

Empowering Students for Success: The Role of Information Literacy and Librarian Interactions in Academic Achievement

Sittie Saadia M. Muti, Cristine A. Geroy

Liceo de Cagayan University, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.903SEDU0651>

Received: 22 October 2025; Accepted: 28 October 2025; Published: 14 November 2025

ABSTRACT

This study examined the influence of information literacy and librarian interactions on students' academic success in higher education. Using a descriptive-correlational design, data were collected from 1,309 fourth year undergraduate students at Mindanao State University–Main Campus, Marawi City. The study assessed students' information literacy—specifically search skills and source evaluation—and the extent of their interactions with librarians regarding frequency, type of assistance, and perceived helpfulness. Results revealed that students demonstrated a high level of information literacy and moderate engagement with librarians. Both variables showed significant positive relationships with academic success, with source evaluation and perceived helpfulness emerging as the strongest predictors. The findings underscore the library's instructional and mentoring role in improving academic performance. Strengthening information literacy programs and fostering proactive librarian-student collaboration are recommended.

Keywords: information literacy; librarian interaction; academic success; higher education; student engagement; research skills

INTRODUCTION

The ability to locate, evaluate, and effectively utilize information is a fundamental competency for success in higher education. In today's digital and information-rich academic environment, students are continuously exposed to vast volumes of data that require critical analysis, ethical use, and discerning judgment. Information literacy (IL) therefore serves as an essential academic skill that empowers students to navigate this complexity, engage meaningfully with scholarly content, and produce high-quality academic and research outputs (Association of College & Research Libraries [ACRL], 2016).

Within this context, librarians play a transformative role in developing students' information literacy competencies. Beyond their traditional functions as resource providers, librarians serve as educators, mentors, and collaborators who facilitate students' ability to access, assess, and apply information critically (Head & Eisenberg, 2019). Through regular and meaningful interactions with librarians, students acquire not only technical skills in searching and retrieving information but also the confidence to evaluate sources, synthesize ideas, and construct well-founded academic arguments.

Recognizing this, the present study investigates the interplay between information literacy and librarian interactions and how these factors collectively influence students' academic success in higher education. By examining the depth and quality of students' information literacy skills and their engagement with librarians, this paper seeks to underscore the library's instructional and developmental role in fostering academic achievement and lifelong learning.

Objective of the Study

The aims of the study are as follows:

1. Determine the level of students' information literacy in terms of search skills and strategies and source evaluation.
2. Determine the level of students' librarian interactions in terms of frequency of interactions, type of assistance provided, and perceived helpfulness.
3. Examine the relationship between information literacy, librarian interactions, and students' academic success.
4. Identify which indicators of information literacy and librarian interactions best predict academic success.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Information literacy (IL) refers to the set of skills and dispositions that enable individuals to recognize when information is needed and to locate, evaluate, and use it effectively (Association of College & Research Libraries [ACRL], 2016). In the context of higher education, IL is increasingly recognized as a cornerstone of academic achievement and lifelong learning. Studies have consistently shown that students with higher levels of information literacy tend to perform better academically, demonstrating greater efficiency in research and higher-quality academic writing (Lanning & Mallek, 2017; Katsirikou & Skiadas, 2020). Effective search strategies and source evaluation skills, in particular, are linked to improved research productivity and the ability to produce credible, well-informed scholarly outputs (Kurbanoglu et al., 2018). Furthermore, integrating information literacy instruction within academic curricula enhances students' critical thinking, reflective judgment, and capacity for independent learning (Weiner, 2014).

Equally important to the development of these competencies are the interactions between students and librarians. Research has shown that librarian engagement significantly contributes to both academic and affective learning outcomes. Haddow and Joseph (2020) found that regular student–librarian interactions correlate with improved academic performance and greater engagement with learning resources. Collaborative activities—such as one-on-one consultations, research assistance, and library instruction sessions—have been shown to promote independent learning and enhance students' confidence in managing information (Webster et al., 2019). The perceived helpfulness and approachability of librarians also play a critical role: when students view librarians as knowledgeable and supportive, they are more likely to seek guidance and apply feedback effectively (Blake & Potvin, 2021).

Taken together, these studies suggest that information literacy and librarian interactions are mutually reinforcing factors that enhance students' academic success. The librarian's role extends beyond providing access to materials; it encompasses teaching, mentoring, and fostering an environment where students develop confidence in evaluating and using information ethically and effectively. Through these instructional and relational roles, librarians contribute not only to students' immediate academic performance but also to their broader intellectual growth and scholarly identity.

METHODOLOGY

The study employed a descriptive-correlational design to explore relationships between information literacy, librarian interactions, and academic success. Participants included 1,309 fourth-year undergraduate students from 14 colleges at Mindanao State University-Main Campus, Marawi City, during Academic Year 20242025. Stratified sampling ensured representation across disciplines. A structured questionnaire measured information literacy (search skills, source evaluation), librarian interactions (frequency, assistance, helpfulness), and academic success. All items used a 5-point Likert scale with excellent reliability (Cronbach's α .92). Descriptive statistics summarized data, Pearson's r measured correlations, and multiple regression identified predictors at $p < .05$.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 Level of Students' Information Literacy in Terms of Search Skills and Strategies

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. I know how to use keywords effectively to search for information.	3.24	1.19	Sometimes	Moderately High
2. I can refine my searches using advanced search techniques (e.g., Boolean operators)	2.88	1.13	Sometimes	Moderately High
3. I am confident in using the library's online catalog to locate materials.	2.76	1.12	Sometimes	Moderately High
4. I know how to search for academic resources using online databases.	2.95	1.14	Sometimes	Moderately High
5. I can identify the most relevant resources for my research needs.	3.01	1.09	Sometimes	Moderately High
6. I use filters (e.g., year, subject) to narrow down search results effectively.	2.99	1.14	Sometimes	Moderately High
7. I can differentiate between primary and secondary sources during my searches.	3.07	1.11	Sometimes	Moderately High
8. I can access full-text resources, such as e-books and journal articles, through the library.	2.78	1.10	Sometimes	Moderately High
9. I know how to search for peer-reviewed articles using scholarly databases.	2.82	1.10	Sometimes	Moderately High
10. I can locate and use specialized resources, such as archives or government documents.	2.76	1.12	Sometimes	Moderately High
11. I am confident in using citation tools provided by the library's online platforms.	2.84	1.14	Sometimes	Moderately High
12. I know how to identify and use credible websites when conducting online searches.	3.06	1.14	Sometimes	Moderately High
13. I can modify my search terms if I don't find relevant results initially.	3.03	1.11	Sometimes	Moderately High
14. I am familiar with using subject-specific databases to find information for my coursework.	2.93	1.13	Sometimes	Moderately High
15. I know how to locate help guides or ask librarians for assistance with search strategies.	2.89	1.12	Sometimes	Moderately High
Over-all Mean	2.93	.905	Sometimes	Moderately High

Legend:

Scale	Range	Description	Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Always	Very High
4	3.51-4.50	Often	High
3	2.51-3.50	Sometimes	Moderately High
2	1.51-2.50	Rarely	Low
1	1.00-1.50	Never	Very Low

Table 1 presents the students' level of information literacy in terms of search skills and strategies. The results show that students exhibited a moderately high level of competence ($M = 2.93$, $SD = 0.905$), indicating that they "sometimes" applied effective search behaviors but did not do so consistently or with full confidence. The highest-rated indicators were: "I know how to use keywords effectively to search for information" ($M = 3.24$,

SD = 1.19), “I can differentiate between primary and secondary sources during my searches” (M = 3.07, SD = 1.11), and “I know how to identify and use credible websites when conducting online searches” (M = 3.06, SD = 1.14). These findings suggest that students were generally comfortable performing foundational search tasks commonly emphasized during early academic experiences and digital literacy instruction.

However, the lowest mean scores were observed in “I can locate and use specialized resources, such as archives or government documents” (M = 2.76, SD = 1.12), “I am confident in using the library’s online catalog to locate materials” (M = 2.76, SD = 1.12), and “I can access full-text resources, such as e-books and journal articles, through the library” (M = 2.78, SD = 1.11). These results indicate that students experienced challenges in navigating advanced research tools and institutional systems crucial for academic scholarship.

The relatively high standard deviations across indicators reflect variability in students’ search proficiency, suggesting uneven access to structured information literacy instruction. This finding aligns with Gross and Latham (2012), who noted that students often overestimate their information literacy abilities, particularly in keyword and database searching. Similarly, Julien et al. (2018) found that inconsistent delivery of library instruction across academic programs led to uneven skill acquisition, leaving some students proficient while others relied solely on informal or self-directed learning.

Overall, the results highlight the need for structured, diagnostic, and discipline-based information literacy programs that bridge the gap between students perceived and actual competencies in search strategies.

Table 2 Level of Students’ Information Literacy in Terms of Source Evaluation

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. I can evaluate the credibility of an author when assessing a source.	3.05	1.03	Sometimes	Moderately High
2. I consider the publication date of a source to ensure its relevance to my topic.	3.27	1.11	Sometimes	Moderately High
3. I can identify the publisher’s credibility when selecting a source.	3.11	1.06	Sometimes	Moderately High
4. I evaluate whether a source is peer-reviewed or academically credible.	3.04	1.05	Sometimes	Moderately High
5. I can distinguish between scholarly and nonscholarly sources.	3.00	1.09	Sometimes	Moderately High
6. I consider the purpose of a source (e.g., informational, persuasive) before using it.	3.16	1.09	Sometimes	Moderately High
7. I verify the accuracy of information by crosschecking it with other reliable sources.	3.18	1.08	Sometimes	Moderately High
8. I evaluate whether a source includes proper citations and references.	3.22	1.10	Sometimes	Moderately High
9. I assess the objectivity of a source to determine if it has any biases.	3.18	1.11	Sometimes	Moderately High
10. I check for the presence of supporting evidence in a source to validate its claims.	3.19	1.09	Sometimes	Moderately High
11. I can differentiate between factual information and opinion in a source.	3.19	1.0	Sometimes	Moderately High
12. I prioritize sources that come from established and recognized institutions.	3.27	1.06	Sometimes	Moderately High
13. I assess the intended audience of a source to ensure it matches my academic needs.	3.21	1.06	Sometimes	Moderately High

14. I examine whether a source aligns with my research goals or thesis.	3.32	1.15	Sometimes	Moderately High
15. I critically evaluate the language and tone of a source to identify possible bias or agenda.	3.17	1.08	Sometimes	Moderately High
Over-all Mean	3.17	.905	Sometimes	Moderately High

Legend:

Scale Range	Description	Interpretation
5 4.51-5.00	Always	Very High
4 3.51-4.50	Often	High
3 2.51-3.50	Sometimes	Moderately High
2 1.51-2.50	Rarely	Low
1 1.00-1.50	Never	Very Low

As shown in Table 2, students demonstrated a moderately high level of information literacy in source evaluation ($M = 3.17$, $SD = 0.905$). The highest mean was observed for “I examine whether a source aligns with my research goals or thesis” ($M = 3.32$, $SD = 1.15$), followed by “I prioritize sources that come from established and recognized institutions” ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 1.06$), and “I assess the intended audience of a source to ensure it matches my academic needs” ($M = 3.21$, $SD = 1.06$). These findings indicate that students practiced evaluative behaviors that were task-oriented and context-driven, aligning with Saunders (2011) who noted that learners often assess credibility based on institutional reputation and relevance to academic goals.

However, the lowest-rated indicators—“I can distinguish between scholarly and non-scholarly sources” ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.09$), “I evaluate whether a source is peer-reviewed or academically credible” ($M = 3.04$, $SD = 1.06$), and “I can evaluate the credibility of an author when assessing a source” ($M = 3.05$, $SD = 1.03$)— suggest moderate awareness but limited mastery of academic evaluation criteria. Michalak et al. (2017) similarly reported students’ uncertainty in assessing scholarly authority and credibility, indicating a persistent confidence gap between conceptual understanding and applied skills.

The data further revealed wide variability in evaluation ability, implying that while some students demonstrated advanced critical judgment, others struggled with consistency. Bear (2020) attributed such differences to psychological and affective factors—such as confidence and academic anxiety—that shape evaluative behaviors. Overall, the findings highlight that while students recognize the importance of evaluating information, they require structured, confidence-building instruction that integrates evaluative tasks within the academic curriculum and reinforces critical appraisal skills across disciplines.

Table 3 Level of Students’ Librarian Interactions in Terms of Frequency of Interactions

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. I approach librarians for assistance with finding books or other physical resources.	2.81	1.26	Sometimes	Moderately Involved
2. I consult librarians for help with using the library’s online catalog.	2.57	1.18	Sometimes	Moderately Involved
3. I interact with librarians to get guidance on using academic databases.	2.60	1.16	Sometimes	Moderately Involved
4. I seek help from librarians when I have difficulty locating specific resources.	2.73	1.22	Sometimes	Moderately Involved
5. I ask librarians for support with understanding citation styles and formats.	2.53	1.19	Sometimes	Moderately Involved

6. I interact with librarians to learn about advanced search techniques.	2.49	1.17	Rarely	Less Involved
7. I seek advice from librarians on selecting appropriate sources for my assignments.	2.51	1.14	Sometimes	Moderately Involved
8. I consult librarians when I need assistance with accessing e-books or journal articles.	2.52	1.17	Sometimes	Moderately Involved
9. I interact with librarians for help with interlibrary loans or special requests.	2.40	1.17	Rarely	Less Involved
10. I ask librarians for recommendations on academic resources related to my field of study.	2.51	1.18	Sometimes	Moderately Involved
11. I consult librarians during workshops or instructional sessions offered by the library.	2.42	1.17	Rarely	Less Involved
12. I interact with librarians to troubleshoot technical issues with library resources (e.g., login problems).	2.49	1.18	Rarely	Less Involved
13. I ask librarians for help with developing effective research strategies.	2.42	1.15	Rarely	Less Involved
14. I interact with librarians to learn about new resources or tools available in the library.	2.49	1.16	Rarely	Less Involved
15. I seek out librarians to discuss or clarify my academic or research needs.	2.43	1.18	Rarely	Less Involved
Over-all Mean	2.53	1.03	Sometimes	Moderately Involved

Legend:

Scale	Range	Description	Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Always	Very High
4	3.51-4.50	Often	High
3	2.51-3.50	Sometimes	Moderately High
2	1.51-2.50	Rarely	Low
1	1.00-1.50	Never	Very Low

Table 3 presents the extent of students' interactions with librarians. The overall mean ($M = 2.53$, $SD = 1.03$) indicates that students interacted with librarians occasionally, reflecting a moderately high but inconsistent level of engagement. The highest means were for "I approach librarians for assistance with finding books or physical resources" ($M = 2.81$, $SD = 1.26$), "I seek help from librarians when I have difficulty locating specific resources" ($M = 2.73$, $SD = 1.22$), and "I interact with librarians to get guidance on using academic databases" ($M = 2.60$, $SD = 1.16$). These results show that students primarily approached librarians for immediate, task-oriented assistance rather than continuous academic support.

Conversely, indicators such as "I interact with librarians for help with interlibrary loans or special requests" ($M = 2.40$, $SD = 1.17$), "I consult librarians during workshops or instructional sessions offered by the library" ($M = 2.42$, $SD = 1.17$), and "I ask librarians for help with developing effective research strategies" ($M = 2.42$, $SD = 1.15$) received the lowest ratings. This implies that students' engagement was largely transactional rather than developmental. According to Mackey and Jacobson (2014), such patterns reveal missed opportunities to promote metaliteracy, where librarian interactions foster reflective and participatory learning. Rempel and Deitering (2017) similarly emphasized that students often overlook librarians' roles as educators, viewing them only as service providers.

The variation in frequency scores underscores the need to redefine librarianship as a teaching and mentoring role. Proactive, embedded librarian engagement—through course integration, faculty collaboration, and

personalized instruction—could transform these interactions into sustained learning partnerships that promote deeper information literacy development.

Table 4 Level of Students' Librarian Interactions in Terms of Type of Assistance Provided

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. Librarians assist me in locating physical books and resources in the library.	2.83	1.24	Sometimes	Moderately High
2. Librarians provide guidance on using the library's online catalog effectively.	2.66	1.20	Sometimes	Moderately High
3. I receive support from librarians in accessing digital resources, such as e-books and databases.	2.56	1.18	Sometimes	Moderately High
4. Librarians help me with developing research strategies for academic projects.	2.52	1.18	Sometimes	Moderately High
5. I get assistance from librarians in evaluating the credibility of sources.	2.56	1.18	Sometimes	Moderately High
6. Librarians provide clear instructions on proper citation and referencing styles.	2.57	1.18	Sometimes	Moderately High
7. I rely on librarians for help with troubleshooting technical issues related to library systems.	2.59	1.21	Sometimes	Moderately High
8. Librarians assist me in understanding how to use advanced search techniques (e.g., Boolean operators).	2.50	1.19	Rarely	Low
9. I receive help from librarians in navigating subject-specific databases for research purposes	2.53	1.19	Sometimes	Moderately High
10. Librarians guide me in finding and using special collections or archives.	2.58	1.18	Sometimes	Moderately High
11. I benefit from librarian's recommendations on relevant resources for my coursework or research.	2.56	1.16	Sometimes	Moderately High
12. Librarians assist in using library tools such as computers.	2.52	1.19	Sometimes	Moderately High
13. I rely on librarians for interlibrary loan requests or obtaining resources from other institutions.	2.33	1.17	Rarely	Low
14. Librarians provide workshops or training sessions to enhance my information literacy skills.	2.29	1.15	Rarely	Low
15. I received personalized support from librarians to address specific academic or research challenges.	2.05	1.14	Rarely	Low
Over-all Mean	2.51	1.01	Sometimes	Moderately High

Legend:

Scale	Range	Description	Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Always	Very High
4	3.51-4.50	Often	High
3	2.51-3.50	Sometimes	Moderately High
2	1.51-2.50	Rarely	Low
1	1.00-1.50	Never	Very Low

As shown in Table 4, students demonstrated a moderately high level of interaction with librarians in terms of assistance type ($M = 2.51$, $SD = 1.01$). The highest-rated items were "Librarians assist me in locating physical books and resources in the library" ($M = 2.83$, $SD = 1.24$) and "Librarians provide guidance on using the library's

online catalog effectively” ($M = 2.66$, $SD = 1.20$). These findings affirm that students continue to rely on librarians for foundational support, echoing Hussain and Abalkhail (2013) who noted that physical resource navigation remains central to students’ library use. Similarly, Gross et al. (2015) emphasized the importance of librarian mediation in improving students’ digital search proficiency.

However, the lowest-rated indicators—“I received personalized support from librarians to address specific academic or research challenges” ($M = 2.05$, $SD = 1.14$), “Librarians provide workshops or training sessions to enhance my information literacy skills” ($M = 2.29$, $SD = 1.15$), and “I rely on librarians for interlibrary loan requests” ($M = 2.33$, $SD = 1.17$)—highlighted minimal engagement in advanced or specialized library services. This pattern reflects Delaney and Bates (2015) and Tewell (2015), who observed that students often perceive librarians as resource facilitators rather than collaborative educators. The limited use of interlibrary loan and workshop participation suggests gaps in awareness, accessibility, and perceived relevance of library programs.

These results underscore the need for strategic promotion of librarian-led instruction and personalized academic support. As Mlis (2024) emphasized, sporadic engagement can be mitigated through curricular integration and consistent faculty-librarian collaboration that position librarians as co-educators in the learning process.

Table 5 Level of Students’ Librarian Interactions in Terms of Type of Perceived Helpfulness

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. Librarians provide clear and accurate answers to my questions.	2.98	1.20	Sometimes	Moderately High
2. The assistance I receive from librarians is timely and effective.	2.90	1.15	Sometimes	Moderately High
3. Librarians are approachable and willing to help whenever I seek assistance.	3.00	1.18	Sometimes	Moderately High
4. The librarians’ guidance helps me find the resources I need efficiently.	2.94	1.19	Sometimes	Moderately High
5. Librarians are knowledgeable about academic databases and research tools.	2.97	1.19	Sometimes	Moderately High
6. I find librarians helpful when I need assistance with citation and referencing styles.	2.85	1.23	Sometimes	Moderately High
7. Librarians provide useful recommendations for resources relevant to my assignments.	2.84	1.21	Sometimes	Moderately High
8. The support pro enhances my research and academic work.	2.82	1.18	Sometimes	Moderately High
9. Librarians are patient and understanding when addressing my concerns.	2.95	1.19	Sometimes	Moderately High
10. Librarians explain search strategies and library tools in a way that is easy to understand.	2.82	1.20	Sometimes	Moderately High
11. The assistance I receive from librarians improves my confidence in using library resources.	2.86	1.22	Sometimes	Moderately High
12. Librarians go beyond basic assistance to ensure I achieve my academic goals.	2.77	1.19	Sometimes	Moderately High
13. Librarians make me feel valued and supported during interactions.	2.84	1.21	Rarely	Low
14. The workshops or sessions conducted by librarians are informative and helpful.	2.80	1.20	Sometimes	Moderately High
15. Overall, I perceive librarians as an essential and helpful resource for my academic success.	2.96	1.20	Sometimes	Moderately High
Over-all Mean	2.89	1.06	Sometimes	Moderately High

Legend:

Scale Range	Description	Interpretation
5 4.51-5.00	Always	Very High

4	3.51-4.50	Often	High
3	2.51-3.50	Sometimes	Moderately High
2	1.51-2.50	Rarely	Low
1	1.00-1.50	Never	Very Low

Table 5 reveals that students perceived librarian helpfulness as moderately high ($M = 2.89$, $SD = 1.06$), indicating generally positive yet uneven experiences. The highest mean was recorded for “Librarians are approachable and willing to help whenever I seek assistance” ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.18$), followed by “Librarians provide clear and accurate answers to my questions” ($M = 2.98$, $SD = 1.20$), and “Librarians are knowledgeable about academic databases and research tools” ($M = 2.97$, $SD = 1.15$). These findings reflect students’ appreciation for librarians’ interpersonal warmth, accuracy, and expertise—factors identified by Johnson et al. (2018) and Bowles-Terry and Donovan (2016) as critical in fostering effective library learning experiences.

Nevertheless, lower scores in “Librarians go beyond basic assistance to ensure I achieve my academic goals” ($M = 2.77$, $SD = 1.19$) and “The workshops or sessions conducted by librarians are informative and helpful” ($M = 2.80$, $SD = 1.20$) suggest that students perceived librarian support as reactive rather than proactive. This aligns with Reynolds et al. (2017), who noted that transactional service models limit librarians’ transformative potential in student learning. Nicholson (2015) further cautioned against the “McDonaldization” of academic libraries—standardized, efficiency-driven practices that undermine meaningful, personalized academic interactions.

In sum, while librarians are viewed as approachable and competent, their perceived role remains constrained by limited visibility and integration within academic instruction. Expanding librarians’ pedagogical presence and tailoring instruction to students’ specific disciplinary needs could enhance both the perceived and actual helpfulness of library services.

OVERALL DISCUSSION

Across all variables, students exhibited moderately high levels of information literacy and librarian interaction, yet findings point to a fragmented and uneven engagement with library resources and staff. Students demonstrated stronger self-perceived skills in basic search and evaluation tasks but weaker performance in advanced, critical, and context-specific research competencies. Similarly, librarian interactions were generally positive but primarily operational rather than instructional or developmental.

The results collectively affirm that the library remains an influential but underutilized component of academic success. Consistent with Mackey and Jacobson’s (2014) concept of metaliteracy, librarians should be reenvisioned not only as custodians of information but as active educators and collaborators who cultivate students’ independent learning and research confidence.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study revealed that both information literacy and librarian interactions play a significant role in enhancing students’ academic success. Students exhibited a moderately high level of information literacy, particularly in source evaluation, yet showed inconsistency in advanced search strategies and resource navigation. Likewise, librarian interactions were found to be moderately high but largely transactional rather than instructional or collaborative in nature. These findings emphasize that while libraries are recognized as essential academic support systems, their potential to foster deeper learning and critical engagement remains underutilized.

To strengthen these outcomes, several key measures are recommended. At the policy level, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) should institutionalize policies that integrate information literacy and library engagement within quality assurance frameworks and provide funding for library development and capacity building. The university administration, particularly Mindanao State University, is encouraged to embed

information literacy instruction into academic curricula, enhance library infrastructure, and promote faculty librarian collaboration to support research and student learning.

Library administrators and associations should design strategic programs and professional development initiatives that enhance librarians' instructional and technological competencies while promoting innovation in user engagement. Librarians themselves are urged to take proactive instructional roles through orientations, workshops, and personalized consultations that strengthen students' research and critical evaluation skills. Faculty members should collaborate closely with librarians in integrating library resources into teaching and assessment activities.

Finally, students are encouraged to maximize library services and participate in information literacy programs to develop strong research habits, while future researchers may extend this study by incorporating additional variables such as digital literacy, learning environment, and faculty support using longitudinal or mixedmethod designs.

By reinforcing the synergy among policymakers, institutions, librarians, and students, academic libraries can evolve from being mere information providers to becoming dynamic partners in advancing research, critical inquiry, and lifelong learning.

REFERENCES

1. Association of College & Research Libraries. (2016). Framework for information literacy for higher education. ACRL. <https://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>
2. Bear, A. (2020). Confidence and information literacy: Understanding students' evaluative behaviors. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 14(2), 45–62.
3. Blake, K., & Potvin, S. (2021). Student–librarian engagement and information confidence in higher education. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 47(2), 102–110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102110>
4. Bowles-Terry, M., & Donovan, C. (2016). Serving the whole student: Integrating affective learning in library instruction. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 10(2), 107–125.
5. Delaney, G., & Bates, J. (2015). Envisioning the academic library: A reflection on roles, relevance, and relationships. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 21(1), 30–50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13614533.2014.911194>
6. Gross, M., & Latham, D. (2012). What's skill got to do with it? Information literacy skills and self-views of ability among first-year college students. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 63(3), 574–583. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21681>
7. Gross, M., Latham, D., & Julien, H. (2015). The marginalized majority: Information skills and perceptions of information literacy instruction among undergraduates. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 15(1), 141–161. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2015.0000>
8. Haddow, G., & Joseph, J. (2020). Librarian interactions and student academic outcomes: Evidence from academic libraries. *College & Research Libraries*, 81(5), 751–768. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.81.5.751>
9. Head, A. J., & Eisenberg, M. B. (2019). *Project Information Literacy: How students engage with information*. Information School, University of Washington.
10. Hussain, A., & Abalkhail, A. (2013). Determining library use and its impact on academic performance of students: A case study. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1–16.
11. Johnson, A. M., Becker, K., & Craig, C. (2018). Librarian approachability and student engagement: Exploring affective factors in academic libraries. *Reference Services Review*, 46(3), 400–417.
12. Julien, H., Gross, M., & Latham, D. (2018). Survey of information literacy instructional practices in U.S. academic libraries. *College & Research Libraries*, 79(2), 179–199. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.79.2.179>
13. Katsirikou, A., & Skiadas, C. (2020). Information literacy and academic performance in Greek universities. *Library Management*, 41(4/5), 253–270. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LM-07-2019-0054>
14. Kurbanoğlu, S., Boustany, J., & Špiranec, S. (2018). *Information literacy in the digital age: Global perspectives*. De Gruyter Saur.

15. Lanning, S., & Mallek, J. (2017). Factors influencing information literacy competency of undergraduate students. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 43(5), 386–392.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2017.06.005>
16. Mackey, T. P., & Jacobson, T. E. (2014). Metaliteracy: Reinventing information literacy to empower learners. ALA Neal-Schuman.
17. Michalak, S., Rysavy, M., Hunt, K., & Smith, B. (2017). Assessing students' evaluation of sources in academic writing. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 11(2), 420–441.
18. Mlis, R. (2024). Rethinking librarian engagement in the post-pandemic university: Curricular integration and collaboration. *International Journal of Library and Information Science*, 16(1), 23–39.
19. Nicholson, K. P. (2015). The “McDonaldization” of academic libraries and the values of transformational change. *College & Research Libraries*, 76(3), 328–338. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.76.3.328>
20. Reynolds, R., Leeder, C., & Chiu, M. (2017). Beyond transactions: Reframing reference services to support student learning. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 56(3), 161–172.
21. Saunders, L. (2011). Information literacy as a student learning outcome: The perspective of institutional accreditation. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 11(2), 331–351.
22. Tewell, E. (2015). The practice and promise of critical information literacy: Academic librarians' involvement in critical library instruction. *College & Research Libraries*, 76(6), 812–833.
<https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.76.6.812>
23. Weiner, S. A. (2014). The contribution of information literacy to student success: Reflections on the literature. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1–10.
24. Webster, J., Thomas, L., & Ivey, S. (2019). Librarian–faculty collaboration and student learning outcomes. *Journal of Library Instruction*, 15(3), 210–225.