



Bridging Standards and Services: Utilization, Compliance, and User Satisfaction at the St. Paul University-Surigao Learning Resource Center

Mary Ann Retorta¹, Antonio Talamayan², Cris Saranza³

¹²³Graduate School and Professional Studies, St. Paul University – Surigao, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100700196>

Received: 09 July 2026; Accepted: 14 July 2026; Published: 28 July 2026

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the extent of regulatory compliance, resource utilization, and user satisfaction of St. Paul University-Surigao (SPUS) Learning Resource Center (LRC) against national regulatory standards for basic and higher education libraries. Using a descriptive-correlational design, data were gathered from 355 stakeholders (students, faculty, and alumni) through a validated researcher-made questionnaire (Cronbach's alpha = 0.99) and institutional document review. Results showed the LRC exceeded Department of Education (DepEd) Order No. 56, s. 2011 requirements (overall mean = 3.35) and Commission on Higher Education (CHED) CMO No. 22, s. 2021 requirements (overall mean = 3.65), with the strongest performance in financial management, vision-mission alignment, and information technology infrastructure. Human resources and collection management were the weakest domains under DepEd standards, while collection management and services/utilization were comparatively weaker under CHED standards. Utilization and satisfaction were both rated favorably across collections, services, and facilities, with electronic resources and internet connectivity emerging as the most utilized and most satisfying components. Analysis of variance revealed significant differences in utilization and satisfaction when respondents were grouped by classification, sex, age, and department, while Pearson correlation confirmed a significant positive relationship between the extent of utilization and user satisfaction across all resource categories ($r = 0.44-0.59$, $p < .001$). The findings suggest that while the LRC functions as a highly effective academic support facility, targeted investment in staffing, collection currency, and academic integrity tools would further strengthen its contribution to the institution's teaching, learning, and research mission.

Keywords: Learning Resource Center, user satisfaction, library utilization, library standards compliance, DepEd, CHED

INTRODUCTION

Learning Resource Centers (LRCs) occupy a central position in the academic and research missions of higher education institutions. The academic library has long been described as "the heart of the university" (American Library Association, n.d.), supporting information literacy, independent inquiry, and the broader development of critical-thinking skills (Goodsett & Schmillen, 2022). Empirical work continues to link effective library service delivery with improved study habits, research productivity, and institutional performance, including student retention and academic success (Soria et al., 2013).

Despite this recognized importance, LRCs in the Philippines continue to face persistent constraints in funding, staffing, and collection currency, particularly under the demands of the K-12 curriculum and the growing research orientation of higher education. A province-wide assessment of Philippine school libraries against DepEd Order No. 56, s. 2011 found that most institutions achieved only fair-to-poor compliance in areas such as human resources, information technology, and financial resources, with library staffing and professional-librarian ratios among the weakest indicators (Agreda, 2017). Compounding these operational gaps, a national survey of Philippine libraries found that most institutions lack a formal disaster management plan despite having experienced at least one natural or human-caused disaster in the preceding decade (Superio et al., 2024) - a vulnerability directly relevant to the present case, whose LRC has itself weathered earthquake and typhoon

damage in recent years. Two national policy instruments were issued to standardize library operations and narrow this compliance gap: Department of Education (DepEd) Order No. 56, s. 2011, which sets minimum standards for school libraries and media centers, and Commission on Higher Education (CHED) Memorandum Order No. 22, s. 2021, which sets minimum requirements for libraries of higher education institutions. Both frameworks specify benchmarks across governance, staffing, collections, information technology, physical facilities, and financial sustainability.

This study evaluated the Learning Resource Center of St. Paul University Surigao against these two regulatory frameworks and examined how compliance, utilization, and user satisfaction interact. Specifically, the study addressed the following objectives: (1) describe the demographic profile of student, faculty, and alumni respondents; (2) determine the LRC's level of compliance with DepEd and CHED standards; (3) assess the extent to which respondents utilize the LRC's collections, services, and facilities; (4) determine respondents' level of satisfaction with these same domains; (5) test for significant differences in utilization and satisfaction across demographic profiles; (6) examine the relationship between utilization and satisfaction; and (7) propose a library service model informed by the findings.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Wilson's (1981) Model of Information Behavior, which frames information need, search, and use as interdependent processes, provides the theoretical lens for this study: individuals' interaction with library collections, services, and facilities is shaped jointly by cognitive need and contextual accessibility. Consistent with this model, library-use research consistently finds that the relevance and currency of collections, rather than sheer volume, drive actual engagement, and that awareness and information-literacy skills - not just availability - determine whether electronic resources are used once acquired (Popoola & Haliso, 2009).

Governance, staffing, and demographic context shape whether library resources translate into measurable service quality and use. Mushtaq and Arshad (2022) found that library use and users' perceived importance of resources, services, and place vary systematically by demographic group, underscoring the value of profiling users when evaluating library performance - an approach mirrored in the present study's ANOVA analysis by classification, sex, age, and department. Information-literacy instruction is similarly central to library value: in a qualitative study of academic librarians, Goodsett and Schmitten (2022) found that fostering critical thinking, not merely point-and-click database skills, is an explicit and increasingly emphasized goal of first-year library instruction.

Physical and technological infrastructure, together with governance capacity, mediates whether libraries meet regulatory and user expectations. Omeluzor and Ogo (2018) linked inadequate information and communication technology (ICT) infrastructure in Nigerian academic libraries to reduced service efficiency and lower staff retention, a pattern broadly consistent with the staffing and infrastructure gaps observed in Philippine contexts (Agreda, 2017). Financial sustainability underlies all of these domains; Fresnido and Mijares (2017) found that Philippine academic library consortia remain constrained by narrow, largely institution-dependent funding streams, making sustained budgetary investment - as observed in the present case - an important differentiator of library performance. At the service-quality level, digital-library research using system-quality and service-quality constructs (Azib et al., 2024) and SERVQUAL-based correlational designs (Mohamad Zaki et al., 2023) both confirm that service and system responsiveness are consistently the strongest predictors of overall user satisfaction. Collectively, this literature suggests that VMGO alignment, staffing adequacy, collection currency, service responsiveness, facility quality, IT infrastructure, financial support, and external linkages jointly determine whether a library functions as an effective, standards-compliant, and user-centered institution - the multidimensional framework adopted in this study.

Beyond compliance and infrastructure, a growing body of evidence links library engagement directly to academic outcomes. In a four-year, card-swipe study of English composition students, Rowe et al. (2021) found that attending library instruction sessions was positively associated with higher GPA, course pass rates, and retention. Information-literacy competence shows a comparable payoff: Tachie-Donkor and Ezema (2023) found that Ghanaian university students with stronger information-literacy skills demonstrated more effective information-seeking behavior and greater lifelong-learning readiness. The relationship extends to faculty as well as students, though its shape differs by role. LeMire and Bodenhamer (2023) found that library collections

meaningfully shaped faculty teaching, research, and retention decisions, while Scoulas et al. (2024) refined this picture by showing that faculty's subjective perceptions of library importance were unrelated to their actual publication output. In contrast, their frequency of use of online journals and databases was positively correlated with it - suggesting that actual engagement, not perceived value, is what drives measurable benefit. Research-support satisfaction, however, is not automatic: Sharma et al. (2023), studying research-scholar use of Panjab University Library, found that although most scholars were satisfied with services, a majority interacted with library staff only irregularly, pointing to an awareness or outreach gap rather than a service-quality one.

Not all evidence in this area points in the same direction, however, and the discrepancies are instructive. Using a LibQUAL-based gap analysis across five colleges of a Ghanaian university, Barfi et al. (2023) found that perceived library service quality fell short of users' minimum expectations even where usage was high, and that faculty and students differed significantly in how they rated that quality - a caution against assuming that heavy use automatically signals a well-performing library. More directly, Nnadozie (2017) tested the same utilization-satisfaction relationship examined in the present study among lecturers in Nigerian university libraries and found only a weak, statistically non-significant correlation ($r = .38$, $p > .05$), attributing the gap to inadequate collections and infrastructure rather than to library use itself. On format preference, global evidence is similarly mixed: whereas the present study found electronic resources to be the most utilized and most satisfying collection type, the 21,000-respondent Academic Reading Format International Study found that large majorities of tertiary students across 33 countries still prefer print for sustained academic reading and report better focus and retention in that format (Mizrachi et al., 2018). Demographic effects on library use are likewise contested; while the present study found a significant sex-based difference in service utilization, Agosto et al. (2007) found no significant gender difference in adolescents' reasons for using public libraries or their frequency of information need, with the sole exception of perceived usefulness for personal needs. These divergent findings suggest that the relationships among utilization, format preference, demographic profile, and satisfaction are context-dependent rather than universal, reinforcing the value of institution-specific assessment such as the one undertaken here.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Design

The study used a quantitative descriptive-correlational design, supplemented by the historical method to document the LRC's developmental trajectory. The descriptive-correlational component assessed the extent of utilization, level of standards compliance, and user satisfaction, and tested the relationships among these variables.

Participants and Sampling

Participants were students, faculty, and alumni of St. Paul University Surigao. A sample of 355 respondents was drawn using random sampling with Slovin's formula, giving every member of the population an equal probability of selection.

Research Instrument

A researcher-made questionnaire was administered in five parts: (a) LRC background, (b) compliance with DepEd/CHED standards, (c) respondent profile, (d) extent of utilization, and (e) level of satisfaction, using a 4-point Likert scale. Face and content validity were established through review by advisers and subject-matter experts. Reliability was assessed through a pilot survey analyzed in SPSS; the instrument yielded a Cronbach's alpha of 0.99, indicating excellent internal consistency.

Data Collection and Analysis

Following institutional approval, questionnaires were personally administered and retrieved by the researcher and were supplemented by institutional document analysis of library records and compliance evidence. Data were analyzed using frequency counts and percentages (demographic profile), means and standard deviations



(compliance, utilization, and satisfaction ratings), Pearson product-moment correlation (utilization-satisfaction relationship), and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA; group differences), all computed at the 0.05 level of significance. Qualitative data from institutional documents were used to contextualize and validate the quantitative findings. Respondent privacy and informed consent were maintained throughout, with participation voluntary and withdrawal permitted at any stage.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Profile

Of the 355 respondents, most were students (64.5%), followed by faculty (33.8%) and alumni (1.7%). Respondents were predominantly young (83.1% aged 10-29) and female (60.9%). By department, the largest shares came from Junior High School (18.6%), the College of Business and Technology (17.2%), and the College of Health Sciences (14.4%), reflecting broad representation across the university's basic- and higher-education units (Table 1).

Table 1. Profile of Respondents (n = 355)

Profile Variable	Category	f	%
Classification	Student	229	64.51
	Faculty	120	33.80
	Alumni	6	1.69
Sex	Male	139	39.15
	Female	216	60.85
Age	10-29 years old	295	83.10
	30-69 years old	59	16.62
Top Departments	Junior High School	66	18.59
	College of Business & Technology	61	17.18
	College of Health Sciences	51	14.37
	Grade School	47	13.24
	College of Education	43	12.11

Compliance with DepEd Order No. 56, s. 2011

Overall DepEd compliance was rated 3.35 (Above the Requirements; Exceeded the Standards). Financial Resources (4.00) was the strongest domain, reflecting consistent budget allocation, a periodically reviewed library fee, and sustained investment in facilities and technology. Vision-Mission-Goals-Objectives (3.67), Administration (3.66), and Physical Facilities (3.66) likewise exceeded standards. The weakest domains were



Human Resources (2.75) - driven by the absence of formally hired support staff and audio-visual technicians - and Collection Management (2.77), constrained mainly by the unavailability of print newspaper subscriptions in the locality (Table 2). The staffing shortfall mirrors a broader regional pattern: in a comparative study of electronic-resource staffing in Ghana, Bentil and Liew (2024) found that understaffing was markedly more pronounced in private university libraries than public ones, often leaving a single professional responsible for an entire resource portfolio - a structural constraint similar to that facing the present LRC's Basic Education units.

Table 2. Summary of DepEd Order No. 56, s. 2011 Compliance

Area of Evaluation	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
Vision, Mission, Goals & Objectives	3.67	Above Requirements	Exceeded Standards
Administration	3.66	Above Requirements	Exceeded Standards
Human Resources	2.75	Met Requirements	Met Standards
Collection Management	2.77	Met Requirements	Met Standards
Services and Utilization	3.16	Met Requirements	Met Standards
Physical Facilities	3.66	Above Requirements	Exceeded Standards
IT Facilities and Services	3.50	Above Requirements	Exceeded Standards
Financial Resources	4.00	Above Requirements	Exceeded Standards
Linkages and Networking	3.00	Met Requirements	Met Standards
Overall Average	3.35	Above Requirements	Exceeded Standards

Compliance with CHED CMO No. 22, s. 2021

At the higher-education level, overall CHED compliance was rated 3.65 (Above the Requirements; Exceeded the Standards) - higher than the DepEd result. Perfect scores of 4.00 were obtained in VMGO, Human Resources, IT Facilities and Services, and Financial Resources, reflecting well-qualified librarians, a functioning Integrated Library System, an official library website with remote OPAC access, and sustained budget support. The LRC's RFID-enabled circulation system in particular reflects a broader trend documented by Chelliah et al. (2015), whose case study of RFID adoption at the University of Technology Sydney found that the technology's value extends beyond faster transactions to strategic gains in staff redeployment and space management when implementation is carefully change-managed. On the financial side, the LRC's consistent budget allocation stands in contrast to the funding instability reported elsewhere in the region; a qualitative study of Ghanaian university libraries found that even well-established institutions rely on multiple, unpredictable revenue streams - institutional allocations, internally generated funds, and irregular donations - that undermine long-term planning (Osman et al., 2026). Collection Management (3.22) and Services and Utilization (3.18) were comparatively lower, consistent with the institution's own March 2025 CHED monitoring finding that Mining Engineering, Criminology, and Early Childhood Education programs required additional updated titles, and with the LRC's continued lack of a plagiarism-detection tool (Table 3). The LRC's 54 Open Educational Resources (OER) subscriptions align with an emerging systematic-review consensus that OER adoption expands access to

knowledge and supports lifelong learning. However, the same review cautions that awareness, time constraints, and quality-assurance concerns continue to limit uptake even where OER are formally available (Adil et al., 2024).

Table 3. Summary of CHED CMO No. 22, s. 2021 Compliance

Area of Evaluation	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
Vision, Mission, Goals & Objectives	4.00	Above Requirements	Exceeded Standards
Administration	3.50	Above Requirements	Exceeded Standards
Human Resources	4.00	Above Requirements	Exceeded Standards
Collection Management	3.22	Met Requirements	Met Standards
Services and Utilization	3.18	Met Requirements	Met Standards
Physical Facilities	3.50	Above Requirements	Exceeded Standards
IT Facilities and Services	4.00	Above Requirements	Exceeded Standards
Financial Resources	4.00	Above Requirements	Exceeded Standards
Linkages and Networking	3.50	Above Requirements	Exceeded Standards
Overall Average	3.65	Above Requirements	Exceeded Standards

Extent of Utilization

Services ($M = 3.28$) and facilities ($M = 3.25$) were rated as highly utilized, while collections ($M = 3.22$) were moderately utilized (Table 4). Within each domain, utilization was not uniform: computers with internet/Wi-Fi connectivity ($M = 3.42$) and electronic resources ($M = 3.28$) were the most utilized individual indicators, reflecting a general shift toward digital access, while Filipiniana and special collections ($M = 3.16$) and printing/scanning services ($M = 3.20$) were the least utilized, largely attributed to limited curricular integration and an inconvenient prepaid-card payment system, respectively (Table 5). This preference for electronic resources runs counter to the Academic Reading Format International Study, whose 21,000-respondent, 33-country sample found that most tertiary students still prefer print for sustained academic reading and report better focus and retention in that format (Mizrachi et al., 2018); the divergence may reflect the LRC's specific role as a research-support and connectivity hub rather than a venue for long-form reading, or a genuinely different format preference among this institution's users. The high utilization of quiet study and reading areas is consistent with Applegate's (2009) finding that a quiet, low-distraction study space is the single most-cited reason students choose to work in the library at all, underscoring that facility design decisions carry weight independent of collection or service quality. The comparatively low utilization of Filipiniana and special collections likewise echoes Flores's (2020) exploratory study of the National Library of the Philippines' Filipiniana Division, which found that despite their intrinsic cultural and historical value, such materials remain underused because of limited promotion, organizational complexity, and weak integration into instruction - a pattern this study's findings reproduce at the institutional level.

Table 4. Extent of Utilization of LRC Collections, Services, and Facilities

Domain	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
Collections	3.22	0.65	Sometimes	Moderately Utilized
Services	3.28	0.67	Always	Highly Utilized
Facilities	3.25	0.78	Always	Highly Utilized

Table 5. Highest- and Lowest-Rated Utilization Indicators, by Domain

Domain	Highest-Rated Indicator	M	Lowest-Rated Indicator	M
Collections	Electronic resources / Reference books for curriculum	3.28	Filipiniana / special collections	3.16
Services	Computer with internet & Wi-Fi connectivity	3.42	Printing & scanning services	3.20
Facilities	Reading area / Quiet study area	3.34	Activity center	3.15

Level of User Satisfaction

Across all four domains, respondents reported high satisfaction, with human resources rated highest ($M = 3.58$), followed by facilities ($M = 3.51$), collections ($M = 3.47$), and services ($M = 3.47$) (Table 6). At the indicator level, helpful support staff, electronic resources, reliable internet connectivity, and computer facilities were the top-rated individual indicators. In contrast, flexible staff scheduling, Filipiniana/special collections, photocopying services, and collaborative-space areas received comparatively - though still favorable - lower ratings (Table 7). The high satisfaction with human resources is notable against the backdrop of Sharma et al.'s (2023) finding, at Panjab University Library, that research scholars were generally satisfied with services yet interacted with library staff only irregularly; the present LRC's stronger staff-satisfaction rating may reflect the smaller, more accessible scale of a university LRC relative to a large research-university library system, though it also signals an outreach strength worth preserving as the institution grows.

Table 6. Summary of User Satisfaction with the LRC

Domain	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
Human Resources	3.58	0.54	Strongly Agree	Highly Satisfied
Collections	3.47	0.57	Strongly Agree	Highly Satisfied
Services	3.47	0.55	Strongly Agree	Highly Satisfied
Facilities	3.51	0.64	Strongly Agree	Highly Satisfied

Table 7. Highest- and Lowest-Rated Satisfaction Indicators, by Domain

Domain	Highest-Rated Indicator	M	Lowest-Rated Indicator	M
Human Resources	Helpful support staff	3.60	Flexible staff availability	3.56
Collections	Electronic resources	3.54	Filipiniana / special collections	3.43
Services	Computer with internet & Wi-Fi connectivity	3.51	Photocopying services	3.41
Facilities	Computer facilities	3.59	Collaborative space area	3.43

Differences in Utilization and Satisfaction by Profile

One-way ANOVA revealed selective, statistically significant differences in utilization: by classification, in facility use ($F = 3.22$, $p = .041$); by sex, in service use ($F = 2.32$, $p = .021$); and by department, in facility use ($F = 2.22$, $p = .007$). No significant differences emerged by age or grade/year level/program (Table 8). For satisfaction, classification produced significant differences across all four domains - human resources ($F = 15.02$, $p < .001$), collections ($F = 7.05$, $p = .001$), services ($F = 8.50$, $p < .001$), and facilities ($F = 9.57$, $p < .001$) - while age produced a significant difference only in satisfaction with human resources ($F = 2.78$, $p = .018$). Sex, grade/year level/program, and department showed no significant satisfaction differences (Table 9). These patterns suggest that institutional role (student, faculty, or alumnus) is the strongest demographic driver of both utilization and satisfaction, consistent with Mushtaq and Arshad's (2022) finding that demographic profile systematically shapes how users perceive and engage with library resources, services, and place, and with Barfi et al.'s (2023) LibQUAL-based finding that faculty and students differ significantly in their perceived library service quality. This role-based divergence is further corroborated by LeMire and Bodenhamer (2023), who found that library collections carry distinct weight for faculty - shaping teaching preparation, research productivity, and even retention decisions - in ways that differ qualitatively from how students engage with the same collections, reinforcing that classification-based differences in this study reflect genuinely different modes of library use rather than measurement artifact. The sex-based difference in service utilization, however, is not universally replicated: Agosto et al. (2007) found no significant gender difference in adolescents' library-use patterns beyond a narrow difference in perceived personal usefulness, suggesting that the strength and direction of demographic effects on library behavior may vary by user population and institutional context rather than reflecting a fixed pattern.

Table 8. Significant Differences in LRC Utilization by Respondent Profile

Profile Variable	Utilization Domain	F	p	Decision
Classification	Facilities	3.22	.041	Significant
Sex	Services	2.32	.021	Significant
Department	Facilities	2.22	.007	Significant
Age; Grade/Year/Program	Collections, Services, Facilities	n.s.	> .05	Not Significant



Table 9. Significant Differences in LRC Satisfaction by Respondent Profile

Profile Variable	Satisfaction Domain	F	p	Decision
Classification	Human Resources	15.02	< .001	Significant
Classification	Collections	7.05	.001	Significant
Classification	Services	8.50	< .001	Significant
Classification	Facilities	9.57	< .001	Significant
Age	Human Resources	2.78	.018	Significant
Sex; Grade/Year/Program; Department	All domains	n.s.	> .05	Not Significant

Relationship Between Utilization and Satisfaction

Pearson correlation confirmed a significant, moderate positive relationship between the extent of utilization and user satisfaction across all three domains, led by services ($r = .59$), followed by collections ($r = .55$) and facilities ($r = .44$) (Table 10). This pattern indicates that responsive, accessible services exert the strongest influence on satisfaction, followed by the relevance of collections and the adequacy of the physical environment - a finding consistent with SERVQUAL-based library research (Mohamad Zaki et al., 2023; Azib et al., 2024) linking service and system quality to overall user satisfaction. The result is not, however, a foregone conclusion: Nnadozie (2017) tested the identical relationship among lecturers in Nigerian university libraries and found only a weak, non-significant correlation ($r = .38$, $p = .453$), concluding that frequent library use does not automatically translate into satisfaction where collections and infrastructure remain inadequate. Read alongside Barfi et al.'s (2023) finding that perceived service quality can fall short of expectations even amid high use, the present study's significant positive correlation is best interpreted as evidence that the LRC's underlying resource and service quality - not merely the frequency of use - is what is driving user satisfaction upward.

Table 10. Correlation Between Extent of Utilization and User Satisfaction

Domain	r	p	Decision	Interpretation
Collections	0.55	< .001	Reject H_0	Significant, moderate positive
Services	0.59	< .001	Reject H_0	Significant, moderate positive
Facilities	0.44	< .001	Reject H_0	Significant, moderate positive

CONCLUSION

The St. Paul University-Surigao Learning Resource Center is an effective, well-managed academic support facility that meets and, in most domains, exceeds both DepEd and CHED regulatory standards. Users consistently rate its digital infrastructure, staff support, collections, and facilities favorably, with electronic resources and internet connectivity emerging as both the most utilized and most satisfying components - evidence of a decisive shift toward digital-first library engagement. Nonetheless, staffing adequacy, collection



currency for select academic programs, and academic-integrity tooling remain areas of comparative weakness under both frameworks. The significant positive relationship between utilization and satisfaction, together with demographic differences tied primarily to institutional role, underscores that continued, role-sensitive investment in services, collections, and human resources will yield measurable gains in user experience and, by extension, in the LRC's contribution to the university's teaching, learning, and research mission.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the following actions are recommended:

1. **Staffing.** Formalize the hiring of qualified library support personnel (e.g., library assistants/clerks) or, where immediate hiring is not feasible, expand and formally evaluate trained student-assistant complements to address the Human Resources compliance gap.
2. **Collection currency.** Implement a focused acquisition plan targeting Mining Engineering, Criminology, and Early Childhood Education, and adopt digital newspaper subscriptions or curated news bulletins to offset the unavailability of local print newspapers.
3. **Academic integrity tools.** Acquire and deploy plagiarism-detection software and virtual-collaboration platforms (e.g., Zoom, MS Teams) to close the identified CHED Services and Utilization gap. Software alone is unlikely to be sufficient, however: Youmans (2011) found experimentally that student awareness of plagiarism-detection software did not affect plagiarism rates unless paired with clear instruction on citation practice, indicating that any new tool should be introduced alongside, not instead of, academic-integrity training.
4. **Special and Filipiniana collections.** Partner with faculty to integrate underutilized special collections into coursework, research assignments, and reading lists to raise both awareness and use.
5. **Digital infrastructure.** Continue upgrading internet bandwidth and Wi-Fi coverage, and modernize the printing/scanning payment system (e.g., mobile wallet or QR-based payment) to remove the identified access friction.
6. **Linkages and networking.** Pursue formal MOAs with partner libraries and academic organizations to expand resource-sharing, inter-library loan, and joint literacy programming.

LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study is limited to a single institution, which constrains generalizability to other Philippine LRCs operating under different resource and enrollment conditions. The cross-sectional design captures a single point in time and relies on self-reported utilization and satisfaction measures, which may be subject to social desirability and recall bias. Future research may adopt a longitudinal or multi-institutional comparative design, incorporate objective usage analytics (e.g., system logs, gate counts) alongside self-report data, and examine the proposed library business model's implementation outcomes over time.

REFERENCES

1. Adil, H. M., Ali, S., Sultan, M., Ashiq, M., & Rafiq, M. (2024). Open education resources' benefits and challenges in the academic world: A systematic review. *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, 73(3), 274–291. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GKMC-02-2022-0049>
2. Agosto, D. E., Paone, K. L., & Ipock, G. S. (2007). The female-friendly public library: Gender differences in adolescents' uses and perceptions of U.S. public libraries. *Library Trends*, 56(2), 387–401. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2008.0000>
3. Agreda, R. L. (2017). Compliance with Philippine library standards of school libraries in the province of Capiz [Unpublished master's thesis]. Central Philippine University. <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12852/115>



4. American Library Association. (n.d.). Definition of a library. ALA LibGuides. <https://libguides.ala.org/library-definition>
5. Applegate, R. (2009). The library is for studying: Student preferences for study space. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 35(4), 341–346. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2009.04.004>
6. Azib, N. A., Abu, R., Rafie, S. K., & Mohd Tokiran, N. S. (2024). Evaluating user satisfaction with digital library services: A study of academic libraries in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(12), 4511–4517. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.8120379>
7. Barfi, K. A., Parbie, S. K., Filson, C. K., Teye, M. V., Kodua-Ntim, K., & Ayensu, E. (2023). Assessing the quality of services at an academic library. *Heliyon*, 9(12), Article e22449. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e22449>
8. Bentil, W., & Liew, C. L. (2024). Electronic resource staffing trends in academic libraries: Competencies and collaboration. *Journal of Electronic Resources Librarianship*, 36(3), 203–220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1941126X.2024.2383523>
9. Chelliah, J., Sood, S., & Scholfield, S. (2015). Realising the strategic value of RFID in academic libraries: A case study of the University of Technology Sydney. *The Australian Library Journal*, 64(2), 113–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00049670.2015.1013005>
10. Commission on Higher Education. (2021). CHED Memorandum Order No. 22, series of 2021: Minimum requirements for libraries of higher education institutions. <https://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/CMO-No.-22-s.-2021.pdf>
11. Department of Education. (2011). DepEd Order No. 56, s. 2011: Standards for Philippine libraries: School libraries and media centers. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2011/07/19/do-56-s-2011-standards-for-philippine-libraries/>
12. Flores, R. L. (2020). Intellectual jewels of the nation: An exploratory study of Filipiniana special materials. *Journal of the Australian Library and Information Association*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24750158.2020.1782037>
13. Fresnido, A. B., & Mijares, J. R. (2017). Philippine library consortia: Priorities and perspectives. *PAARL Research Journal*, 4, 24–39. <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=18447>
14. Goodsett, M., & Schmillen, H. (2022). Fostering critical thinking in first-year students through information literacy instruction. *College & Research Libraries*, 83(1), 91–110. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.83.1.91>
15. LeMire, S., & Bodenhamer, S. (2023). Impact of library collections on faculty teaching, research, and retention: A mixed-methods study. *College & Research Libraries*, 86(6), Article 880.
16. Mizrachi, D., Salaz, A. M., Kurbanoglu, S., & Boustany, J. (2018). Academic reading format preferences and behaviors among university students worldwide: A comparative survey analysis. *PLOS ONE*, 13(5), Article e0197444. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0197444>
17. Mohamad Zaki, M. H., Hasan, H., Syed Wahid, S. N., & Mohamad, M. (2023). Library service quality and users' satisfaction: A correlational study among UiTM Puncak Perdana students. *Jurnal Intelek*, 18(2), 118–127.
18. Mushtaq, A., & Arshad, A. (2022). Public library use, demographic differences in library use and users' perceptions of library resources, services and place. *Library Management*, 43(8/9), 563–576. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LM-10-2021-0093>
19. Nnadozie, C. O. (2017). Library use as correlate of user satisfaction amongst lecturers in university libraries in South-East Zone of Nigeria. *Research Journal of Library and Information Science*, 1(1), 31–41.
20. Omeluzor, S. U., & Ogo, E. P. (2018). Role of Nigerian libraries for sustainable educational system, information literacy and national development. *Annals of Library and Information Studies*, 65(2), 122–127.
21. Osman, H., Dango, J., & Kugblenu-Mahama, H. A. (2026). Challenges in sustainable funding for academic libraries: Perspectives from university libraries in the Volta Region, Ghana. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 52(2), 552–567.
22. Popoola, S. O., & Haliso, Y. (2009). Use of library information resources and services as predictor of the teaching effectiveness of social scientists in Nigerian universities. *African Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science*, 19(1), 65–77.



23. Rowe, J., Leuzinger, J., Hargis, C., & Harker, K. R. (2021). The impact of library instruction on undergraduate student success: A four-year study. *College & Research Libraries*, 82(1), 7–18. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.82.1.7>
24. Scoulas, J., De Groote, S., & Shultz, M. (2024). Faculty productivity and patterns of library resource use in higher education. *College & Research Libraries*, 85(1), 23–39.
25. Sharma, R., Rawat, K., Jasyal, A., & Chakravarty, R. (2023). Library research support and services: A case study of Panjab University Library. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, Article 8107. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/8107>
26. Soria, K. M., Fransen, J., & Nackerud, S. (2013). Library use and undergraduate student outcomes: New evidence for students' retention and academic success. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 13(2), 147–164. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2013.0010>
27. Superio, D. L., Yap, J. M., Sebial-Guinanao, J. M. L., & Calilung, R. P. (2024). When a disaster strikes: Are libraries in the Philippines ready? *IFLA Journal*, 50(2), 322–340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03400352231222039>
28. Tachie-Donkor, G., & Ezema, I. J. (2023). Effect of information literacy skills on university students' information seeking behaviour and lifelong learning. *Heliyon*, 9(8), Article e18427. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e18427>
29. Wilson, T. D. (1981). On user studies and information needs. *Journal of Documentation*, 37(1), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb026702>
30. Youmans, R. J. (2011). Does the adoption of plagiarism-detection software in higher education reduce plagiarism? *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(7), 749–761. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2010.523457>