use (Venkatesh et al., 2003). Crucially, the non-significant effect of Performance Expectancy suggests that students' belief in the OPAC's usefulness is insufficient to drive behavior. This reflects a competence gap

DOI: 10.53974/unza.zajlis.9.2.210

where students lack the necessary Information Literacy skills to translate perceived benefit into effective search and utilization. This is a barrier noted by Ahmed, Zin, and Majid (2016) and Aju and Foti (2020). Therefore, external catalysts (FC and SI) are essential to overcome this inertia, supporting the advocacy of Gana et al. (2019) for enhanced support services and targeted literacy programs to improve engagement.

The third objective's finding of moderate satisfaction, marked by high user neutrality, suggests the OPAC is merely adequate. The inferential analysis, which explained a high percentage of variance, clearly established the determinants of satisfaction. Performance Expectancy was confirmed as the strongest positive determinant, firmly upholding the core UTAUT principle that perceived usefulness is paramount to system contentment (Venkatesh et al., 2003). Both Effort Expectancy and Facilitating Conditions were also significant positive predictors, reinforcing Davis's (1989) argument that a reliable, easy-to-use, and well-supported system is crucial. The most compelling theoretical nuance was the significant negative predictive effect of Social Influence. This finding suggests that while external pressure may successfully drive utilization (Objective 2), it simultaneously introduces negative sentiment or unrealistic expectations, leading to diminished user satisfaction, a complex dynamic warranting further investigation. The significant variation in satisfaction across Programme of Study and Year of Study highlights that user contentment is not universal but is shaped by evolving academic demands and digital literacy levels (Miller, 2019; Julien et al., 2018).

The integrated analysis confirms that student OPAC use is governed by a robust interplay of internal perceptions and external institutional support, validating the UTAUT framework in this context. The study establishes Facilitating Conditions and Performance Expectancy as the foundational drivers of the entire user lifecycle. underscoring the necessity of a highly functional and supported system. While Social Influence effectively catalyzes Utilization, its detrimental effect on Satisfaction serves as a strategic caution: promotional strategies must prioritize the OPAC's intrinsic value over external pressure. The consistent and highly significant influence of Age Group, Programme of Study, and Year of Study on all three dependent variables confirms that OPAC acceptance is not uniform. This aligns with White (2022) and Graham (2021), who emphasize that demographic characteristics are powerful moderators of technology acceptance in academic settings. This necessitates a shift toward tailored, context-specific Information Literacy interventions rather than a generalized approach.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study successfully achieved its objectives by determining the levels of OPAC awareness (Objective 1), the extent of its utilization (Objective 2), the level of student satisfaction (Objective 3), and examining the factors affecting its use (Objective 4). The analysis concludes that while basic awareness is high, a significant Information Literacy (IL) gap exists, demonstrated by suboptimal utilization of advanced features and resulting in only moderate overall satisfaction. The UTAUT framework confirmed that system use is primarily governed by Performance Expectancy (PE) and Facilitating Conditions (FC); FC is essential for promoting awareness and utilization, while PE is the fundamental driver of satisfaction. Although Social Influence (SI) successfully encourages utilization, its negative effect on satisfaction signals that external pressure is detrimental to the user experience.

In view of the findings, the following recommendations are formulated to address the identified barriers and enhance student engagement with the OPAC, leveraging the insights from the UTAUT framework:

DOI: 10.53974/unza.zajlis.9.2.210

i) Shift training from system existence to functional competence. Implement mandatory, practical workshops that specifically teach the use of underutilised advanced to convert awareness into effective utilization.
ii) Collaborate with faculty to design course assignments that mandate the use of advanced OPAC features, thereby directly reinforcing the system's Performance Expectancy and demonstrating its real-world academic value.
iii) Invest in modernizing the OPAC interface to improve speed, search relevance, and overall user-friendliness, directly addressing Effort Expectancy. This should be coupled with ensuring that technical assistance and online help guides are mmediately accessible to bolster positive user experience and satisfaction.
iv) Reorient promotional campaigns to emphasize the intrinsic, demonstrable benefits of the OPAC (PE) rather than relying on external pressure (SI). This is essential to mitigate the significant negative effect of Social Influence on Satisfaction and foster organic, positive system acceptance.

REFERENCES

Abrizah, A., Badawi, F., Zoohorian-Fooladi, N., Nicholas, D., Jamali, H. R., & Norliya, A. K. (2014). What do scholarly channels and resources do authors trust to read, cite and publish in? *5th International Conference on Libraries, Information and Society.* Kuala Lumpur.

Aguolu, C. C., & Aguolu, I. E. (2002). *Libraries and information management in Nigeria: seminal essays on themes and problems.* Ed-Linform Services.

Ahmed, U., Zin, M. L., & Majid, A. H. (2016). Impact of Intention and Technology Awareness on Transport Industry's E-service: Evidence from an Emerging Economy. *International Journal of Industrial Distribution & Business, 7*(3), 13-18.

Aju, D. T., & Foti, S. T. (2020). Undergraduates' awareness, utilization and satisfaction with online public access catalogue. *Library and Information Perspectives and Research, 2*(1), 18-29.

Amin, M., Rezaei, S., & Abolghasemi, M. (2014). User satisfaction with mobile websites: the impact of perceived usefulness (PU), perceived ease of use (PEOU) and trust. *Nankai Business Review International*.

Anderson, D. R., Sweeney, D. J., Williams, T. A., Camm, J. D., Cochran, J. J., Fry, M. J., & Ohlmann, J. W. (2015). *Quantitative methods for business.* Boston: Cengage.

Antoney, L., & Vazhacharickal, P. J. (2019). Service Quality and Customer Satisfaction in Private and Public Sector Banks in Kerala: A Comparative Study. Kerala: Department of Biotechnology, Mar Augusthinose College .

Association of College and Research Libraries. (2015). *Framework for information literacy for higher education.* Chicago: American Library Association.

Atuase, D., & Maluleka, J. (2023). Marketing of library resources and its impact on the library usage of distance-learning students. *Digital Library Perspectives, 39*(1), 111-123.

Auten, B., Glauner, D., Lefoe, G., & Henry, J. (2016). Educating faculty members on the importance of requiring High-Quality information resources at a community college. *Auten, B., Glauner, D., Lefoe, G., & Henry, J. (2016). Educating faculty members on the importance of requiring High-Quality inCommunity & Junior College Libraries, 22*(1-2), 19-30.

Barifah, M. H. (2021). *From facet-based to visualised digital library interfaces: an empirical study of user experiences with digital libraries.* Università della Svizzera italiana.

Becker, B. W. (2013). Gamification of library instruction. *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian, 32*(3), 199-202.

DOI: 10.53974/unza.zajlis.9.2.210

Bhattacherjee, A. (2012). *Social science research: Principles, methods, and practices.* Tampa, FL: University of South Florida.

Bocarnea, M., Reynolds, R., & Baker, J. (2012). *Online Instruments, Data Collection, and Electronic Measurements: Organizational Advancements.* Information Science Reference.

Booth, C. (2009). *Informing Innovation: Tracking student interest in emerging library technologies at Ohio University.* Ohio: Association of College & Research Libraries.

Bruce, C. (2008). *Informed learning.* Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Chen, H. L., & Albee, B. (2012). An open source library system and public library users: Finding and using library collections. *Library & information science research, 34*(3), 220-227.

Copperbelt University. (2023). *The Copperbelt University Library*. Retrieved from https://www.cbu.ac.zm/schoolsAndUnits/library/?page_id=11

Cordes, S. (2014). Student perceptions of search tool usability. *Internet reference services quarterly, 19*(1), 3-32.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Deans, M. J., & Durrant, C. F. (2016). An investigation into the knowledge and use of electronic library resources in Jamaican community colleges. *Journal of Web Librarianship, 10*(4), 239-266.

Delaney, G., & Bates, J. (2015). Envisioning the academic library: A reflection on roles, relevancy and relationships. *New review of academic librarianship, 21*(1), 30-51.

Dube, L. (2011). Quality assurance practices in university libraries in South Africa. *South African Journal of Libraries and Information Science, 77*(1), 26-36.

Eserada, R. E., & Okolo, S. E. (2019). Use of online public access catalogue (Opac) in selected university libraries in South-South Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice, 2586*.

Esse, U. C. (2014). Effects of library instruction on satisfaction with the use of library and its services: A study of undergraduate students in five universities in the Southern part of Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal, 10*(13).

Eun Oh, K., & Colón-Aguirre, M. (2019). *A comparative study of perceptions and use of Google Scholar and academic library discovery systems.* Retrieved May June, 2023, from http://hdl.handle.net/10342/7832

Ezeani, C. N., Ukwoma, S. C., Gani, E., Igwe, P. J., & Agunwamba, C. G. (2017). *Towards Sustainable Development Goals: What Role for Academic Libraries in Nigeria in Assuring Inclusive Access to Information for Learners with Special Needs?* International Federation of Library Associations.

Fabunmi, O. M., & Asubiojo, B. O. (2013). Awareness and use of online public access catalogue by students of Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice, 922*.

Gakibayo, A., Ikoja-Odongo, J. R., & Okello-Obura, C. (2013). Electronic information resources utilization by students in Mbarara University Library. University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Georgas, H. (2015). Google vs. the library (part III): Assessing the quality of sources found by undergraduates. *Libraries and the Academy, 15*(1), 133-161.

Hampwaye, G., & Mweemba, L. (2020). 15 Zambia. Retrieved from http://dspace.unza.zm/bitstream/handle/123456789/6983/Main%20Document.pdf?sequence=1

Harpel-Burke, P. (2012). Catalog Maintenance in the Discovery System: Opinions of Early Adopters. *College & Undergraduate Libraries, 19*(2-4), 246-263.

Haruna, B., Madu, A. U., & Adamu, D. B. (2017). An Exploration of the Relationship between Service Quality, Users' Satisfaction, and Loyalty in the Academic Libraries. *International Journal of Library Science, 15*(1), 23-36.

DOI: 10.53974/unza.zajlis.9.2.210

Hicks, A., & Graber, A. (2010). Shifting paradigms: teaching, learning and Web 2.0. *Reference Services Review, 38*(4), 621-633.

Kani-Zabihi, E., Ghinea, G., & Chen, S. Y. (2008). User perceptions of online public library catalogues. *International journal of information management, 28*(6), 492-502.

Kato, A., Kisangiri, M., & Kaijage, S. (2021). A review development of digital library resources at university level. *Education Research International*, 1-13.

Kim, K. S., & Sin, S. C. (2007). Perception and selection of information sources by undergraduate students: Effects of avoidant style, confidence, and personal control in problem-solving. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 33*(6), 655-665.

Kumah, C. H. (2015). A Comparative Study of use of the Library and the Internet as Sources of Information by Graduate Students in the University Of Ghana. *Library Philosophy and Practice, 1298*.

Kumar, R. A., & Singh, J. (2014). A journey of card catalogue to web-OPAC. *International Journals of Library and Information Studies, 4*(2), 38-40.

Kumar, S. (2014). Relationship of OPAC users' satisfaction with their demographic characteristics, computer skills, user education, user assistance and user-friendly OPAC. *The electronic library, 32*(1), 106-123.

Kumar, S., & Vohra, R. (2013). User perception and use of OPAC: a comparison of three universities in the Punjab region of India. *The Electronic Library, 31*(1), 36-54.

Kuruppu Arachchi, T. (2015). *Information Literacy Competency of Undergraduate Students in University of Ruhuna: with a Special Focus on Usage of Online Public Access Catalogue.* Matara, Sri Lanka: University of Ruhuna.

Kwadzo, G. (2015). Awareness and usage of electronic databases by geography and resource development information studies graduate students in the University of Ghana. *Library Philosophy and Practice*.

Laird, T. F., & Kuh, G. D. (2005). Student experiences with information technology and their relationship to other aspects of student engagement. *Research in Higher education, 46*, 211-233.

Large, J. A., & Beheshti, J. (2013). *The Information Behavior of a New Generation: Children and Teens in the 21st Century.* Scarecrow Press.

Lawless, J., & Foster, M. J. (2020). Searching systematically and comprehensively. *A step-by-step guide to conducting an integrative review*, 21-44.

Levine-Clark, M., & Carter, T. M. (Eds.). (2013). *ALA Glossary of Library and Information Science.* American Library Association.

Li, L. (2022). Reskilling and Upskilling the Future-ready Workforce for Industry 4.0 and Beyond. *Information Systems Frontiers*. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-022-10308-y

MacWhinnie, L. A. (2003). The information commons: the academic library of the future. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy, 3*(2), 241-257.

Mason, M. K. (2023). Historical Development of Library Catalogues: Their Purpose and Organization. Retrieved from https://www.moyak.com/papers/history-library-catalogues.html

Meadows, I. (2011). *Meadows, I. (2011). Graphical vs. Command User Interface: An Exploratory Study of Undergraduate Students' OPAC Interface Preferences.* Chapel Hill, North Carolina : University of North Carolina.

Mi, J., & Weng, C. (2008). Revitalizing the library OPAC: Interface, searching, and display challenges. *Information technology and libraries, 27*(1), 5-22.

Mulla, K. R., & Chandrashekara, M. (2009). Access of Web-OPAC in engineering college libraries in Karnataka: A survey. *SRELS Journal of Information Management, 46*(3), 321-332.

DOI: 10.53974/unza.zajlis.9.2.210

Musyoka, K., & Chirchir, M. K. (2013). Service quality and library user satisfaction among universities in Kenya. Nairobi: University of Nairobi.

Newsum, J. M. (2016). School collection development and resource management in digitally rich environments: An initial literature review. *School Libraries Worldwide*, 97-109.

Nwankwo, N., & Amechi, A. (2019). Awareness and Use of Library Information Resources: A Conceptual Approach. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Reviews, 9*(2), 188–197.

Oliver, R. L. (1997). Satisfaction: A Behavioural Perspective on the Consumer. New York: McGraw- Hill.

Oluwatayo, A., Ezema, I., Opoko, A., & Uwakonye, O. (2015). Motivation and self-regulated learning in design education. *ICERI*, 375-380.

Onuoha, A. E. (2017). Impact of Information Literacy Skills on Academic Performance of Students of Federal Polytechnic, Ede, Osun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Research in Education and Society, 8*(3).

Puustinen, M., & Rouet, J. F. (2009). Learning with new technologies: Help seeking and information searching revisited. *Computers & Education, 53*(4), 1014-1019.

Rachna, P. (2017). *Role of Digital Libraries in Supporting E-Learning.* INFLIBNET Centre.

Rassel, G., Berner, M., O'Sullivan, E., & DeVance, T. (2016). *Research Methods for Public Administrators.* Taylor & Francis.

Reynolds, R., & Woods, R. (2007). *Handbook of Research on Electronic Surveys and Measurements.* Idea Group Reference.

Rico, M., Vila-Suero, D., Botezan, I., & Gómez-Pérez, A. (2019). Evaluating the impact of semantic technologies on bibliographic systems: A user-centred and comparative approach. *Journal of Web Semantics, 59*(100500).

Rowley, J., Banwell, L., Childs, S., Gannon-Leary, P., Urquhart, C., & Armstrong, C. (2001). Encouraging and Facilitating the Use of EIS. *The Changing Universities-The Role of Technology, The Changing Universities-The Role of Technology, The 7th International Conference of European University Information Systems.* Gesellschaft für Informatik eV.

Roy, A. (2020). *A Comprehensive Guide for Design, Collection, Analysis and Presentation of Likert and Other Rating Scale Data: Analysis of Likert Scale Data.* Amazon Digital Services LLC - KDP Print US.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research Methods for Business Students* (8th ed.). New York: Pearson.

Singh, N., & Klingenberg, A. (2009). Information literacy in India and Germany–university libraries as activators of life long learning. *Library and Information Science*.

Solanke, O., & Osuchukwu, N. (2018). Libraries and Facilitation of Public Access to Information in Nigerian Society. *IJoLIS, 3*.

Sonawane, C. S. (2018). Library catalogue in the internet age. *Digitizing the Modern Library and the Transition From Print to Electronic*, 204-223.

Suleiman, H., Rajeev, V., & Hassana, J. (2018). Suleiman, H., Rajeev, V., & Hassana, J. (2018). Awareness and Utilization of Library Resources by Library Users' of Nims University Central Library, Jaipur, India. *International Journal of Movement Education and Social Science, 7*(2), 1067-1078.

Sweeney, R. T. (2005). Reinventing library buildings and services for the millennial generation. *Library Leadership & Management, 19*(4), 165-176.

Ternenge, T. S., & Kashimana, F. (2019). Availability, accessibility, and use of electronic information resources for research by students in Francis Sulemanu Idachaba Library University of Agriculture, Makurdi. *Library Philosophy and Practice, 2352*, 1-41.

Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User Acceptance of Information Technology: Toward a Unified View. *MIS Quarterly, 27*(3), 425–478.

DOI: 10.53974/unza.zajlis.9.2.210

Waldman, M. (2003). Freshmen's use of library electronic resources and self-efficacy. *Information Research, 8*(2).

Wanyonyi, M. S., Odini, C., & Sikolia, G. S. (2018). Effect of Library Services on the User Satisfaction at Pwani University Library. *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management, 5*(3), 1080-1092.

Williams, J., & Woolwine, D. (2011). Interlibrary Loan in the United States: An Analysis of Academic Libraries in a Digital Age. Journal of Interlibrary Loan. *Document Delivery & Electronic Reserve*, 165-183. doi:10.1080/1072303X.2011.602945

Xu, J., Kang, Q., Song, Z., & Clarke, C. P. (2015). Applications of mobile social media: WeChat among academic libraries in China. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 41*(1), 21-30.

Zamora, S., Quesada, G., Hurtado, G., & Mondéjar, R. (2020). *An Introduction to Data Analysis in R: Hands-on Coding, Data Mining, Visualization and Statistics from Scratch.* Springer International Publishing.

DOI: 10.53974/unza.zajlis.9.2.210