

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF LIBRARY SERVICES IN ACHIEVING TOTAL CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

**Cherly C. Cordova¹, Denis A. Tan², Prinyl J. Pardo³, Precille Babes T. Baldapan⁴,
Belinda B. Calunsag⁴, Eden C. Luza⁵, Jaybriel E. Tabay⁶**

^{1, 2}College of Education, Central Mindanao University,

University Town, Musuan, Bukidnon, 8710 Philippines Correspondence Tel.: +639177103100,

^{3,4,5,6}Office of the Library Services, Central Mindanao University, University Town, Musuan, Bukidnon, 8710

denistan@cmu.edu.ph²

ABSTRACT: *This study used a descriptive research design to assess the quality of service at the Central Mindanao University Office of the Library Services and its college reading rooms. The respondents were library users, including students, faculty, staff, alumni, and visitors, who participated through a complete enumeration or census sampling procedure from August to October 2024. A two-part questionnaire, adapted from the SERVQUAL model, was used to gather data. The first part collected demographic information (age, gender, category, and frequency of visits), while the second part measured the respondents' assessment of service quality across nine dimensions: competence, responsiveness, accessibility, communication, courtesy, credibility, reliability, security, and tangibility. Descriptive statistics, including frequency, mean, standard deviation, and percentage, were used for data analysis. The findings showed that the majority of library users were students aged 18-21, and females utilized the services more frequently than males. The Office of the Library Services was the most visited location. Overall, respondents rated the library's services positively, with most dimensions receiving a "Very Satisfactory" (VS) or "Outstanding" (O) rating. Older clients (aged 26 and above) and alumni/visitors tended to give slightly higher ratings, particularly for communication, courtesy, and reliability, suggesting they highly value professional and consistent service. Students and faculty, as more frequent users, had slightly lower ratings, possibly due to higher expectations or more exposure to service variations during peak times. The results underscored the library's dedication to offering a professional, secure, and accessible environment, while also identifying opportunities for improvement in areas such as digital engagement to better cater to the needs of younger users.*

Keywords: customer satisfaction, library services, students perception

1. INTRODUCTION

In the ever-evolving landscape of education, libraries are integral components of academic institutions, with Central Mindanao University being no exception. The presence of libraries in higher education setting help to accelerate the implementation of educational programs so that the aims and objectives of education could be achieved (Anyawu et al., 2013). As Gorman (1999) points out, the core product of libraries is service. Without service, libraries may turn into stagnant storage spaces, lacking their fundamental educational significance.

Moreover, in the context of library services, ensuring high-quality service is important, with a key emphasis on satisfying user expectations and requirements. Users anticipate libraries to provide services that accommodate their diverse levels of knowledge and preferences, while also enabling convenient access to a broad range of information sources, both traditional and electronic (Claraval, 2005).

To cater to the changing needs of the users, it is important that library services continually improve with time (Amarasekara & Marasinghe, 2020). Regular assessment and improvement of library services are crucial to ensuring that they remain effective in supporting teaching, learning, and research endeavors (Gyau et al., 2021). By staying responsive to the dynamic nature of education, libraries can better serve their community and contribute to the achievement of educational objectives.

Historically, library service assessment primarily relied on sporadic statistics, such as circulation counts and reference queries, collected by librarians and staff. However, these statistics often remained isolated, lacking further analysis or actionable measures for service improvement. This approach predominantly reflected the perceptions of service providers and offered limited insights into enhancing service quality (Claraval, 2005).

Recognizing the limitations of traditional assessment methods, researchers and librarians in the field of Library and Information Science (LIS) advocated for a more systematic approach involving user engagement in the assessment process. This shift led to the development of new

methodologies, including institutionally created surveys, focus group interviews, and complaint analysis, aimed at gathering user feedback to inform service improvements (Xi Shi & Lévy, 2005). In recent years, the utilization of questionnaires tailored to specific purposes has become prevalent, facilitating the collection of user data from students, faculty, and other library patrons. These data are then analyzed and presented using descriptive statistical techniques to provide interpretable insights into library operations and service quality (Shi & Lévy, 2005).

This evolution in assessment methodologies underscores the importance of incorporating user perspectives into the evaluation of library services, ultimately enhancing the quality and effectiveness of service delivery.

Furthermore, the mission of the CMU library is to serve as a hub of information resources, catering to the educational, informational, and research needs of both the college and the wider community. As a dynamic center for learning, the library not only houses knowledge but actively supports the university's core functions: instruction, research, extension, and production.

In the realm of instruction, the library conducts orientation programs and provides guidance on utilizing its resources effectively. For research endeavors, it promotes and facilitates the use of relevant materials, aiding users in conducting thorough and efficient studies. In terms of extension, the library engages in information dissemination through networking initiatives, sharing resources with other libraries and promoting research among various stakeholders, including researchers, teachers, students, and the general public. Lastly, in production, the library generates abstracts and other periodical tools, along with providing photocopying services to assist students in their research endeavors.

While the Central Mindanao University Library delivers commendable service, there remains a constant need for assessment to ensure continuous improvement in meeting the evolving expectations and demands of its clients. Patron evaluation serves as a valuable tool in enhancing efficiency and effectiveness across various service areas.

Considering the aforementioned factors and the imperative to uphold service quality, it is essential to evaluate the CMU Library's services in terms of competence, responsiveness, accessibility, communication, courtesy, reliability, security, understanding of customer needs, and tangibility. Such assessment will enable the library to identify areas for improvement and enhance the overall service experience for its patrons.

2.REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

SERVICE QUALITY

Service quality is defined in different ways but for the concept of service quality that is used for library evaluation to examine the difference between a user's expectations and the user's perceived sense of actual performance (Hernon & Whitman, 2000).

According to Altman and Hernon, (2010), service quality is defined in terms of reducing the gap between user expectations and actual service provided. Though there is ambiguity between the concept of service quality and satisfaction, and they concluded that service quality focuses on the interaction between customers and service providers, and the gap or difference between expectations about service provision and perception about how the service was actually provided. In an academic library composes a patron and the one who renders and delivered the service. Service quality focuses the needs and expectations of customers to improve services. Over the past decade, both academics and practitioners in the field of library and information science (LIS) have increasingly recognized the significance of assessing library services. Library assessment applications have been encouraged at all scales, massive amounts of data have been collected and published, and processes and results have been reported. However, it is surprising that little comprehensive analysis of the current library assessment tools has been performed (Xi Shi & Levy ,2005)

A significant aspect of library service quality, which is as central to the issue as the library itself, revolves around meeting the expectations of the user (Hernon & Altman, 2000). Interviews conducted with users have revealed that they anticipate the library to deliver services that acknowledge their diverse levels of expertise and sensitivities. Furthermore, users expect the library to facilitate wide and easy access to a broad spectrum of informational resources, including traditional local library collections as well as electronic resources and remote print collections (Hernon & Whitman, 2000).

USER SATISFACTION

According to Versoza (2011), the primary goal of a user-centered library is to provide quality service and ensure user satisfaction. She emphasizes that measuring service quality in libraries should be both a specific project and a continuous process aimed at enhancing and improving services. Versoza underscores that when librarians deliver quality service, users will ultimately be satisfied. User satisfaction, in this context, is focused on individual transactions and encompasses collective encounters and emotional reactions to experiences.

Similarly, Peter Hernon and Ellen Altman (2010) highlight the significance of adding value, service quality, and customer satisfaction in libraries. They assert that these concepts are essential for the continued well-being of libraries, as the consequences of poor-quality service include dissatisfied customers who may share their negative experiences and refrain from returning to the library. They emphasized that achieving positive results and impressions hinges on ensuring user satisfaction. They stress the importance for librarians to value the way they serve clients and provide high-quality service, as this ultimately leads to more satisfied users. Librarians should prioritize serving the academic community rather than seeking personal recognition.

Review of Related Studies

There are various relevant studies that have a relationship with this research. The first study is done by Anyawu et al. (2013) entitled, *Staff Development in School Libraries in Nigeria*. The study investigated staff development strategies in school libraries and Information centers in Owerri, Imo State, Nigeria. The study emphasized the importance of staff development as essential to the provision of efficient library services. Self-designed questionnaires were utilized to gather data from ten schools, revealing methods used in staff development and identifying factors limiting its effectiveness. The study concluded that embarking on staff development positively impacts the level of services rendered by school library media centers.

The second study is from Gyau et al. (2021) entitled, *Evaluation of User Satisfaction in Academic Libraries*. This study focused on evaluating user satisfaction with academic library services, particularly from students' perspectives. The study aimed to determine the relationship between user satisfaction and overall library service quality. Utilizing survey research methods, the researchers collected data from international students at Jiangsu University Library. The findings indicated overall satisfaction with library support for learning and research. Statistical analyses, including Pearson correlation and multivariate analysis of variance, highlighted a positive and significant relationship between user satisfaction and the overall quality of library services.

The third study by Amarasekara and Marasinghe (2020) entitled *User Satisfaction Survey in Sri Lanka* emphasized the importance of user satisfaction surveys as a measure of library service quality. The study, conducted at the Open University of Sri Lanka, assessed user satisfaction with library facilities, staff, services, resources, and the library website. Results indicated various purposes for library usage, with respondents generally satisfied with library staff, services, and resources. However, areas for improvement were identified, including the need for information literacy programs and enhanced online services.

The fourth study is from Mamta and Kumar (2023), a systematic review of studies on library service quality. The researchers analyzed articles published from 2010 to 2021, focusing on models and dimensions used to measure service quality. Findings revealed that SERVQUAL and LibQual models were frequently adopted, with key dimensions such as empathy, reliability, tangible aspects, assurance, responsiveness, information control, and library as a place. Questionnaire-based survey research methods were predominant, often with sample sizes below 100 respondents, primarily reported in academic libraries.

The fifth study is from Carvalho e Rodrigues & Mandrekar (2020) entitled, *Impact of Library Usage on Students' Academic Success*. This study explored the relationship between library usage and students' academic success. The study highlighted the significant impact of library resources and services on students' academic performance. Random surveying revealed the challenges faced by students in accessing library resources. The findings underscored the need for information literacy programs to enhance students' awareness of library benefits, ultimately improving their academic success.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The descriptive research method was used in this study. Descriptive research design guided this study to investigate the quality service of Central Mindanao University Office of the Library Services.

This study also described the assessment of the respondents by considering the different kinds of dimensions namely: competence, responsiveness, accessibility, courtesy, communication, courtesy, reliability, security, and tangibility.

This study was conducted in the Office of the Library Services and College Reading Rooms, Central Mindanao University, Musuan, Maramag Bukidnon. It is situated in a two-storey building and in eight (8) different college reading rooms of the said university.

The library can accommodate 1676 library clients. The library has six (6) sections namely, Circulation section, Reference section, Serials section, Filipiniana section, Technical section and E-Library.

Furthermore, the College Reading Rooms serve as the extensions of the main library. These include the College of Agriculture, College of Arts and Sciences, College of Business and Management, College of Education, College of Engineering, College of Forestry and Environmental Science, College of Human Ecology and College of Veterinary Medicine. This is to ensure that each college has convenient access to resources.

This study used complete enumeration or census. The respondents of the study were the library users who visited within the months of August-October 2024 and were willing to participate in the study. They were students, faculty, staff, alumni and visitors of the University.

The questionnaire was divided into two (2) parts. Part 1 of the questionnaire focused on the respondent’s profile. The second part determined the assessment of the respondents on the quality of service rendered by Library staff.

The demographic profile includes Age, Gender, Category, Library/Reading Room visited and Frequency of Visit in Semester and the assessment part consist of nine (9) subparts namely: competence, responsiveness, accessibility, communication, courtesy, credibility, reliability, security and tangibility where the respondents rated using the scale a four-point scale as shown below

Response	Points	Interval Scale	QD
At all times	4	3.70-4.00	O
Most of the Time	3	2.80-3.69	VS
Sometimes	2	1.90-2.79	S
Never	1	1.00-1.89	NI

Library users were asked to participate in the study and a consent form were given. An orientation on the ethical considerations and proper disposal of data gathered were followed. Moreover, presentation of the purpose and uses of the result were included. Willing participants were asked to answer a two-page survey questionnaire adopted from Parasuraman et al., 1988’s SERVQUAL.

Scoring Procedure

As mentioned earlier, Part 1 of the questionnaire described the respondent’s demographic profile. The categories used in each of these variables are coded as follows:

Table A. Code Guide for the Respondents Profile

VARI ABL E	CO DE GUI DE	CATEGORIES
AGE	18- 21 22- 25 26	

	and above	
GENDER	1	Male
	2	Female
Category	1	Student
	2	Faculty and Staff
	3	Alumni
	4	Visitors
Library/Reading Room	1	University Library
	2	College of Home Ecology Reading Room
	3	College of Forestry & Environmental Science Reading Room
	4	College of Agriculture Reading Room
	5	College of Education Reading Room
	6	College of Arts and Sciences Reading Room
	7	College of Engineering Reading Room
	8	College of Veterinary Reading Room
	9	College of Business and Management Reading Room

For Part II, answer of the respondents to the questions asked in the survey questionnaire were based on the 4-point Likert scale.
Descriptive statistics, such as frequency, mean, standard deviation, and percentage using statistical software.

1. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Demographic Profile of Library Clients
The demographic profile of clients includes age, gender, category, and the library/reading room being visited. Table 1 presents the demographic profile data.
Table 1. Demographic profile of library clients.

Variables	Categories	Frequency	%
Age	18-21	1306	76
	22-25	367	22
	26-above	35	2
Gender	Male	560	34
	Female	1104	66
Category	Student	1538	90
	Visitor	74	4
	Alumni	88	5
	Faculty and Staff	11	1
Library/Reading Room visited	Office of the Library Services	1551	61

	College of Agriculture Reading Room	110	4
	College of Arts and Sciences Reading Room	265	10
	College of Business and Management Reading Room	99	4
	College of Education Reading Room	122	5
	College of Engineering Reading Room	128	5
	College of Forestry and Environmental Science Reading Room	91	4
	College of Human Ecology Reading Room	81	3
	College of Veterinary Medicine Reading Room	89	4

Age

The data reveals that the majority of library/reading room clients fall between 18-21 age group, with a total of 1,306 visits or 76%. This indicates that younger clients, particularly those in their early years in the university, are the most frequent users of library services. This is true in the study of Grossnickle (2016) which revealed that during this age, students are curious and has the desire for new knowledge, information and experience, which explained that first-second year students are more reliant on library resources for academic support, research, and study space as they adjust to university-level coursework. Additionally, first-second year students visit the library because it is safe, and has comfortable spaces that support relaxation, mental and social well-being (Berens & Noorda, 2023).

Moreover, the age 22-25 follows with 367 visits (22%). This data suggests that as students' progress in their studies, their frequency of library use may decrease. This decline could be attributed to students developing alternative study habits and utilizing digital resources more frequently. As seen in the study of Lacović (2012), one half of all graduate students used the internet to find research papers, journal articles, white papers, or/and working papers.

Furthermore, the 26 and above age group has the lowest usage, with only 35 (2%) visits recorded. This group likely consists of faculty, staff, and MS/PhD students who may have different study

routines. Additionally, many faculty members prefer to use other platform to get information they needed rather than visit the library (Cabfilan & Ricardo, 2020).

Gender

In terms of gender, the data shows a significant disparity in library usage. Female clients recorded 1,104 visits (66%), while male clients recorded only 560 (34%) visits. This suggests that female students tend to utilize library services and reading spaces more frequently than male. According to Adetayo et al. (2024), various factors including study habits, academic engagement, and personal preferences in learning environments suggest the difference in library usage. Additionally, Chukwu et al. (2023) noted that female students often engage in longer study sessions compared to males, further explaining their higher library attendance.

Category

The data reveal that the majority of the library clients are students, with a total of 1,538 (90%). This indicates that students rely heavily on the library for academic resources, study spaces, and research materials (Scoulas & De Groote, 2019). Additionally, it suggests that the library remains a crucial support system for their educational needs (Adetayo, et al., 2024).

Moreover, alumni recorded 88 visits (5%), indicating that a portion of graduates continue utilizing library resources. This suggests that alumni may still require access to academic materials or a quiet space for continued learning (Aluko-Arowolo & Omeluzor, 2023). According to the study of Okojie and Adeyemi (2022), alumni engagement with university libraries is often linked to lifelong learning initiatives, professional development, and research projects.

Furthermore, 74 visits were recorded by visitors (4%), which may include external researchers, prospective students, or guests accessing public resources. Some studies, such as the study of Aluko-Arowolo & Omeluzor, (2023), highlight the importance of university libraries in serving a broader community beyond enrolled students.

Lastly, faculty and staff accounted for only 11 visits (1%), indicating minimal library usage among this demographic. This aligns with findings from the study of Korobili et al. (2006), which suggest that faculty members primarily access resources through digital subscriptions, institutional repositories, and departmental research centers rather than visiting physical library.

Library/Reading Room Visited

The data reveals that the Office of the Library Services is the most frequently visited space, with a total of 1551 counts (61%). This is because it serves as the central hub for library-related transactions. According to the study of Hassan (2025), libraries have been integral institutions for centuries, serving as resource hubs for communities in approachable, physical spaces. Additionally, in the study of Abukari (2019), it was revealed that a library provides resources and services to support teaching, learning, and research. The students and faculty visited the main library since it provides wide array of resources and services.

Meanwhile, the College of Arts and Sciences Reading Room is the second most frequently visited library space, with a total of 265 counts (10%). This suggests that the reading room provides a conducive study environment and is conveniently located for clients.

In contrast, the other college reading room recorded a lower number of visits compared to both the Office of Library Services and the College of Arts and Sciences Reading Room. This may indicate that other factors influence its lower usage, such as accessibility, study environment, or user preferences.

Respondents' Assessment of the Quality of Library Services

The assessment of library services is categorized into nine (9) key indicators: *Competence, Responsiveness, Accessibility, Communication, Courtesy, Credibility, Reliability, Security, and Tangibility*. The responses are grouped by three age brackets: 18-21, 22-25, and 26 and above. Overall, the data suggests a generally positive perception of library services, with respondents frequently rating them as available “VS” and “O”.

Table 2. Library Clients' Assessment of Library Service Responsiveness according to Age bracket

Age Bracket		18-21		
		MEAN	SD	QD
A	Competence	3.51	0.636	VS
B	Responsiveness	3.59	0.581	VS

C	Accessibility	3.63	0.557	VS
D	Communication	3.55	0.626	VS
E	Courtesy	3.72	0.491	O
F	Credibility	3.67	0.506	VS
G	Reliability	3.69	1.838	VS
H	Security	3.76	0.466	O
I	Tangibility	3.65	0.582	VS
Age Bracket		22-25		
		MEAN	MEAN	MEAN
A	3.55	3.55	3.55	VS
B	3.61	3.61	3.61	VS
C	3.61	3.61	3.61	VS
D	3.50	3.50	3.50	VS
E	3.68	3.68	3.68	O
F	3.63	3.63	3.63	VS
G	3.69	3.69	3.69	VS
H	3.70	3.70	3.70	O
I	3.47	3.47	3.47	VS
Age Bracket		26 AND ABOVE		
		MEAN	MEAN	MEAN
A	3.62	3.62	3.62	VS
B	3.66	3.66	3.66	VS
C	3.68	3.68	3.68	VS
D	3.70	3.70	3.70	VS
E	3.78	3.78	3.78	O
F	3.67	3.67	3.67	VS
G	3.73	3.73	3.73	VS
H	3.75	3.75	3.75	O
I	3.68	3.68	3.68	VS

Library staff competence was evaluated based on the ability of the library staff to handle pressure and respond to clients’ inquiries. The weighted means across all age groups indicate that respondents believe staff members demonstrate competence “VS” with an overall weighted mean of 3.51, 3.55 and 3.62 for age brackets 18-21, 22-25, and 26-above respectively. The 26 and above age group gave the highest rating with a total weighted mean of 3.62, suggesting a slightly higher level of satisfaction compared to the 18-21 and 22-25 groups, which had weighted means of 3.55 and 3.51, respectively which was described as “VS”. All three age brackets expressed a VS assessment to the library service competence.

Furthermore, the findings suggest that the library maintains a well-trained and competent staff, ensuring the quality delivery of services (Ijeh et al., 2024). This indicates that the clients are generally confident in the library staff’s ability to address their concerns effectively and provide accurate assistance when needed (Baharuddin, 2016). Lastly, in the study of Pandey and Prasad (2023), it is believed that librarians need to possess competencies in order to offer full services to their patrons, includes the capacity to manage and operate the library services completely.

Library staff responsiveness, which measures willingness to help, dependability, and prompt attention to complaints, follows a similar finding. The 26 and above group gave the highest weighted mean of 3.66, while the 18-21 and 22-25 groups gave a weighted mean of 3.59 and 3.61, respectively which was described as “VS”. The findings suggest that, regardless of age, library clients find library staff helpful most of the time, implying that the library prioritizes customer service and strives to create a supportive environment for its users (Dupa et al., 2018). These findings reflect the library’s dedication to promptly addressing client needs and ensuring a positive library experience (Manguil et al., 2024).

The accessibility of library services, including staff presence, convenient access of collection, and

service hours, received a generally favorable assessment. The 26 and above group rated this the highest with a total weighted mean of 3.68, with a notable 3.74 rating for convenient service hours, which was described as "O". Moreover, the 18-21 and 22-25 groups gave slightly lower ratings with a total weighted mean of 3.63 and 3.61, which described as "VS".

The data suggests that the library clients find the library convenient for accessing its collection. Additionally, the service hours are deemed suitable for users, ensuring accessibility during the clients preferred time. Furthermore, the findings highlight that the library staff is consistently available at their designated areas to assist clients. This suggests that the library effectively provides an accessible and user-friendly environment, which enhances the overall experience of its clients (Shukla & Mishra, 2025). Ensuring convenient access to library resources and maintaining a reliable presence of staff contribute to user satisfaction and reinforce the library's role as a support system for learning and research (Ateboh, 2016).

The ability of library staff to orient clients on library use, make information easily accessible, and update clients on new acquisitions was evaluated. The findings show that the 26 and above group gave the highest rating with a total weighted mean of 3.70, which was described as "O", compared to the 18-21 and 22-25 groups with a weighted mean of 3.55 and 3.50, which were described as "VS".

Moreover, the high ratings show that the library staff are good at giving clear instructions, especially when it comes to using the library's resources. The results also show that the staff make information easy to access for everyone. In addition, the library staff keep clients informed about new acquisitions, which encourages clients to explore the library. The findings are true in the study of Sahu and Tiwari, (2024), which emphasized that when individuals patronize a library and find that their need is acknowledged and catered to, they develop a sense of belonging.

However, the slightly low ratings of the younger visitors might suggest that they need more interaction or different ways of communication, such as social media updates or interactive activities, to keep them engaged and informed. Studies have shown that younger audiences respond better to digital engagement and personalized communication methods, which could help enhance their library experience. Khan and Bhatti (2022) described that social media is important to capture the attention of online users and helps in distance learning and knowledge sharing. Additionally, in the study of Mugo and Mathu, (2021), it was revealed that social media is useful in many occasions to deliver information services to library users.

The library staff's courtesy was evaluated based on their ability to treat clients with respect and understanding, provide fair and equal treatment, and offer guidance when needed. The findings suggest that the 26 and above group rated staff courtesy the highest, with a total weighted mean of 3.78, followed by the 18-21 age group at 3.72, both describing staff behaviors "O". The 22-25 group gave a weighted mean of 3.68, describing courtesy as "VS"

Moreover, the results suggest that the library clients across all age groups generally perceive staff as respectful and considerate, ensuring a welcoming environment for users, treated with respect and courtesy while seeking library services (Mogu & Mathu, 2021). Additionally, according to the study of Scoulas and De Groote (2022), a higher rating from older clients is potentially linked to higher expectations of professionalism. Overall, the results imply that the library creates a culture of respect and inclusivity (Nair,2025), where clients feel valued and supported during their library experience.

The library staff's credibility was assessed based on their ability to instill confidence in users while ensuring the accuracy and confidentiality of the client's information. The findings reveal that credibility is consistently rated positively across all age groups, with weighted means of 3.67, 3.63, and 3.67 for the 18-21, 22-25, and 26 and above groups respectively which describe as "VS".

The results suggest that library users trust the staff to handle their inquiries and personal data responsibly (Hess et al., 2014). The slight variation in scores indicates a stable perception of credibility, reinforcing the notion that the library upholds high standards of integrity and professionalism (Udofot et al., 2023). Furthermore, the emphasis on safeguarding user information highlights the library's commitment to maintaining confidentiality. According to Navigator (2024), maintaining clients' confidentiality strengthens client trust creating a secure environment. The library's reliability was evaluated based on staff's willingness to assist with inquiries, the smooth handling of transactions, and the consistency of procedures guiding clients. The highest ratings come from the 26 and above age group, with a total weighted mean of 3.73 which described

as “O” while the 18-21 and 22-25 age groups both reported a mean of 3.69 which described as “VS”.

Moreover, the results indicate that library users perceive the staff as dependable most of the time, ready to help and the structured processes in place. Additionally, according to Lenstra et al. (2019), the slightly higher rating from the older age group may suggest greater reliance on clear procedures and efficient service. Overall, the findings imply that the library prioritizes consistency and efficiency (Udofot et al., 2023), ensuring clients receive reliable support and guidance throughout their library experience.

The library's security was assessed based on perceptions of safety, the protection of resources, and the confidentiality of personal data of the clients. The findings show consistently high ratings across all age groups, with weighted means of 3.76 for ages 18-21, 3.7 for ages 22-25, and 3.75 for ages 26 and above, all described as "O"

These findings suggest that the library is perceived by the clients as a safe and well-secured space where users feel protected. The high ratings imply that adequate security measures are in place, ensuring the protection of resources and maintaining the confidentiality of user data. This may be attributed to the presence of security systems (Penetrante et al., 2010), which are seen in the library, such as the RFID Security Gate system and the CCTVs. Additionally, according to Noh (2014), the strict protocols for data privacy and resource management may contribute to the protection of the clients and staff, since the CMU Library Services strictly implemented the Data Privacy Act of 2012.

The library's tangibility was assessed based on how it provides comfort to users, the use of modern equipment and facilities, the appearance and professionalism of the staff, and the library’s capacity to accommodate users.

The findings show that across all age groups, clients perceive the library positively in terms of comfort, facilities, staff presentation, and capacity. The weighted mean ratings were 3.65 for ages 18-21, 3.47 for ages 22-25, and 3.68 for ages 26 and above, which were described as “VS”. These results indicate that, in general, users find the library environment satisfactory in terms of physical aspects and service delivery. This is true in the study of Alam and Mezbah-Ul-Islam (2022), which highlighted that resources, staff competence, demeanor, and tangible facilities significantly impact user satisfaction.

However, the slight low in ratings among the 22-25 age group (3.47) suggests that this demographic might have higher expectations regarding modernity and convenience (Somaratna, 2019). This could be due to their frequent exposure to advanced technology and contemporary library standards. Furthermore, these preferences suggest a desire for both modern technological amenities and traditional resources to enhance their academic experience (American Library Association, 2019).

Overall, the findings indicate that the library maintains an environment that is both visually appealing and functionally efficient. The positive perception suggests that investments in infrastructure and technological upgrades contributed to a well-rounded user experience (Khan et al., 2022).

The assessment of library services is categorized into 9 key indicators: Competence, Responsiveness, Accessibility, Communication, Courtesy, Credibility, Reliability, Security, and Tangibility.

The responses are grouped by four categories: student, visitor, alumni, and faculty/staff. Overall, the data suggests a generally positive perception of library services, with respondents frequently rating them as “VS” and “O”.

Table 3 Respondents’ Assessment of the Quality of Library Services according to CATEGORY

CATEGORY		FACULTY/STAFF		
		MEAN	SD	QD
A	Competence	3.55	0.50	VS
B	Responsiveness	3.51	0.636	VS
C	Accessibility	3.60	0.587	VS

D	Communication	3.54	0.632	VS
E	Courtesy	3.71	0.502	O
F	Credibility	3.67	0.523	VS
G	Reliability	3.68	0.514	VS
H	Security	3.67	0.52	VS
I.	Tangibility	3.62	0.608	VS
CATEGORY		ALUMNI		
	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	QD
A	3.830	3.830	3.830	VS
B	3.64	3.64	3.64	VS
C	3.72	3.72	3.72	VS
D	3.71	3.71	3.71	VS
E	3.75	3.75	3.75	O
F	3.70	3.70	3.70	VS
G	3.73	3.73	3.73	VS
H	3.70	3.70	3.70	VS
I.	3.72	3.72	3.72	VS
CATEGORY		VISITORS		
		MEAN	SD	QD
A	Competence	3.64	0.599	VS
B	Responsiveness	3.83	0.464	O
C	Accessibility	3.84	0.407	O
D	Communication	3.79	0.444	O
E	Courtesy	3.85	0.405	O
F	Credibility	3.79	0.439	O
G	Reliability	3.80	0.443	O
H	Security	3.79	0.439	O
I.	Tangibility	3.76	0.497	O
CATEGORY		STUDENTS		
		MEAN	SD	QD
A	Competence	3.51	0.636	VS
B	Responsiveness	3.55	0.58	VS

	ess		1	
C	Accessibility	3.63	0.586	VS
D	Communication	3.67	0.526	VS
E	Courtesy	3.75	0.450	O
F	Credibility	3.67	0.484	VS
G	Reliability	3.80	0.410	O
H	Security	3.67	0.484	VS
I	Tangibility	3.61	0.583	VS

The library’s competence was assessed based on how the library staff handles pressure in serving clients and their knowledge in answering questions raised by clients. The findings show that alumni gave the highest rating, with a weighted mean of 3.83, which is described as “O.” Meanwhile, students, visitors, and faculty/staff gave weighted means of 3.50, 3.64, and 3.55 respectively, all described as “VS.”

The findings imply that the alumni perceive the library staff as highly capable in handling client needs and equipped with sufficient knowledge to respond to inquiries. This might be because alumni, having experienced the library over a longer period and now viewing it from an external perspective, are more appreciative of the improvements and professionalism of the staff (Wiranto & Slameto, 2021).

However, the students and faculty gave slightly lower ratings, possibly because they interact with the library staff more frequently and over an extended period. According to the study of Barfi et al. (2023), faculty and staff who are constantly exposed to the daily operations, are more likely to notice inconsistencies or lapses in service, which could influence their ratings. Similarly, the study of Atinkut and Abe (2019) found that students’ perceptions of service quality could be influenced by the clients’ exposure to daily operations and any inconsistencies therein. Therefore, their proximity allows them to observe not just isolated experiences but patterns in behavior, responsiveness, and availability of staff.

Furthermore, the slightly lower rating of the visitors might imply that they have limited interactions with the library staff and may form their impressions based on first encounters (Rahayu & Qudratullah, 2017).

Overall, the ratings imply that the library staff are generally seen as competent and reliable, with perceptions ranging from VS to O. The consistent high ratings across all user groups suggest a strong foundation of professionalism among the library personnel (Udofot et al., 2023).

The library’s responsiveness was assessed based on library staff’s willingness to help the clients, dependability in handling users service problems and staff’s immediate responds to complaints and emergencies. The results show that alumni gave the highest rating with a weighted mean of 3.84, describes as “O.” This was closely followed by visitors at 3.72, also describes as “O.” On the other hand, students and faculty/staff gave slightly lower ratings at 3.60 and 3.63 respectively, both still falling under “VS.”

These findings suggest that the staff’s efficiency and supportiveness are most noticeable to alumni and visitors. This could be due to being occasional users of the library. According to the study of Maesaroh et al. (2024), responsiveness is often weighed by how quickly concerns are addressed in a single visit, which is often managed effectively, and library users attach top priority not only to reliability of the services but more importantly on the responsive assistance from service personnel.

In contrast, the slightly lower ratings from students and faculty/staff could be result to experience variations depending on staff availability such as delays during peak hours, unmet user expectations and perceived lack of attentiveness. As noted in the study of Khaola and Mabilikoane (2015), routine users tend to experience the full range of service conditions, allowing them to critically assess both strengths and weaknesses.

Moreover, students may have higher expectations due to technology-driven immediacy norms. According to the study of Regusa (2017), students influenced by the immediacy of digital communication, anticipate prompt responses in their educational interactions, which may not always be met in traditional settings.

In summary, while the ratings remain strong, they also indicate a need for a more dynamic and consistent user engagement strategies, particularly for daily library users.

These findings suggest that the library consistently delivers quality service and remains ready to serve its clients. This aligns with the study by Adetoro (2019), which found that accessible library services, including extended hours, well-organized collections, and responsive staff, significantly enhance user satisfaction. Additionally, Kumar and Singh (2020) emphasized that libraries with strong accessibility features contribute to higher engagement and positive perceptions among patrons.

Moreover, accessibility is a key factor in overall library satisfaction, as noted by IFLA's Guidelines for Library Services (2021), which highlight that ease of access to resources and services directly impacts user experience. The slightly lower rating from students may indicate specific needs, such as extended hours during exam periods or more digital resources, suggesting an area for further improvement.

Overall, the library's "O" and "VS" ratings reflect its commitment to accessibility, reinforcing the idea that well-managed libraries play a crucial role in supporting their users' academic and research needs.

The library's accessibility was measured by several factors, including the presence of permanently assigned personnel in their posts, convenient access to library collections, and convenient service hours. The findings revealed that alumni gave the highest rating of 3.82, described as "O," followed by visitors, faculty and staff, who all gave a weighted mean of 3.72, also described as "O." Meanwhile, students provided slightly lower rating of 3.62, described as "VS."

These findings suggest that the library consistently delivers quality service and remains ready to serve its clients. This aligns with the study of Hernon and Calvert (1995), which found that accessible library services, including extended hours, well-organized collections, and responsive staff significantly enhance user satisfaction. Additionally, van Vugt et al. (2021) emphasized that libraries with strong accessibility features contribute to higher engagement and positive perceptions among patrons. The research demonstrates that actively involving students with disabilities in the design of library services and spaces leads to a more inclusive environment.

Moreover, accessibility is a key factor in overall library satisfaction, as noted by IFLA's Guidelines for Library Services (2021), which highlight that ease of access to resources and services directly impacts user experience. The slightly lower rating from students may indicate specific needs, such as extended hours during exam periods or more digital resources, suggesting an area for further improvement.

The library's communication was assessed based on how staff orient patrons on using the library, how accessible information is for independent use, and how updates on new acquisitions are shared. Alumni gave the highest rating at 3.79, described as "O." This was closely followed by visitors at 3.70, also described as "O." Students and faculty/staff gave slightly lower ratings at 3.54 and 3.67, respectively, both described as "VS."

These findings suggest that alumni and visitors find the library's communication strategies to be clear, concise, and effective for their needs. This may be due to the library using direct and general messaging methods like announcements, posters, or information from the front desk. This is true in the study of Ahmed et al. (2015) that highlighted that informed communication at the front desk to enhance user experience, particularly for occasional clients who may require additional guidance and support during their visits.

On the other hand, students and faculty, however, might desire more personalized or in-depth communication, especially about new acquisitions or digital resources. According to the findings of Scoulas and De Groote (2024), academic users often seek updated, subject-specific, and research-relevant information.

Overall, the findings suggest that the library communicates effectively with its library clients, keeping them well-updated of library acquisition. The library's courtesy was assessed by how the staff treat clients with respect, understanding, and fairness, how concerns are addressed, and whether clients are guided properly. Alumni gave the highest rating at 3.85, while both visitors

and faculty/staff rated 3.75, closely followed by students at 3.71. All user groups rated the service as “O.”

The findings suggest a uniformly strong perception of courteous and respectful behavior from library staff across all user types. The high ratings may be a result of well-established customer service training or institutional emphasis on empathy and professionalism in public interaction (Khaola & Mabilikoane, 2015). Moreover, the closeness in all scores also implies that courtesy is a strength that the library has successfully institutionalized across roles and shifts, as confirmed by a similar study by Udofot et al. (2023), who found that perceived fairness and kindness in staff behavior directly correlate with client trust and satisfaction.

Overall, the consistency of high ratings across categories suggests that the library’s culture is one of respect and inclusiveness, which positively influences overall user experience.

2.

The library’s credibility was assessed based on how the library staff instill confidence in users and how staff ensure the accuracy and confidentiality of patrons’ information. The data reveals that the alumni gave the highest ratings with 3.79, described as “O”. This is followed by visitor with a rating of 3.70, also described as “O”. Furthermore, the student and faculty/staff gave a slightly lower rating, both with 3.67, which was described as “VS”.

The findings reveal that the library staff shows credibility in dealing with the students and in handling sensitive information. However, the slightly lower rating of students and faculty/staff may indicate that they develop more standards for what they consider “credible”. In the study of Bush, T. L., & Shaver, M. G. (2018) it was revealed that regular users can observe consistency and professionalism over time, particularly on how they handle sensitive interactions or data-related tasks. Regular users may notice if a staff struggles with confidentiality and they are also more attuned to how confident, knowledgeable, and composed staff appear when dealing with complex inquiries, especially those involving personal records or research data. It found that users are indeed attentive to staff’s actions and that their perceptions of professionalism and trust are built on the staff’s consistent and discreet behavior. Furthermore, even small moments like hesitation when asked about access rights or inconsistent enforcement of confidentiality rules can change perception just a little.

On the other hand, alumni and visitors might only see the best face of the library during short visits and may not witness any lapses, giving them a more uniformly positive view.

The library’s reliability was evaluated in terms of the willingness of staff to assist clients with inquiries, the smooth and orderly handling of transactions, and the presence of clear, consistent procedures that guide patrons on what to do. Alumni and faculty/staff both gave the highest rating of 3.83, described as “O.” Visitors followed closely at 3.73, while students gave a slightly lower score of 3.68, which is “VS.”

These findings suggest that the library is largely dependable and well-organized in delivering its services. The high marks from alumni and faculty/staff indicate strong satisfaction with consistent and effective support systems. The slightly lower student rating might reflect occasional gaps in the responsiveness of staff. Additionally, according to the study of Andrew A. Nicholson et al. (2018) specifically examines how effective signage impacts user experience. It finds that clear, well-designed signage significantly improves a patron’s ability to navigate the library, which in turn reduces frustration and increases satisfaction. The findings emphasize that these simple guidance tools are crucial for enhancing the overall user experience. user-friendly guidance tools such as signage, updated FAQs, or digital assistance kiosks improved the user engagement and satisfaction.

Moreover, the high reliability scores can be attributed to well-established operating procedures and an evidently strong service culture. Research by Moses et al. (2016) emphasized that consistency and clarity in library services increase user confidence and reduce service bottlenecks, particularly in academic libraries.

Security was assessed based on the perceived safety within the library premises, how well resources are protected, the currency of copyrighted materials, and the confidentiality of user records. Alumni and faculty/staff again gave the highest ratings at 3.79, described as “O.” Visitors followed with 3.70, also described as “O”, and students and faculty/staff both rated the library at 3.67, still “VS.”

These findings suggest that security is well regarded, particularly among less frequent users.

According to Ceccato et al. (2023), alumni and visitors evaluate security more on physical safety and general order. Factors such as clear sightlines, well-maintained spaces, and visible staff presence contributed to a sense of safety. On the other hand, students and faculty/staff, who regularly access digital resources and data, might consider broader aspects like digital security, up-to-date copyright information, or the visible enforcement of confidentiality protocols (Jiang et al., 2023).

Given that safety and security underpin a user's willingness to engage fully in a learning environment, these results indicate a solid baseline with room for enhancement, especially in reinforcing digital resource management and visible information governance practices. According to Jiang et al. (2023), digital and physical safety improves user engagement and contentment with library services.

Tangibility was evaluated through the physical comfort of the premises, the presence of equipment and facilities, the neatness and grooming of library staff, library capacity, and the provision of quiet study spaces. Alumni and faculty/staff rated this area highest at 3.76, followed by visitors at 3.72, all described as “O.” Students and faculty/staff gave slightly lower scores at 3.62 and 3.61 respectively, categorized as “VS.”

These findings suggest that the library is visually and functionally appealing to most users, however day-to-day users may have noticed areas for improvement in the physical environment. According to the study of Cha and Kim (2015), since students and faculty are more likely to use the space for prolonged periods, their experience is more sensitive to issues such as overcrowding, availability of study areas, cleanliness, and the condition of facilities and equipment. These factors significantly influenced clients’ decisions on where to study, especially prolonged periods in the library.

Moreover, staff appearance also contributed to the clients’ satisfaction and their likelihood to return to the library. In the study of Lee and Choi (2020), staff grooming and presentation can significantly impact user experiences in service-oriented environments, such as libraries.

Furthermore, while the data reflects strong satisfaction overall, a continued effort to upgrade facilities and manage spatial dynamics is essential. This aligns with recommendations by Cha and Kim (2015), who observed that even high-quality academic libraries benefit from routine environmental assessments to stay responsive to user expectations.

3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

The data indicates that the library's primary users are young, female students who predominantly visit the main library. The demographic profile is heavily skewed towards this group, with other categories representing only a small fraction of total visitors. The library's services are primarily utilized by its student population, with a clear majority being young, female undergraduates. The data strongly suggests that the Office of the Library Services serves as the main point of engagement for these clients, overshadowing the usage of the various reading rooms. This demographic information is crucial for the library in tailoring its services, resources, and outreach efforts to best meet the needs of its core user base while also considering strategies to attract a more diverse range of patrons, such as faculty, staff, and alumni.

The library's services are generally perceived as "Very Satisfactory" (VS) or "Outstanding" (O) across all key indicators and demographic groups. While all user groups—students, visitors, alumni, and faculty/staff—hold a high opinion of the library, alumni consistently give the highest ratings, often describing the services as "Outstanding." This suggests that alumni, perhaps with a long-term perspective on the library's evolution, have a particularly high level of satisfaction.

The data collectively demonstrates that the library provides high-quality, user-centric services that meet or exceed the expectations of most patrons. The positive feedback on staff competence, accessibility, and courtesy is a significant strength. However, the slightly lower ratings from students and faculty in certain areas, particularly communication and tangible resources, offer clear opportunities for enhancement.

Recommendations

To further improve its services, the library may consider addressing the expressed suggestions of library users.

1. The Physical Environment and Facilities.

The most frequent suggestions are related to the physical comfort of the library. Students repeatedly requested air conditioning and more fans for better ventilation, especially on the upper floors, which they described as hot and uncomfortable. There were also several calls to address noise distractions, particularly from the UCC area, to create a more peaceful study environment. Other suggestions for physical improvements include: more tables and chairs to accommodate more students, especially during peak times like exam week, A dedicated sleeping lounge or student lounge where they can rest between classes ,Fixing and cleaning restrooms, including providing soap and toilet paper ,Repairing broken furniture like shaky tables ,Providing a water dispenser with cold water, Adding a generator to ensure services are available during power interruptions.

2. Technology and Connectivity

A critical and recurring theme in the feedback is the urgent need for free, stable, and accessible Wi-Fi for all

students, on all floors. Many students reported poor or non-existent internet signal, which hinders their ability to do research and access online learning materials. Specific suggestions included: Making Wi-Fi available for everyone, not just staff, Adding charging stations for devices, Addressing "dead zones" with a stronger signal, Improving the electrical outlets for consistent power.

3. Resources and Services

Students also provided suggestions to enhance the library's core services and resources. Key requests include:

Providing more books, especially for science subjects like Chemistry, that are available both in the catalog and on-hand for borrowing, Improving the borrowing procedures to make them faster and more efficient, Offering an online or offline orientation on how to use the library, as an alternative to face-to-face sessions, to better accommodate students with jobs or those in graduate studies, A few students also suggested new books and novels, as well as recreational items like chess boards.

While the majority of suggestions focused on improvements, it's worth noting that some students expressed complete satisfaction, stating that the library services were "good" and that the staff were doing a great job maintaining a quiet atmosphere. However, the overwhelming feedback points to a clear demand for better physical comfort and reliable internet access.

Acknowledgment:

The researcher would like to extend their gratitude to the CMU Administration, colleagues, students, alumni, staff, faculty and other stakeholders of the University who assisted them in the conduct of the study.

4. REFERENCES:

- Atanda, A. D., Owolabi, K. A., & Uguala, C. P. (2021). Professional competence and attitudes of library personnel towards digital services in selected university libraries in Nigerian. *Digital Library Perspectives*, 37(3), 209–222.
- Ateboh, P. a. T. B. A. (2016). Users' satisfaction with library information resources and services: A case study College of Health Sciences Library Niger Delta University, Amassoma, Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(16), 54–59. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1105267.pdf>
- Adetayo, A., Alawiye, M. K., Emmanuel, S. O., Omotoso, A. O., & Bello, T. O. (2024). Exploring university students' library engagement: Reading habits, preferences, and gender dynamics.¹ *Journal of Digital Learning and Education*, 4(1), 15–29. <https://doi.org/10.52562/jdle.v4i1.884>
- Alam, M. J., & Mezbah-Ul-Islam, M. (2022). Impact of service quality on user satisfaction in public university libraries of Bangladesh using structural equation modeling. *Performance Measurement and Metrics*, 24(1), 12–30. <https://doi.org/10.1108/pmm-06-2021-0033>
- Ahmed, W., Soroya, M. S., & Malik, G. F. (2015). Service quality of library front desk staff in medical colleges of Lahore. *Library Management*, 36(1/2), 12–22. <https://doi.org/10.1108/lm-05-2014-0056>
- Atinkut, L., & Abe, Y. (2019). Impact of library service quality on students' satisfaction in higher educational environments: The case of Wollo University. *Asian Journal of Economics Business and Accounting*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajeba/2019/v10i230100>
- Barfi, K. A., Parbie, S. K., Filson, C. K., Teye, M. V., Kodua-Ntim, K., & Ayensu, E. (2023).² Assessing the quality of services at an academic library. *Heliyon*, 9(12), e22449. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e22449>
- Cabfilan, N. W., & Ricardo, M. C. (2020). *Library usage by faculty members of Benguet State University*. DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/5095/>
- Ceccato, V., Ercin, E., Hazanov, J., Elfström, S., & Sampaio, A. (2023). Safety in a public library: The perspective of visitors and staff. *Library Management*, 44(3/4), 229–245. <https://doi.org/10.1108/lm-12-2022-0127>
- Cha, S. H., & Kim, T. W. (2015). What matters for students' use of physical library space? *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 41(3), 274–279. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2015.03.014>
- Doneva, Y., & Angelova, V. (2023). The educational role of the academic library. *Izvestia Journal of the Union of Scientists-Varna. Economic Sciences Series*, 12(2), 260–267.
- Dupa, L. B., Vivero, G., Hare, F., & Vicitacion, F. (2018). Library users and their satisfaction level on library service. *Philippine E-Journals*, 24(2), 1. <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=13297>

- Hess, A. N., LaPorte-Fiori, R., & Engwall, K. (2014). Preserving patron privacy in the century academic library. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 41(1), 105–114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2014.10.010>
- Jiang, J. A., Yamamoto, F. R., Nagy, V., Zander, M., & Barker, L. (2023). Data privacy in learning management systems: Perceptions of students, faculty, and administrative staff. In *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* (pp. 100–115). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-48060-7_8
- Khan, A. U., Rafi, M., Zhang, Z., & Khan, A. (2022). Determining the impact of technological modernization and management capabilities on user satisfaction and trust in library services. *Global Knowledge Memory and Communication*, 72(6/7), 593–611. <https://doi.org/10.1108/gkmc-06-2021-0095>
- Khaola, P., & Mabilikoane, M. (2015). Perception of library service quality, satisfaction and frequency of use of library resources. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(1), 44–52. https://journals.co.za/content/uz_inka/7/1/EJC171655
- Lee, B., & Choi, J. (2020). Effect of staff appearance on customer satisfaction and revisit intention. *International Journal of Services Economics and Management*, 11(2), 119. <https://doi.org/10.1504/ijsem.2020.108979>
- Lenstra, N., Oguz, F., & Duvall, C. S. (2019). Library services to an aging population: A nation-wide study in the United States. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 52(3), 738–748. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961000619871596>
- Manguil, C. J., Mendoza, M. K. A., & Del Rosario, J. (2024). Level of satisfaction with the library resources and services of education faculty and students in Lone Agricultural State College in Bulacan.³ *Pedagogy Review*, 4(1), 17–30. <https://doi.org/10.62718/vmca.pr-ijetas.4.1.sc-1024-010>
- 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.
- Nair, N. (2025, March 10). *How can libraries create inclusive environments and promote diverse collections?* Editage Insights. <https://www.editage.com/insights/how-can-libraries-create-inclusive-environments-and-promote-diverse-collections>
- Navigator, C. (2024, October 23). *Library Assistant: Handling Confidential Information*. American Profession Guide. <https://americanprofessionguide.com/library-assistant-handling-confidential-information/>
- Noh, Y. (2014). Digital library user privacy: Changing librarian viewpoints through education. *Library Hi Tech*, 32(2), 300–317. <https://doi.org/10.1108/lht-08-2013-0103>
- Omeluzor, S. U., & Aluko-Arowolo, T. K. (2023). *Use of Library Resources and Services by Postgraduate Students in a Specialized University in Nigeria*.
- Penetrante, M. O. T., Gicana, R. A., Balontong, R. P., Sapul, M. S. C., & Montañó, A. M., Jr. (2010). *Electronic library monitoring system with RFID technology*. BAHÁNDIAN, Institutional Repository of Central Philippine University. <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12852/1520>
- Ragusa, A. T. (2017). Technologically-mediated communication: Student expectations and experiences in a FOMO society. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-017-0077-7>
- Scoulas, J. M., & De Groote, S. L. (2022). Faculty perceptions, use, and needs of library resource and services in a public research university. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 49(1), 102630. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2022.102630>
- Udofot, C. O., Asibi, L. I. J., & Cln, C. K. D. (2023). *Workplace Ethics, Productivity and Professionalism in Library Organizations in Nigeria*. Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7751197>
- Wiranto, R., & Slameto, S. (2021). Alumni satisfaction in terms of classroom infrastructure, lecturer professionalism, and curriculum. *Heliyon*, 7(6), e06679. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06679>